

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th November, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions: Caris Bros' robbery, reward	1618
Aborigines, legislation	1618
Bills: Native Flora Protection, report	1618
Lotteries (Control) Act Continuance, 2R.	1618
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report	1619
Workers' Homes Amendment (No. 2), returned	1622
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, Com.	1622
Reserves, 2R.	1640

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—CARIS BROTHERS' ROBBERY, REWARD.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Police: 1, Has the reward in connection with the Caris Bros. robbery yet been allocated? 2, If so, by whom? 3, What was the method of allocation? 4, Has any claim yet been refused?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Police) replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Answered by No. 1. 4, Yes.

QUESTION—ABORIGINES, LEGISLATION.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for the North-West: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session following upon the report of the Royal Commissioner on the treatment of aborigines in Western Australia?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied: Yes.

BILL—NATIVE FLORA PROTECTION.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: The Bill proposes to continue the operations of the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1932-34, for one year. It has become the custom with regard to that

Act and a few others for Parliament to enact them as temporary measures only. The operations of the Act have been restricted to one year and I propose on this occasion to continue that practice. That is all the Bill provides. Hon. members may require to know something about the transactions and operations of the Lotteries Commission who operate under the powers provided by the measure. During the year there have been ten consultations finalised to the 8th October. The total amount subscribed by the public was £172,551 10s. Prize money was allocated amounting to £82,828 10s. and the expenses totalled £26,064 7s. 5d. The prize money allocated represented 48 per cent. of the subscriptions and the expenses 15 per cent., the latter, of course, including 10 per cent. paid to the sellers of tickets. The profit realised was £63,658 12s. 7d., being 36.8 per cent. available for distribution. A balance of £53,111 18s. 8d. was carried over from 1934, making a total of £116,770 11s. 3d. Of that sum £62,345 7s. 11d. was paid out in donations this year, leaving a balance of £54,425 3s. 4d. against this amount. There are commitments amounting to £40,196 18s. 8d., including £20,000 for the King Edward Memorial Hospital and £1,413 for the Children's Hospital. A balance for further distribution of £14,228 4s. 8d. is now actually available. It will be observed that I have given hon. members the shillings and pence because, in a matter of this description, it is essential to be accurate, so that there shall be no possibility of suspicion whatever. Between 40 and 50 refrigerators have been supplied to hospitals throughout the State at a cost of over £4,000. X-ray plants have been installed at 29 hospitals, with assistance from the Commission representing nearly £6,000. The Youth and Motherhood Appeal was aided to the extent of £10,000. Hospitals, besides having received X-ray plant and refrigerators, have also been assisted financially to the extent of £15,361. Nearly 3,000 pairs of blankets and 1,350 pairs of sheets were given for distribution to the indigent and needy through the medium of different relief committees. Besides this bedding, the sum of £3,170 was spent for the relief of distress through the same agencies. To the Child Welfare Department £650 was made available to enable them to provide necessary articles of household furniture in the homes of widows with children who are dependent on the department for the means

of living. The hospital social service has benefited to the extent of £1,265. The following orphanages have received allocations from the Commission totalling £4,423:—Castledare Home, Clontarf Orphanage, Swan Boys' Orphanage, Anglican Girls' Orphanage, Parkerville Home and St. Joseph's and St. Vincent's Foundling Homes. The following institutions and others have also been assisted:—

	£
Flying doctor fund	1,100
Aborigines Department	1,425
Ugby Men's Association	1,500
Beagle Bay Mission	300
Drysdale River Mission	170
Bickley disaster relief	628
Mental Hospital After-Care Committee	525
Returned Maimed and Limbless Men's Association	650
R.S.L.	1,500
Lady Lawley Cottage	336
Chandler Boys' Farm	1,000
Tardun Boys' Farm	1,000
W.A. School for Deaf and Dumb	600
Housing Trust	2,100
Infant Health Centres	844
Kindergarten Union	545
School for the Blind	2,500
Silver Chain Nursing League	850
St. John Ambulance Association	2,525
Sister Kate's Home	250
Braille Society	500

That is all the information I have to place before members, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Thorn, debate adjourned.

BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th November.

Mr. McDONALD (West Perth) [4.43]: I propose to support the second reading of the Bill, which is one of those pieces of legislation that cannot be stopped at a moment's notice without creating some hardship and confusion amongst those people who have hitherto been protected by its provision. I feel, however, that the time has arrived when this matter could have been dealt with in a rather different fashion. It has been considered by Parliament that the economic crisis has passed to a considerable degree, and that the time has arrived when many measures adopted to meet the difficulties that arose during

that period can be repealed. For that reason we have completely restored, by legislation passed through this House, the cuts made in the salaries of the civil servants, which was the principal measure taken to counter the economic stringency that occurred in 1931. I do not feel that we can long continue to mark out one particular class of people as those to whom this special emergency legislation is to continue to apply. In the case of certain mortgagors or borrowers who are the owners of farm lands—in other words, the primary producers—a certain amount of protection is still necessary and may be necessary for a considerable time, but they are dealt with under special legislation for the preservation of their position as farmers. But there are other mortgagors and purchasers of property in the metropolitan area, for example, who are not suffering the special disabilities common to primary producers and who might now be asked to meet their ordinary obligations.

The Minister for Justice: The mortgagees could make application to the court.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, but many people hesitate to make application to the court. They have to consult solicitors, which involves a certain amount of expense, and many people hesitate about embarking on any court proceedings. Last year when I spoke on a similar measure to continue the Act, I suggested two ways in which the matter might be dealt with. One was that we should adopt what has always been the law in Victoria and, instead of the mortgagee or lender or seller of a house having to go to the court and prove that the borrower or purchaser was able to pay, the position should be reversed. Under a provision of that kind, the lender or the seller could proceed to exercise his contractual rights, subject to the borrower or purchaser having the privilege of going to court and showing that it would be a hardship in his particular case. To put it another way, instead of the onus being placed, as now, on the lender or seller of property to show reason why he should exercise his rights by contract, we should place the onus upon the person who is seeking to show that he is not able to fulfil his obligations. As I have said, that has been the law in Victoria all along. In 1931, when the Government of the day introduced this legislation, very much heavier obligations

were imposed on the investor and vendor class here than was the case in Victoria. The other method I suggested last year was that we should deal with this legislation in the same way as the Federal Government dealt with the moratorium legislation after the war. During the war, people were prevented from enforcing contracts, particularly in respect to mortgages and the sale of houses, but when the war ended, it became necessary to get rid of those restrictions on contractual rights in such a way that no hardship would be inflicted upon the people who would be called upon to meet their obligations. So the Federal Government passed legislation by which people were given fair notice, perhaps a year or two years, that, at the expiration of that time, they would be liable to carry out their obligations. That appears to be a very suitable way in which to deal with legislation of this kind. The period might be fixed at 12 months or two years, but borrowers and buyers of houses would know that they had that period in which to arrange their affairs, so that they could meet their contractual obligations when the time had expired.

The Minister for Lands: You mean the debtors?

Mr. McDONALD: Yes; they would know that within 12 months or two years they would be required to make arrangements to meet their obligations. Further, the creditor—that is, the mortgagee or vendor of the house—would have the assurance that at the end of the specified period he would have his money coming in, and would be entitled to act under his contract as he thought fit. Many people to whom money is owing are themselves in great need of money to meet various obligations which they have incurred. I had hoped that the idea of the Federal Government for working off the moratorium legislation might have been adopted by the Government this year in connection with this legislation. I hope that next year it will be possible to bring down a measure which will afford relief in the direction I have indicated. For the time being I feel that we must re-enact this legislation, because, to terminate it suddenly would cause a certain amount of hardship to people who are indebted, and it is only fair that they should be given reasonable time in which to make arrangements to take up once again the obligations for which they are liable under their contracts.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.50]: I regret that the necessity still exists for this class of legislation. While I agree with a good deal of what the member for West Perth has said, I wish to point out that the farming community are in a position totally different from that of purchasers of houses in the metropolitan area. Ever since it was necessary to introduce this legislation many farmers have been building up a bigger liability against their holdings, and consequently it is only fair that they should be given sufficient security to ensure that when there is a chance of their meeting their liabilities, they will still be afforded some protection. At present it is difficult to dispose of farm property, and I believe that any mortgagee would be very reluctant to foreclose, but there may come a time when the industry is more prosperous and a good many foreclosures might result. That is calculated to create a good deal of fear amongst the farming community. Certainly farmers are entitled to certain protection in return for the national service rendered to the State during the last five years, in which period they have continued to produce wheat even though incurring a loss. I should like to see this legislation tapered off in some way so that we might gradually unload the protection afforded to purchasers of houses in the metropolitan area. I cannot see that it is possible to do that to-day, but I hope it will be possible in the near future to give certain relief to the mortgagees in the metropolitan area. But it will be some time before we can relieve the mortgagees who hold security over farming properties. I know that there are certain people who to-day are refraining from carrying out their obligations and are sheltering themselves behind this legislation.

The Minister for Justice: They are subject to application to the court by the mortgagees.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for West Perth pointed out clearly the reason why many mortgagees will not make application to the court. Quite a lot of people hate to go to court.

The Minister for Justice: It is not a very expensive procedure.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Quite so, but many people have a rooted objection to approaching the court. On a previous occasion I spoke of an old lady who held a mortgage for £500 on a property at Victoria Park, and she was left absolutely

stranded, because the amount she was able to collect by way of interest was insufficient to keep her. She could not get any financial assistance from the State, and could not obtain the old-age pension, and in consequence she was absolutely stranded. She was under the impression that, as the mortgage had fallen due, she could collect her capital and use it for her maintenance. There are many similar cases.

The Minister for Justice: The position is not as bad as that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That statement is quite true. We obtained legal assistance for that woman, but unfortunately we were unable to do anything for her, because the man said he could not meet the amount due and could not raise the money in any other way. However, I am concerned about the people engaged in primary industries. They require still further protection and probably, as the member for West Perth said, it will be some time before we are able to abolish this legislation. I am not in favour of the hon. member's suggestion to reverse the order by requiring the mortgagor to make application to the court. The reason why the onus was thrown on the mortgagee was that otherwise quite a number of farmers owing money to private mortgagees would have had to come to Perth, and they had not the money to do so. Consequently we reversed the usual order and placed the obligation of making the application on the people who could afford to pay. That was the reason why the measure was framed in its present form. The Act has served a very useful purpose, and will continue to do so. Ministers and those who occupied seats in the House when the original measure was introduced will recall instances having been given of people who, although they had paid substantial deposits on farming properties, owing to inability to meet their commitments on the due date, were being dispossessed. That happened in quite a number of instances. Action of that sort is taken by a certain class of people, and they are entitled, under their contractual rights, to do it.

The Minister for Justice: Some of them were very glad to get the farms back again.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Some of the men who voluntarily took their farms back might have been glad, but the man who was landed was the one who had sold on extended terms, and taken up another farm. That man found himself landed with two farms. I am

supporting the second reading because I know that the Act is necessary and will be necessary for some time to come. I hope that next year we shall be able to taper off this legislation, but meanwhile, and probably for some years to come, the farming community will need protection somewhat on the lines of the present statute.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [4.57]: I support the second reading. I should like to state in a few words the feeling that exists in many country districts, including my own. I have received a large number of communications from farmers voicing their fear of the consequences that would follow if this legislation were allowed to pass off the statute-book. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, during the last three or four years the prices for primary products have not been commensurate with the cost of production, and instead of farmers being able to reduce their burden of debt, they have piled up an increased liability. With interest and compound interest continued over a few years, the position of the man on the land becomes almost impossible, especially if he has to cart his produce many miles to a railway siding. In the minds of many thinking people—men who have no desire to shirk their obligations—there exists a great fear as to what will happen if this legislation is not re-enacted. Suppose the prices for wheat, wool and other produce improved a little. We know that some of the financial institutions have no soul, and the first man who came along with a decent offer for a property mortgaged to one of the institutions would be able to get it over the heads of those who had been working the property for years. There is no shadow of doubt of the truth of that statement. An instance came under my notice quite recently of a man who sold his wool and paid the proceeds into the bank. There was sufficient money to meet the interest due on all his liabilities. He thought he would be able to draw on part of the wool cheque in order to meet some of his obligations to private creditors. Would the House believe it, he was met by a refusal to be allowed to draw out any of the money for that purpose. I am simply stating facts. It is absolutely necessary that this legislation should remain on the statute-book for

a few years longer. I support the second reading.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.0]: I support the second reading. The proposition is an exceedingly difficult one, particularly in the case of properties outside the metropolitan area. Within the city and suburbs the question of finance is a comparatively easy one, although I admit the interest charges have been far in excess of what they ought to be. That is a condition which applies, not only in the case of individual investors and borrowers, but to the nations of the world. This country is an example of excessive interest charges. A mortgagor who has a property in the outer suburban or country areas, and is endeavouring to obtain a living by the cultivation of his land, faces an exceedingly difficult if not an impossible position should he attempt to raise a loan. Some time ago I was approached by one of my electors who was in grave financial need. He was called upon to pay up a mortgage on his property, which had been raised by him subsequent to the passing of the first emergency measure. I went to a great deal of trouble, and advertised twice in the "West Australian" in the hope of coming into contact with someone who would lend £500. The property could fairly be valued at £1,500, and yet no financial institution which had money available at a reasonable rate would advance the requisite amount upon it. The house is a good one, and the ground comprises a certain area under cultivation with trees, poultry, etc. The money could not, however, be obtained. The house is worth probably at least £550. That is what it cost to build when building was cheaper than it is to-day. Through the good offices of a third party I got into touch with someone who was prepared to find the money, but the interest was at eight per cent. That is a high rate, but we were very grateful to get the money. There is a widespread objection to investing money in properties other than bricks and mortar in Perth and the suburbs. It should be remembered that it would be impossible for Perth to carry on but for developments in the outlying districts. This is an old story. Everyone knows the position. I have on many occasions regretted that we have not a rural bank, or have not in the Agricultural Bank sufficient funds to enable those possessed of good security to obtain

assistance. I can only hope that those who depend upon others for finance will be treated with the greatest possible consideration. Primary produce is sold in our markets at a low rate to-day, and competition is ever increasing. I am very doubtful if there will be any material improvement for a long time; there will certainly be none for some years. I hope members will give consideration to the needs of people living outside the city and suburbs, and that steps will be taken to make money available at a reasonable rate of interest and thus encourage the development of our outer suburban and country areas.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair: the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1-3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 6 of principal Act:

Mr. CROSS: In the absence of Mr. Needham I move an amendment—

That after the word "amended" in line 1 the following words be inserted:—"by deleting the word 'five' in the first line of subsection (2)."

What is desired is that the personnel of the board shall be increased from five to six. If this amendment is agreed to, I should then like to move to insert "six" and for the insertion of the following words, "One member as a representative of the retailers, who shall be elected by such retailers as are at the time of the election registered with the milk board, and such shall include all registered milk vendors within a radius of 15 miles of the Perth Town Hall."

Mr. NEEDHAM: The amendment which the member for Canning has just moved appears on the Notice Paper under my name. He has already explained the purport of it. This is not the first occasion when the suggestion has been made that retail dairymen should be represented on the board. During the second reading debate the member for Murray-Wellington suggested that dairymen were already represented. The producer-retailer is represented, but generally speaking the retail-dairyman is not represented. The producer-retailer is elected by the votes of the producers. On the 22nd August last, in reply to a question asked by the member for Murray-Wellington, the Minister for Agriculture stated the number of licensed producers under the Whole Milk Board supplying milk to the metropolitan area as 481, and the number of producer-retailers as 226, and the number of milk vendors as 1,007. There is considerable disparity between the number of retail dairymen and that of producer-retailers, men who go around supplying homes with milk. In the second reading debate mention was made of the British procedure for election of milk boards. There the producers are entitled not only to one vote as producers in the election of a representative, but also to a vote for every cow they have. According to the number of cows the producer there has, he votes in the election of his representative—one cow, one vote. Retail dairymen have no representation whatever on our Whole Milk Board, and I have not yet heard one solid argument against the equity of such representation. The Minister has not disputed that the retail dairymen contribute about 75 per cent. of the board's administration costs, nor that the retail dairymen are a big factor in helping him and the board to bring to the consumer the best quality of milk. It may appear strange for a member of the Labour Party to be so solicitous for the retail dairyman, who is a middleman. Our policy, of course, differs from that. If the Minister sought to bring about socialisation of the dairying industry and to convey the milk direct from the producer to the consumer, I would not trouble about the retail dairyman. But while, under the present system, it is necessary to avail ourselves of that middleman's services, he should get fair play and should have an opportunity to help in the administration of the board. Time and again the board's

policy has militated severely against retail dairymen. The producer is well represented on the board, and well protected; and so is the consumer. Between the producer and the consumer there is a bridge of communication which has to be negotiated by the retail dairymen. He is an important entity in the distribution of milk, and he should have a voice on the board. Therefore I support the amendment.

Mr. MOLONEY: I also support the amendment, though not necessarily for the reasons given by the member for Perth, who evidently has one ideal—the retail dairyman. I have searched the original Act and found no such term in it as “retail dairymen,” but I have found “milk vendors.” It may be contended that the amendment would make the board unwieldy, but other representatives could be excluded from it. The composition of the board could be altered while only five members were retained. The retail dairymen are not being fairly treated, and that remark applies particularly to shopkeepers who sell milk. The retail dairymen themselves are relatively a negligible quantity. If a representative of retail dairymen were to be elected, the preponderance of shopkeepers vending milk would elect a representative of the shopkeepers. However, the carrying of the amendment would be an indication of the Chamber's desire to augment the board. Representation would be on the basis of the number of people engaged in the milk industry.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am rather disappointed at the attitude of some of my colleagues. We have had a board functioning; and the board, after experience, have made representations to the Minister. As a result, the Minister has submitted the amendments now under discussion. I am prepared to support the Bill as printed. Firstly, the board are the best people to advise regarding essential improvements, so that they may administer the industry more for the general advantage. The Minister, with his officers, is able to confer with the members of the board; and therefore Parliament can accept the proposed amendments as amendments essential to the better administrative authority and powers of the board. Now, however, it is proposed to alter the representation. It is a new experience to me to hear all this advocacy on behalf of the middleman. I have never understood that Labour was anxious to placate, or give representation to, middlemen. I thought that

when representation was given to the producer and to the consumer, adequate representation was given. To give representation to the man between the producer and the consumer is quite a new thought in Labour politics. We should not approach a matter of this kind for the purpose of giving such representation, because these people—to whom I have no objection other than that I consider we should not carry so many of them as we are carrying—can have only a selfish interest. I do not use the word “selfish” in an offensive way, but they represent no one except themselves.

Mr. Cross: They serve the public, too.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They may serve the public; but the public are represented by the consumers' representative, who will see that they are not exploited unduly or served in an improper way. The producers' standard of living should not be reduced by false administration on the part of the board; and that is why the producers have a representative on the board. What would the retailers' representative on the board do? Would he be there to strengthen the point of view of the producer, or that of the consumer, or more successfully to exploit both? Surely we do not stand for that. It is not true that the middleman is taxed. He is never taxed. He cannot be taxed, for he simply passes taxation on. The board regulate prices so that the consumer will pay enough to keep the producer in business. The member for Subiaco correctly states that representation of retailers would be representation of shopkeepers.

Mr. Needham: This is not the first time you have been wrong.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have firm opinions on this subject, and therefore express them. Never since I have been in Parliament have I done other than to work for the elimination of middlemen. That is what I am in the Labour movement and in the co-operative movement for—to get away from middlemen. Is there any reason whatever why those people should get the support of Parliament, as they are getting? My conviction is that the middleman is the servant of both parties represented, and both parties are the people directly concerned. To-day the board is well balanced in that way, and to add to its numbers for the purpose of starting a wrangle inside the board would preclude decent administration.

Mr. Moloney: You should not say that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Well, why should they want to get there?

Mr. Moloney: To look after your interests.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We do not want that. Speaking as a consumer, I say we have a representative there, and he is doing his job well. The proposal would only do injury to one or the other, and I think it would do injury to both. While we recognise the services of the middlemen, we should not think of giving them representation on the board.

Mr. NORTH: The general claim of this amendment is that there shall be no taxation without representation. Much that the last speaker said is very true, and applies particularly to his own party, because he believes that if possible the whole thing should be socialised. Under our present economic system, as production becomes more efficient the middlemen tend to increase. So to speak, people leave the factory where the article is made and get on the job selling that article. It is not a question of taking control of the board, for it would be only one voice out of six on the board, and that voice would be only to express the viewpoint of the retailer. It is hard to understand the opposition to the amendment. Many do not realise the thousands of pounds that retailers have spent in giving us a very fine product at our doors, which is very different from merely producing a very fine product in the dairy. Last evening I heard a short address by a retailer who has just returned from Europe. He said that Perth milk is far superior to London milk, and he had nothing but praise for the situation here. Nevertheless, that does not say that a large section of the industry should be without a voice on the board. I cannot see the reason for the hostility to an extra voice on the board.

Mr. Thorn: One of the producers on the board is a retailer.

Mr. NORTH: That does not affect the position.

Mr. McLARTY: The Minister the other evening made a very effective reply to the assertion that the retailers are not represented on the board. He proved that the retailing side of the business of the representative of the producer-retailers is easily the more important side of that business. So what benefits the present representa-

tive as a retailer must benefit all retailers. I take it that if the amendment be carried and it is decided to put another retailer on the board, we shall have on the board two representatives of the retailers.

Mr. Moloney: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Cross: The man there is elected by the producers.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, but the more important side of his business is the retail side. Every retailer has access to him and can place the position before him; indeed every representative on the board can be approached by the retailers.

Mr. Cross: What is wrong with the retailers having their own representative?

Mr. McLARTY: They are already represented on the board, and if the amendment be carried they will have two representatives. When the original legislation was before the House it was proposed to give the retailers representation on the board, but the House decided against it. If the amendment be agreed to, the usefulness of the board will be very much restricted.

Mr. Raphael: That won't matter very much.

Mr. Cross: In what way will it be restricted?

Mr. McLARTY: Because it will give the retailers just as much representation as the producers have. The retailers are quite capable of looking after themselves.

Mr. Moloney: You are a little biased.

Mr. McLARTY: No, but I want the board to function as it should do.

Mr. THORN: The Minister, in replying to the second reading debate the other evening, definitely proved that the retailer was ably represented on the board at present. He also proved that in the turnover of that representative by far the larger portion of his business was the retailing, and that the production side of his business was practically nothing, that he was purchasing the bulk of his milk and that the retail side of the business meant everything to him. The member for Canning (Mr. Cross) promised this Chamber fireworks to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing the member for Canning.

Mr. THORN: Undoubtedly some influence has been brought to bear on members of the Committee, probably when they were in the city last night with the retailers. If the Committee agree to put another re-

presentative of the retailers on the board, it will serve to unbalance a well-balanced board. I hope the clause will be passed as printed. There is nothing to be gained by giving the middleman representation on the board, for he is quite capable of looking after himself and it has been our policy here to try to give the other man a fair share of the spoils. The consumer is well represented on the board. I hope the Committee will agree to the Bill as it stands. I am awfully sorry to notice that some members have been influenced—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect on members.

Mr. THORN: Very well, I will say no more.

Mr. DONEY: I agree with the remarks of the member for Guildford-Midland. His views upon retailers' representation are very sound, but I cannot see how any signatory to the Labour platform can possibly support the amendment. The nature of the amendment suggests that he does not know his own political platform, or, if he does, that he does not attach much importance to it.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Labour platform.

Mr. DONEY: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that you permitted the member for Guildford-Midland to make pointed reference to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I am ruling that the hon. member cannot discuss the Labour platform.

Mr. DONEY: I bow to your ruling, but I must say that I wish you had given that ruling earlier.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask members to assist me to keep order. There have been too many interjections, and no Chairman can possibly keep the House in order unless he is assisted by members themselves.

Mr. MARSHALL: All will agree that the retailer or milk vendor renders a valuable service inasmuch as he makes it possible for the producer to continue to produce without being inconvenienced in the way of the distribution of his product. Arguing along those lines, he also renders a service to the consumer. But I do not think the point raised that because he renders this service he is actually entitled to representation on the board will carry any weight. I am not going to argue that the retailer has representation on the board, although, from the Minister's statement, it can be said that

he has. What would be the nature of his operations as a member of the board? What would be his objective if he became a member of the board? That is what I want cleared up. Would he be influenced in the direction of assisting the consumer to get better milk at a cheaper price? I do not think so.

Mr. North: But you say he is already on the board.

Mr. MARSHALL: No; the Minister's statement implied that the retailers had representation in an indirect way. If there were such a representative on the board, would he on the other hand assist the producer to produce better milk at a better price? For years there was no legislation in existence, and we never heard from the retailing section of any agitation for control. They never thought of control, even though it was shown that the industry was about to be crippled by the producer having to supply a commodity at a price which would not give him anything like a fair return for his labour. Did the retailer ever consider the consumer in lowly circumstances, and who also may have had a big family? He never considered it advisable to agitate for control, but now that we have control, in order that the producer and the consumer should give a fair and square deal, he desires to come in. What for? What has actually happened is that the cost of distribution, due to the competitive system, and with this law in existence, is making it almost impossible for retailers to exist. We see vendors of milk with their depot, say, at North Perth, actually delivering milk in South Perth, and vendors whose depot is at South Perth delivering milk in North Perth. So it is the distribution that is the cause of the trouble. The point was also raised that these people are taxed without representation. That may or may not be so.

Mr. Moloney: It happens to be true.

Mr. MARSHALL: Very well. That is no new factor in the life of any nation. Every individual in the State under the age of 21 who earns £100 or more pays taxation and has no representation. I suggest that the anti-Labour section residing in the Murchison electorate and who pay taxation can rightly advance the argument that they, too, are obliged to pay taxation without representation. I do my best, but in their eyes I do not represent them. And they can ad-

vance a good argument to show how it is that I do not.

The CHAIRMAN: All this has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am merely stating that there are scores of instances of people paying taxation without having any representation, and that is more important than giving retailers representation on the Milk Board. Having analysed the arguments for and against, I cannot support the amendment. In my opinion, there are only the two sections to be considered. People who vend milk, like all other persons participating in the distribution of a commodity, overlap greatly. Four or five or six shops of the same class can be seen in one street, or in one city block, all distributing the same commodity; and probably the only person making a profit is the landlord. All costs are passed on to the consumer. The shopkeepers here in question have created an organisation, just like other retailers have done. They meet and say, "We cannot afford to go on any longer under present conditions, and therefore the price must go up."

Mr. Moloney: Competition corrects that.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Not where there is strong organisation.

Mr. MARSHALL: Generally speaking, there is no competition between shops in point of price. The only competition between them is competition for trade. The prices are fixed. I shall vote for the clause as it stands.

Mr. LAMBERT: Tentatively I say that I shall vote for the amendment. If we have reached a position where we definitely conclude competition between producer and consumer and distributor to be wrong, this Bill is not the legislation required, but legislation framed on lines similar to those of the liquor licensing statutes is needed. We must get down to this question, whether as a deliberative Assembly we will intervene to cut out the competitive system, irrespective of whether it applies to milk or liquor or honey or butter or cream; the position is the same in each case. Restrictive legislation stopping somebody from selling milk on one side of the street will never get us anywhere. The only possible corollary to restriction of production, to control of distribution, and to fixation of prices is the creation of selling zones for certain commodities. There is no other remedial measure. The Whole Milk Board restrict operation if they do not actually restrict pro-

duction. The reason for the creation of the board was over-production of milk.

Mr. Thorn: No; the desire for orderly marketing.

Mr. LAMBERT: Phrases of that type have no practical application. The remedy for over-production is the lowering of prices. Everything leading up to this legislation was related to lowering of prices to the consumer.

Mr. Moloney: That does not apply to dried fruits, though.

Mr. LAMBERT: Not in the opinion of some people. In that respect other agencies are at work, and to some extent justifiably. Parliament should deal with this problem by starting from the very basis.

Mr. P. C. L. Smith: The amendment will not accomplish that.

Mr. LAMBERT: Admittedly, but I shall support it in the hope that commonsense public opinion will eventually condemn this collection of boards that are so inefficient and so inoperative. There can be no tomorrow for a Parliament that can be so superficial in its outlook that it can believe difficulties can be remedied by restrictive legislation of this description.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie is getting away from the amendment.

Mr. Thorn: That does not worry him in the least.

Mr. LAMBERT: I may take an opportunity to further amend the Act. It is time that we realised the futility of legislation of this description.

Mr. Hegney: Why should the retailers be represented on the board?

Mr. LAMBERT: They have every right to be represented on the board. If we are to set up superficial boards like this one, everyone is entitled to representation. As a matter of fact, I think the Metropolitan Water Supply Department should have representation as water may play a part in the business.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to deal with the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: I find no fault with the board, who are functioning reasonably well within the four corners of the Act. If Parliament would only recognise the stupidity of the competitive system and seek to set up boards to protect sections of the community, it should be done in a wholesome,

decent manner. The method adopted so far will not get us anywhere.

Mr. North: Would you socialise the industry?

Mr. LAMBERT: The Bill amounts to a squeamish way of socialising it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not discussing the socialising of the industry. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie must confine his attention to the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: This legislation is most regrettable. If the board endeavoured to promote the consumption of milk instead of restricting its supply, there might be something in it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are endeavouring to do that.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the board enabled hundreds of kiddies who cannot afford to purchase milk, to be supplied with that commodity, instead of acting so as to restrict the production and sale of milk, they would be performing better service.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. McDONALD: I support the amendment, and I am glad to find the Committee are almost unanimously in favour of the principle of the representation of retailers on the board. The only question before the Committee is how that shall be done. Those who have argued against the amendment have done so on the ground that the retailers are already represented, and therefore they say the amendment is unnecessary. The only representative of the retailers on the board is a producer-retailer, and it has been said that his retail interests are more extensive than his producing interests. The producers decided that one man on the board should be a man who could speak on behalf of the retailing interests, not only because those interests should be represented, but also because he was a man whose interests, being substantially retail, would cause him to see and advocate the point of view of the retailers. So we find the principle of the representation of the retailers is acknowledged even by those who oppose the amendment. What they say is, that as the retailers are represented under the existing system it is unnecessary to pass the amendment and have an extra member of the board representing retailers exclusively. That is the only issue to be decided—whether the present representation of the

retailers is sufficient or whether they should have representation by means of the amendment. The present system cannot be said to be satisfactory, for although the producers have adopted the highly proper view that they would elect a man who would represent the retailing interests because there is no provision in the Act for a representative of the retailers, the producers in future may not hold the same view, but may go back to their rights under the Act and say they are entitled to two producer representatives. If that should happen, the present system under which the retailers are represented would cease and the retailers would be left without representation. In other words, although the retailers are now represented, they are represented by grace of the producers. Let me look at the matter from another aspect. It is very unsatisfactory for a representative of the producers who is a producer-retailer to sit on the board in a dual capacity. The man himself must have met with many difficulties. I do not know whether he would be present in the retailers' interests at one board meeting and of the producers' interests at the next board meeting, or whether on coming to a meeting he would announce that on that day he would represent the retail interests, but that to-morrow he would represent the producers' interests. If we had a member of this House who called himself a Labour-Nationalist, it would be difficult to find out what his views were going to be on any particular subject.

Mr. Withers: It would not be difficult at all, for they always show that they are Nationalists.

Mr. McDONALD: The point is that any man called upon to act in a dual capacity is being called upon to fill a difficult position and one which we ought not to perpetuate. Really, I am putting up the case that has been advanced by opponents of the amendment. The whole case is that the amendment is unnecessary because the retailers are already represented—

Members: No, no.

Mr. McDONALD: —and represented by a man more substantially interested in retailing than in producing. That is the whole case in the argument against the amendment.

Members: No, no.

Mr. McDONALD: That is the only substantial point in the argument. I want to see the amendment go through, because it will put the whole matter on a reasonable basis. I want to see that the producers have both their representatives acting solely in the interests of the producers. That is what the Act provides for. When the intention of the Act is carried out it becomes necessary to have on the board someone who will represent the retailers' point of view in a way that a producer-retailer cannot do. The amendment is the only logical way of dealing with the position, for certainly the retailers should have someone to speak on their behalf. We have been told there is a producer-retailer on the board who will give representation to the retailers.

Member: You are appealing for the retailers?

Mr. McDONALD: I am appealing for justice. I am unable to follow the reasoning of those who deny representation to a substantial body engaged in the industry. If the producers thought a man should be elected to the board partially to represent the retailers, that is the view of the producers. I do not need to argue the fundamental principle that where there are certain branches engaged in one industry and there is a board controlling that industry, all those branches should be fairly represented. One voice out of six, and that one on behalf of the retailers, is something that the producers and consumers' representatives should welcome. It would make for a balanced board, obviate many misunderstandings, and ensure the smoother administration of the board's affairs. If the producers and consumers are entitled to representatives to watch their respective interests, the third substantial body of people engaged in the industry cannot justly be denied representation.

Mr. Moloney: Particularly when they are taxed.

Mr. McDONALD: That is so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are not.

Mr. Moloney: They are.

Mr. McDONALD: And, I might add, particularly when they contribute substantially to the cost of the board and when the fixing of prices automatically fixes the remuneration they receive. Suppose the price were reduced to 6d., the position of the retailers would become untenable.

Mr. McLarty: There is no danger of that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We can very well do without retailers.

Mr. McDONALD: Would the hon. member invite the producers to vend their milk to the doorsteps in the metropolitan area? If so, the whole problem would be solved. While the present system obtains and is recognised by the Act, the least we can do is to give the retailers representation. All they are asking for is the minimum of one representative.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I have been subjected to a lecture from the member for Guildford-Midland, in the course of which he said that I did not understand the platform of the Labour movement. Because I suggested an amendment to provide representation for the middlemen, he said I was doing something in contravention of the Labour platform.

Mr. Moloney: The member for Williams-Narrogin also gave you a lecture.

Mr. NEEDHAM: But he has not yet attained the dignity of belonging to the Labour movement. Being a young man, there is yet hope for him. If I have misinterpreted the Labour policy, I have erred in good company.

Mr. DONEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, having regard to your ruling of a little while ago, is the hon. member in order in making reference to the Labour platform on the amendment before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in discussing the Labour platform, but he is in order in referring to the remarks of other members during this debate.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The present Minister for Water Supplies, who last year was Minister for Agriculture, introduced a measure which became the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Act. It is an Act relating to the treatment, distribution and sale of certain dairy products, and other purposes incidental thereto. I direct special attention to the word "distribution." Section 6 provides for the Act being administered, subject to the Minister, by the Dairy Products Marketing Board. According to the definitions, "dealer" means any person who purchases or receives dairy products for the purposes of re-sale wholesale or sale wholesale. If the retail dairyman or vendor of milk is not in the same category as a dealer

under that Act I do not understand English. Let me quote from the speech delivered by the then Minister for Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member intend to connect it with the amendment before the Chair?

Mr. NEEDHAM: Yes. The proposal to increase the board to six by including a representative of the retailers will provide a test of the Committee's feeling on several amendments of which notice has been given. The Minister pointed out that the board would consist of a chairman, nominated by the Minister, a representative of the consumers nominated by the Minister, and a nominee of those engaged in the manufacture of dairy products who were licensed under the Act, and two nominees of the producers who were to be nominated by all the producers of dairy products and not by producers' organisations. He believed that the organisation then in existence did not represent the views of the majority of producers. Another member of the board was to be nominated by the dealers licensed under the Act. He believed that the last named would prove of great value to the board. At present that group of persons played an important part in the distribution. These were the views of the Minister. Surely the vendor of milk who purchases from the producer and sells to the consumer is in the same position with regard to the milk board as is the dealer with regard to the dairy products board.

Mr. Patrick: They cannot be compared.

Mr. NEEDHAM: They are in the same category.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The dealers had a lot of money locked up in butter.

Mr. NEEDHAM: They are both middlemen as between the producer and the consumer. At any rate, if the principle is opposed to the Labour platform now under consideration as contended by the member for Guildford-Midland, and I have erred, I have erred in the company of the member for Mt. Hawthorn, who brought down the Act of last year.

Mr. DONEY: On a point of order, I suggest that the hon. member is again in conflict with the view you stated to me a little while ago. I submit that he is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is in order in replying to statements made by another member.

Dissent from Chairman's ruling.

Mr. DONEY: I move—

That the Committee dissent from the Chairman's ruling.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Chairman: The member for Williams-Narrogin has moved to disagree with my ruling, when I allowed the member for Perth to reply to certain remarks made during the speech by the member for Guildford-Midland. The hon. member contended that the member for Perth was not in order in mentioning the platform of the Labour Party. I ruled that he was in order in replying to certain remarks made by the member for Guildford-Midland.

Mr. Doney: Before tea I was taking part in the debate following upon the amendment moved by the member for Perth and I was giving reasons why members on the Government cross bench should not support the amendment. The course I followed was to show that it was not in keeping with the platform of the party to which they owe allegiance. When the Chairman ruled me out of order I accepted the correction and resumed my seat. Subsequently the member for Perth mentioned my name, and began to traverse much the same ground I had intended to traverse if permitted to continue. I then rose to a point of order, but the Chairman said that the member for Perth was in order. Later on the member for Perth again called attention to the nature of my remarks, and again I rose to a point of order. I have now moved to disagree with the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. Marshall: I listened to the whole discussion. The member for Guildford-Midland made reference to a plank of the platform of the party to which he belonged. The member for Williams-Narrogin later on set out to expose to the Chamber the plank in the platform which he wished to show was affected by the amendment.

Mr. Doney: How do you know that?

Mr. Marshall: I am stating what happened. The Chairman reminded the hon. member that he was out of order in attempting to define what the plank of the Labour Party really meant in this connection, and told him that it had nothing to do with the amendment. After that the member for Perth set out to explain where he stood in the matter. To prove his contention he quoted the Dairy Products

Marketing Act passed last session, a measure similar to the one before us. In doing so he referred to the utterances of the member for Guildford-Midland regarding policy, but did not in any way attempt to deal with the plank of the platform or its definition. While the member for Perth was making an explanation by way of reply to the references of the member for Guildford-Midland, the member for Williams-Narrogin asked for a ruling, which the Chairman gave. In my opinion the Chairman's ruling was correct.

Mr. Sleeman: I submit there is no case to go to the jury. The only argument is whether the Chairman was right or was wrong in allowing the member for Perth to refer to certain remarks made by the member for Guildford-Midland by way of passing reference. Whether the member for Williams-Narrogin was in order or out of order at another stage of the proceedings has nothing to do with the question. I claim that the hon. member was certainly out of order, though that has nothing to do with the question before the Chair. The only matter to be decided is whether I was right or wrong in allowing the member for Perth to reply to certain remarks made, as a passing reference, by the member for Guildford-Midland.

Mr. Doney: Have I the right to make a brief reply, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Williams-Narrogin has not such a right. The hon. member had moved to disagree with the Chairman's ruling permitting the member for Perth to refer to the platform of the Labour Party, though the Chairman had previously ruled that the member for Williams-Narrogin was out of order in doing the same thing. The question before the Chair, as I understand, was an amendment to delete the word "five" in the first line of Subclause 6 and to insert the word "six" in lieu thereof. What I am asked to decide is whether the member for Perth was in order in referring to the platform of the Labour Party whilst replying to something on similar lines said by the member for Guildford-Midland. I was not in the Chamber during the period in question, and therefore, not knowing what was said, I have to take just what is before me. The amendment before the Chair was to delete the word "five" and to insert the word "six" in lieu. I shall certainly rule that any references to the platform of the Labour

Party by any hon. member would be out of order on that simple amendment. If the member for Perth was replying to the member for Guildford-Midland and was out of order, and if the member for Guildford-Midland was out of order in referring to the platform of the Labour Party, then the fact that the member for Perth was replying to something out of order does not put that hon. member in order. I have no alternative but to uphold the motion to disagree with the Chairman's ruling.

Committee resumed.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Now that I have been tried and acquitted, let me mention that the member for Guildford-Midland was a member of this Chamber when the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Act was passed. In that legislation there is provision for a representative of the dealers. I fail to see any difference between the dealer—of which term there is a definition in the Act—and the man or woman who retails the milk from the producer to the consumer. No objection was taken to the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Bill by the member for Guildford-Midland: and therefore, from that aspect, I consider that the amendment providing for representation of milk distributors on the Whole Milk Board should be carried.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The hon. member. if he looks at the Act which he helped to pass—

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I did not help to pass it.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The hon. member was then a member of this Chamber, though I believe that at the particular time I have in mind the hon. member was ill. The board under the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Act is a nominee board. Nominee boards of that type are not a plank of the Labour platform. We stand for the elective system. The vendor of milk is of just as much importance to the community as is the dealer in dairy products, resale, wholesale, or retail. The Minister introducing the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Bill stressed the importance of this provision. Surely a comparison may be drawn between that case and the case we are now endeavouring to put forward.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The analysis made by the member for West

Perth has certainly failed to satisfy me. The question is whether the personnel of the board is to be extended in number or in representation. The amendment moved by the hon. member deals intentionally and specifically with an additional member on the board in the person of a retailer. The amendment seeks to provide one additional member of the board who, as appears from a later amendment on the Notice Paper, is to be a member of the Retail Dairywomen's Association. I find from the registrar that the membership of the association is 48 and the hon. member seeks to have one of those individuals placed on the board. In my previous analysis of his contentions, I clearly showed the position of the board in respect of the producer-retailer. If we are to permit one of 48 to have representation on the board, then, if the principle be right, it must be remembered that there are over 270 who retail from vehicles in the metropolitan area and the total number of retailers, including those vending from shops, approaches 1,200. In those circumstances, the hon. member cannot substantiate his argument in favour of representation for one section of them. As to his claim that no section of the retailers has representation, it is suggested they should have it on account of being taxed. I would point out that that section receive a very large proportion of the total price charged to the consumer for the services rendered. They receive 1s. 3d. for every gallon, whereas the producer receives 1s. 1d. or less per gallon. In respect of the service they admittedly render to the community, surely that basis of 1s. 3d. per gallon gives them ample room within which to come and go. Since the advent of the board, those retailers who were not in the industry for the good of the consuming public have been driven out, in consequence of which the value of the rounds of the retailers has gone up appreciably. The undesirable who was indulging in price cutting and digging into the retailers' business has been almost entirely eliminated and it is now rarely that we hear of a milk round for sale. I suggest that the retailer is adequately rewarded in respect of the service he renders the community. He is now installing machinery and providing the service that the consumer demands, under conditions that are necessary for the health of the public. The

member of the board who is the producer-retailer, Mr. Kinsella, is an energetic, enthusiastic gentleman who is fully alive to the requirements of the retailers. His personal interests are largely on the retailing side because whereas he sells over 3,000 gallons retail, he produces about 500 gallons only. The contentions of those who support the amendment cannot be substantiated.

Mr. SAMPSON: In his remarks the Minister has rather anticipated an amendment that will be dealt with later, which has reference to those who will have an opportunity to elect the retailers' representative. Everyone appreciates the work of the board, but there are many who think the retailers should have some representation. I do not think there is any virtue in the argument that the retailers should have that representation merely because they are taxed and have to find so much money. The retailers provide an essential service of undoubtedly great importance, but they are a link in the industry. I was surprised at the remarks of the member for Guildford-Midland, who expressed amazement that it was desired to give representation to the retailers. Apparently he considers that the principle of co-operation and all the gods that control marketing are to suffer if the amendment be accepted.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think that is a lop-sided view to take.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The hon. member's trouble is that he is always lop-sided.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know that I am, but, without any desire to be offensive, I think that view is lop-sided, inasmuch as it means depriving one section of an industry from direct representation on the board. If every section had reasonable representation, the board would be able to function more effectively. I do not know that it is a question of one section being paid well or otherwise, because I presume that all sections receive payment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The dairymen themselves were in a bad way.

Mr. SAMPSON: On this occasion I can agree with the Leader of the Opposition that before the Act was passed the dairymen were not well treated.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Every section has been treated well since the Act was passed.

Mr. SAMPSON: Because there was unfairness before the Act was passed is no reason why unfairness should be extended to any one section of the industry now. It is my intention to vote for the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No matter who is to be the additional representative, but assuming the retailer is going to be represented, I ask the Committee where is he going to get any additional benefit and, should he get any, who is going to pay for it? Is the producer going to get any more for his product, or is the consumer to get the commodity at a lesser price because of the retailers' representation on the board? I should not think so, but I say that is the only question to be considered.

Mr. MOLONEY: The Minister's remarks only bear out what I mentioned at the outset. There are 48 retailers and 270 producer-retailers, and the bulk of them consist of the people on whose behalf I speak.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The shopkeepers.

Mr. MOLONEY: Yes. I do not wish the Committee to be led astray. The Minister said that in the event of the amendment being carried, there were other amendments to provide for those 48 retailers and the 270 producer-retailers. But I do not think the member for Perth desires that, even though in his zeal he spoke of the producers. Certainly if the occasion arises I will move that the interests of the shopkeepers shall be looked after, and that they shall have a representative. I am looking for representation for all those concerned. I do not wish the Committee to think that if the amendment be carried we shall be confined to the 270 plus the 48. If it is good enough for one vendor to secure representation, then the majority will decide who is to be their representative. Certainly if the amendment be carried I will put forward something to provide for the shopkeepers.

Mr. CROSS: I have been surprised at the paucity of reasons put up for representation of the vendors' section on the board. Those who have been opposing the amendment have really given no reason for their attitude. They have been adroitly dodging the real issue. I should like to draw attention to the change of front by the members now seated in Opposition. When on the 13th September, 1932, the parent Act was brought down by the Hon. P. D. Ferguson, then Minister for Agriculture, it provided for a board of seven, four to be representa-

tive of the producers, one to be representative of the retail distributors, and one a representative of the wholesale distributors: and it was proposed to add one representative for the consumers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And the Labour Party altered it, and we agreed to it.

Mr. CROSS: That was your proposal, yet to-day you strenuously oppose the representation of vendors, including hundreds of shopkeepers, who are to have no voice at all. You were not the only people who advocated representation on the board for vendors. A Royal Commission was appointed in 1925 to inquire into the milk supply, and that Commission recommended that a board be appointed constituted of one member to represent the consumers, who should be the chairman, one to represent the producers, one to represent distributors, and one to be designated by the Commissioner of Health. On the 20th September, during the second reading debate on the parent Act, reported on page 710 of "Hansard" of that session, Mr. Millington discussed the merits and demerits of the Act, and pointed out that the Minister had missed the constitution of the board, which was one representative of the consumers, who would be chairman, one representative of the producers, one representative of the vendors, a medical officer of health designated by the Commissioner of Public Health, and the Chief Veterinary Officer of the State. Mr. Millington said the board so constituted was to be the board, and he asked why had the Minister missed that when reading the report of the Commissioner. In reply, the Minister for Agriculture said it was because that was not a board he could approve of. It might be said, and has been said, that no benefit would be gained by the vendors by having a representative on the board. But it must be remembered that that very considerable section of the industry are seeking only one voice as a means to place before the board their grievances. It is only a reasonable demand. By no stretch of imagination can it be said that one representative could dominate the board. Who would contend that the hundreds of shopkeepers vending milk should not be able to ventilate their grievances before the more reasonable members of the board? The small shopkeepers are taxed; they have to pay license fees and submit to regulation. Many of the conditions laid down by the

board are onerous. Shopkeepers who desire to sell milk can do so only with the consent of the board. There are people who desire to get milk from certain shops, but those shops cannot obtain licenses.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to keep to the amendment.

Mr. CROSS: I am keeping to it fairly closely. No case has been made out against the proposal to give the vendors representation. It is a basic principle that there shall be no taxation without representation, and I cannot understand why some members should be so afraid of one man. Representation of the retailers would make for contentment in the industry, which does not exist at present.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I might have remained silent but for the criticism by the member for Canning of what happened when the previous Government introduced the parent measure. It was experimental legislation in this State. True we had the Dried Fruits Act to guide us, but we were dealing with a different commodity. The Bill, as then introduced, provided for a board of seven, but the Labour Party influenced the Government to reduce the number to five. According to "Hansard" of 1932, page 2133, the member for East Perth (Hon. J. J. Kenneally) said—

There is no earthly reason why the consumers and the producers should not be equally represented on the board with an independent chairman.

On the next page, following an interjection that the consumer would be able to get cheaper milk, the member for East Perth said—

I believe that is possible, but to achieve that objective, it will be necessary to curb the avariciousness of the middleman. That phase does not apply to milk only.

It has been interesting to hear members on the Government side seeking to protect men who are quite capable of protecting themselves. There are only two sections whom we need worry about—those who are producing the milk, to ensure that they receive a reasonable price and are enabled to pay their way, and those who consume the milk, to ensure that they are not exploited. That is all we can be expected to do. The board have worked very satisfactorily up to date, and to introduce the amendment would defeat the good that has been done.

Amendment put and a division called for.

Mr. Marshall: There can be no division; only one member called "aye."

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	11
Noes	28

Majority against	..	17
------------------	----	----

AYES.	
Mr. Clotbier	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cross	Mr. North
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Moloney	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Boyle	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Fox	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Latham	Mr. Warner
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Watts
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Millington	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Wise
Mr. Rodoreda	Mr. Withers
Mr. F. C. L. Smith	Mr. Doney
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. McDONALD: I move an amendment—

That after the word "amended" in line one the following words be inserted:—"by inserting the words 'one of whom shall be a woman' after the word 'members' in line one of paragraph (a) of subsection (2) and."

The board at present consists of five members. The Act provides that two of these shall represent the consumers, and shall be appointed by the Government. My desire is that one of these two representatives shall be a woman. The Government may if they desire have only women on the board, but if the amendment is carried, they will be obliged to appoint at least one woman member. Women are playing an active part in the social structure in many countries in the world. Many women are holding office in England as mayoresses, and in both England and America women have become members of the Cabinets of the day. It is particularly fitting that a woman should be a member of the milk board. Milk is the chief household diet, and the direction of the household is in the hands of women. They are in a position to know how far the milk supply is satisfactory, and whether the objects of the Act in the distribution of milk at a reasonable cost are being achieved. There would be no difficulty about securing a competent woman to fill the position. The president of the Housewives' Association or

the president of the Congress of Labour Women are more in contact with social and economic questions of the day than are many men. A woman of this description would be well qualified for an appointment of this nature, and would strengthen the board by bringing to bear upon its deliberations her specialised knowledge of the milk industry.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I support the amendment. It would be of special advantage to have a woman on the milk board. When I was speaking on the second reading a member suggested by interjection that all the members of the board might be women. My reply was, "You can have too much of a good thing." The presence of a woman on this board would be particularly advantageous. In the average household woman is not only the controller of the purse but the judge of the class of food that shall come into the home. Not only has she to cook the food, but she must first be sure that the food she purchases is of the purest description. I do not know who would be better able to judge the quality of milk.

Mr. Hegney: Inspectors do the judging.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Inspectors are not infallible. Surely the hon. member would not argue that a woman would not be a competent member of the board. Besides the question of quality of milk, there is the question of administration. At this period of our civilisation, woman is recognised as being of considerable assistance in deliberative assemblies. In the Old World women are members of city councils and district boards. I would like to see women in our municipal councils and on our road boards. Of foods certainly there is no better judge than woman. One of the representatives of the consumers on this board ought to be a woman. The carrying of the amendment would enhance, and not decrease, representation of the consumers.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I oppose the amendment. I do not believe in the proposal.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: You do not believe in petticoat government.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: All of us are governed by our womenfolk. Probably the amendment would not be accepted as a compliment by women. The appointment of a woman to the board should not be mandatory. If the Government consider that two representatives of the consumers should be women, they will appoint two women. There is no power under the Act to prevent a lady from being appointed to the board.

However, I do not think the ladies desire such appointments.

Mr. MOLONEY: The previous speaker takes it for granted that women do not want to be members of the board. I have been approached by several ladies, representative of various organisations, who expressed themselves as desirous of appointments such as these. They believe representation would be improved by the presence of women on the board, women being the best judges of food. Latterly women have made such strides that they are now desirous of securing all kinds of positions. However, we are slaves to custom. Are the producers likely to send a woman from a farm to represent them? Some women devote themselves to a life of social service; others assume civic responsibilities; others again desire to sit in Parliament. In Abyssinia women are even taking part in the war. Women are equally entitled to have representation on the board. I am not prejudiced and I will support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government have the privilege of making appointments to the board, and the amendment will have the effect of restricting their choice. If it is specified that one must be a woman, the other must necessarily be a man. It is quite possible that the Minister in charge might think that there were two women of capacity, administrative ability and genuine desire to serve the State, and he would not hesitate, perhaps, to appoint not one but two women.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	26

Majority against 15

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. North
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Keenan	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Needham	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Fox	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Wanbrough
Mr. Latham	Mr. Warner
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Waite
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Millington	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Rodoreda	Mr. Wise
Mr. Sampson	Mr. Withers
Mr. F. C. L. Smith	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 9:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

I ask that this clause be deleted.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 17:

Mr. NEEDHAM: I oppose the clause. If agreed to, it will have the effect of continuing the system of dual inspection. I desire either the Health Department or the Metropolitan Whole Milk Board to be the arbiters as to whether milk supplied is fit for human consumption. It might be well to determine that issue for good or ill. We are still at the experimental stage with this legislation, but already we have sufficient evidence of the irritation caused by the system of dual inspection. It has been suggested that the effect of the clause will be the removal of that system; that is to say, inspection by the Health Department and inspection by the board. If I can be satisfied that that is so I will not proceed with the amendment. But I have not yet heard from the Minister that it will remove the inspection. All the interests concerned in the milk industry agree that the Government inspection is negligible. This subsection provides that the Minister for Health can authorise any specified officer or officers in the service of the board to exercise the power and function of health inspectors. I presume that every inspector appointed by the Health Department would have undergone a certain examination in order to qualify as an inspector under the Health Act. If that is so this clause means that the board can suggest to the Health Department that Brown or Smith or Jones is qualified to be an inspector for the board without undergoing any preparation on the question of general health. That has never been explained. An objection taken by the Leader of the Opposition during the second reading debate was, what about the stock, the cows? I realise the necessity for a very careful examination of the stock. But it has been contended that we have stock inspectors who go around examining the stock. Thus we carry on from the stock inspector to the inspector under the Health Department, and now it is proposed to have a continuation of the inspection under

the milk board. This double inspection means unnecessary cost and is irritating to those in the industry. If the premises are certified to be hygienic, surely that is sufficient without a second inspector coming along, and without in any way imperilling the milk board in the carrying out of their work. So we can well eliminate this provision.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The sole object of the clause is to remove the existing anomaly of duplicate inspection. The board are charged with the prohibition of the use of milk for human consumption in any form which is said to be deleterious to the health of the community. That being so, it is desired that the board should have its officers appointed with the approval of the Minister for Health, and that no other officers shall interfere with health matters. Thus the Minister for Health would be the one to have the approving of an officer appointed for health matters. It merely means the elimination of control of health matters by other authorities, and that that control shall be the function of the qualified officer appointed by the board and approved of by the Minister for Health.

Mr. Needham: Do I understand the Minister to say that only inspectors under the Health Department shall operate?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, only health officers under the board and approved by the Minister for Health. An officer of a local authority will not have any authority in regard to health matters, and the officer controlling this part of the board's operations shall be appointed by the board, and the appointment approved by the Minister for Health. The Department of Public Health is the supreme health authority and only through the Minister can an appointment by any other authority be made. So in this case the officer shall be appointed by the milk board and his appointment approved by the Minister for Health. The object of the amending of Section 28 of the principal Act is to eliminate the duality of control existing at present.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—Repeal of Sections 20-23 of the principal Act:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That after "supply" in line 4 of subparagraph 1 of subsection 1 of the proposed new

Section 21 the words "by wholesale" be inserted.

The object of the amendment is to make the position quite clear that a dairyman's license shall entitle the holder to carry on the business or calling of a dairyman in specified premises in a specified dairy area to supply wholesale the milk produced on such premises for consumption or treatment in the metropolitan area. On examination, members will find that all the inconsistencies that have occurred in the past in relation to licenses have been clarified in this proposed subsection.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That after "in" in line 2 of subparagraph (a) of paragraph (ii) of the proposed new Section 21 the words "a specified district in" be inserted.

A milkman's license is to apply to a specified district. That is the existing law; the words were omitted from the draft.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "milk" in line 2 of subparagraph (iii) of the proposed new Section 21 be struck out, and the words "for use or consumption in the metropolitan area, but in particular premises to be specified in the license" inserted in lieu.

The object is to include premises in the country that treat milk to be supplied to the metropolitan area. The Bill as printed refers only to milk treated in the metropolis for consumption therein.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (c) of the proposed new Section 22 "twenty-six" be struck out and "twenty-one" inserted in lieu.

The amendment is necessary owing to a printer's error.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. McLARTY: On behalf of the member for Irwin-Moore, I move an amendment—

That the following new section be inserted:—"22A. The board shall have power to demand that an applicant for a retailer's license shall provide a bond, approved by the board, to the value equivalent to one month's supply of milk which he is licensed to sell, to insure

that payment shall be regularly made to producers supplying the said applicant for a license with milk."

The amendment is to ensure that the producer receives payment for his commodity. It will also guarantee that the dealer in milk is one who should have a license. Producers have lost a good deal through men engaged in the industry being unable to pay them. The board operating in Victoria have a similar provision.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Even if the amendment were accepted, the form of it is incorrect. There is no such thing in the Bill as a retailer's license. The amendment would insist upon payment for the services and commodity of one section, but the vendor, for whom a great fight has been waged this evening, would have no such protection. The bad debts in the industry force vendors to make a definite stand in the way they have done. One who renders important service to the industry should not be deprived of payment for his work.

MR. LAMBERT: I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment. It is not the function of Parliament to police the private accounts of individuals, and to introduce such a principle into the measure would be wrong. If we go on like this, we are likely to drift—

MR. WITHERS: Into the milky way.

MR. LAMBERT: This constitutes a dangerous departure from the usual principle. It would give every other industry an equal right to demand the same thing.

MR. J. H. SMITH: I oppose the amendment. It would be a retrograde step to insist upon the putting up of bonds.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. NEEDHAM: I move an amendment—

That after the word "issue," in line 2 of proposed new Section 23, the words "or transfer" be inserted.

This section deals with appeals against the decisions of the board on the question of licenses. I desire that the section should also cover appeals in cases of refusal to transfer licenses. It would be very hard upon people who were carrying on a business if they were not allowed to transfer it to someone else, or who wished to remove that business to some more favoured locality. A man can appeal against the refusal of the board to grant a license, and may secure such license on appeal, but having secured

it, he may then find he can get no transfer for it. It is the premises that are licensed and not the man who runs the business. There is nothing unusual in the request I am making, and I hope the Committee will agree that it is a fair and reasonable one in all the circumstances.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

There is no necessity for such an amendment. If the hon. member will turn to proposed Section 21 he will find that the license belongs to the place or property, and not to the person. There is nothing to prevent a license being transferred. In practice, the license of the person who wishes to sell his business is surrendered, and a new one issued to the person to whom the business has been transferred. It merely means the surrender of the existing license, and the issue of a new license to the purchaser of the business. That has been the practice, and is the existing practice, of the board. I referred the matter to the Parliamentary Draftsman, and he assured me that there was no necessity for this amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Amendment of Section 26B, principal Act:

MR. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That the word "entitled," line 8, be struck out, and "liable" inserted in lieu.

The wording should be corrected. Probably it is a printer's error.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

The amendment is quite unnecessary. If a person is privileged, by virtue of being granted a license, to pay a fee, he is entitled to pay it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 12 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Amendment of Section 42, principal Act:

MR. McLARTY: I move an amendment—

That the words "thirty-six" be struck out, and "thirty-nine" inserted in lieu.

If the board are to formulate a policy and put it into effect, the life of the board must be extended. I dealt with this aspect on the

second reading. The year-to-year system creates unrest in the industry. The original justification pleaded for a life of only 12 months was that the legislation was experimental. The experimental stage is now past. To function successfully, the board must have security of tenure. All sections of the industry favour the board. If the board went out of existence, the industry would relapse into chaos. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment. I was inclined to suggest the removal of any limitation on the life of the board. A period of three years is undoubtedly necessary.

Mr. THORN: I support the amendment. Members will agree that the measure has passed the experimental stage. The board have rendered good service, and every section of the industry appears to desire the continuance of the Act. Without the Act, there would be chaos in the industry. All sections of the community have benefited by this legislation. Retail rounds are far more valuable to-day than they were prior to the Act, because people now know where they stand, the industry having been stabilised. Legislation of this nature must include contentious provisions, and much of the time of Parliament would be saved if the measure were continued for three years instead of one. An annual review is not needed. Other Acts of the same type have been extended for three years.

Mr. LAMBERT: I oppose the amendment. Legislation of this description should be reviewed by Parliament each year. I always understood that the board was appointed originally as an emergency body because of difficulties that arose in connection with the industry. The idea of some Opposition members is that it shall be made a permanent board.

Mr. Thorn: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member knows it is wrong in principle.

Mr. Thorn: Of course I do not.

Hon. C. G. Latham: At any rate, this is not emergency legislation.

Mr. LAMBERT: Parliament should reserve the right to review annually legislation of this description.

The Minister for Lands: The Upper House adopt that attitude with all our legislation each year.

Mr. LAMBERT: They do not treat our legislation as of the emergency type. It would be wrong to remove our prerogative to review this type of measure. If we are

to get down to that stage at which we must create boards because the prices of production and distribution are—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing about that in the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: If I am to have the Standing Orders thrown out at me every moment—

Mr. Marshall: You get a pretty good go.

Mr. LAMBERT: My remarks have a clear relationship to the amendment. Parliament should have the right of annual review, or are we to regard the Act as part and parcel of our permanent legislation? Opposition members are advocating sectional interests, at the expense of the rest of the community. I do not like to suggest that they adopt that attitude because of an impending general election. If this legislation is fundamentally and economically sound—

Mr. McLarty: It must be, seeing that you introduce it each year.

Mr. LAMBERT: If we are to proceed along those lines, then there are other sections of production that should receive similar protection, including the one in which I am interested.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is that necessary?

Mr. LAMBERT: It is more than necessary.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then let us make a start here, and we can deal with your industry later on.

Mr. LAMBERT: There is a difference between what is done from the standpoint of expediency and that which is done because of necessity. If we are to start appointing boards to regulate prices and conditions, let us have boards to deal with every phase of production.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: You should set up a board to limit speeches.

Mr. LAMBERT: We might have a board to limit the amount of common sense that some people apparently possess. I express my definite opposition to any suggestion of making permanent legislation that we have always regarded as of a purely emergency character.

Mr. McLarty: It has passed the emergency stage.

Mr. LAMBERT: Has it? When the parent Act was passed, butter fat was 8d. per lb. What is it to-day?

Mr. McLarty: It is 1s. 1½d.

Mr. LAMBERT: This Chamber regarded the parent Act as emergency legislation, and it should not be permanently continued.

Mr. McLarty: We are dealing with milk, not butter fat.

Mr. LAMBERT: The two commodities are interlocked.

Mr. HEGNEY: On a point of order: I should like your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether, in discussing this amendment we are permitted to discuss the whole of the ramifications of the milk industry, or whether we must confine ourselves to the terms of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment gives a fair range. Nevertheless, the hon. member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie is getting away from it.

Mr. LAMBERT: This is the only clause under which we can discuss the advisability of continuing the legislation. The Committee must consider whether this is emergency legislation, to be brought up year after year, or whether it should be made permanent.

Mr. Thorn: What about telling us your reasons for opposing the amendment?

Mr. LAMBERT: I oppose it because it is asking too much of Parliament to expect that this legislation should be continued for no other reason than to increase the price of the commodity produced.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think the hon. member has missed the point altogether. This legislation was introduced to save the milk industry and rehabilitate it. Since the Act was introduced in 1932 Parliament has seen fit to continue it year by year. If we were to give the people interested some further continuity of tenure, say for the next three years, it would offer them some inducement to consolidate their position, and so would serve a useful purpose. It has not increased the price of milk to people who have to buy milk; I understand it has slightly reduced it.

Mr. Marshall: Before the Act came into operation I was paying a much higher price for milk than I pay now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: To-day we are living in a state of organised industry. It does not matter whether it be labour or capital, throughout the world industry is being organised, indeed has been organised, and so we have to protect our primary producers as primary producers are being protected in other parts of the world. The amendment would do no more than extend the Act for three years, and Parliament could review it in the meantime if necessary.

Mr. J. H. Smith: How many financial emergency measures have been repealed?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: One was repealed yesterday. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The Bill, although it may not be characterised as emergency legislation, is still experimental legislation, and I think there is a great deal more we have to learn before we put a consolidated measure of this nature on the statute-book. If the operations of the board are extended for a number of years, when that time expires the question of consolidating the Act should be considered. A proposed new clause on the notice paper shows definitely why the measure should not be extended beyond the end of next year. It is desired that the tenure of the board shall synchronise with the duration of the Act.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	7
Noes	23
<hr/>	
Majority against	16
<hr/>	

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Doney
Mr. McLarty	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Cross	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Fox	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Troy
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Wahsborough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Warner
Mr. Millington	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. North	Mr. Wise
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Rodoreda	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Reprinting of principal Act and amendments:

Mr. McLARTY: The board in New South Wales undertake extensive advertising.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that come under this clause?

Mr. McLARTY: Perhaps the Minister will tell me where the provision exists for our board to undertake advertising.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:
The board have absolute authority to advertise if they so desire. That is contained in Section 30, paragraphs 4 and 12.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:
I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 4 (a):—"Section eight of the principal Act is amended by adding a subsection as follows:—'(3) The election of the present members of the board is hereby validated and, notwithstanding anything contained in this or the preceding section, the present members of the board shall hold office until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-six.'"

Under the Act the term of members of the boards expires in June next, while the Act will have another six months to run. The new clause will correct that anomaly.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:
I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 5:—"Section nine of the principal Act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end of Subsection (2):—"The provisions of this subsection shall apply to the present members of the board, whose tenure of office expires on the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-six.'"

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—RESERVES.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [10.18] in moving the second reading said: This Bill follows the lines of similar measures brought down in other sessions. The proposals generally are agreed to by all parties concerned. The Education Department desire to erect a public school at Hollywood and have applied for portion of a Class A reserve 20838 coloured blue on lithograph No. 1. The reserve is at present vested in the Nedlands Road Board for recreation, and they are quite agreeable to the portion required for a school site being excised. Being a Class A reserve, Parliamentary approval is necessary. The Busselton coun-

cil desire to establish a camping ground on the unused portion of the old Busselton church cemeteries. The land, which is coloured green on lithograph No. 2, is held respectively by the Roman Catholic and Methodist churches, and those bodies have agreed to surrender such portions to the Crown to be set apart as a camping reserve. As Lot C.1 is the subject of a very old title not under the Transfer of Land Act, it is necessary to re-vest this land in the Crown. The Busselton council consider that the land is ideally situated for a camping reserve. In connection with Clause 3, the narrow strip shown on Plan No. 2 along the eastern side of Stanley-street is required for an additional side width to the jetty railway which passes along this street. This strip of land is outside the cemetery fence, and the Church of England has no objection to its being surrendered at the same time for such purpose. Some years ago, in 1911, Youanmi Lot 101 was granted to the trustees of the Youanmi Miners' Union of Workers (A.W.A.) for a hall site. The union have since been absorbed in the Australian Workers' Union, W.A. Branch. It is now desired that the lot should be granted to the existing body. To give effect to this it is necessary to re-vest the existing lease in His Majesty, so that a similar lease may be granted for the same purpose to the Australian Workers' Union. In connection with Clause 4, a number of lots at Katanning are set apart as a Class A reserve for education endowment, and the Crown grant thereof has been issued to the education endowment trustees. The Katanning Road Board are desirous of acquiring four of these lots for the establishment of a sale-yard, and the education endowment trustees wish to sell them to the road board. As the lots form part of a Class A reserve, this cannot be done except by Parliamentary authority. The purpose of the clause is to enable the education endowment trustees to sell the land to the road board freed and discharged from any trust. The commissioners of the Presbyterian Church desire to establish a men's club for the Australian Inland Mission at Carnarvon, and have selected Lot 507 for the purpose. This lot is one of the number granted to the Carnarvon Municipal Council in trust for "municipal endowment," but the council is quite agreeable to the surrender of the lot for this other purpose. The Bill provides that the lot shall be re-vested in the Crown,

and granted to the Presbyterian Church for the purpose required. Lot 507 is shown in green on lithograph No. 2. A slight amendment is necessary, as disclosed in Clause 6, to Section 2 of the Reserves Act, 1934, owing to a wrong location number having been inadvertently quoted. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 12th November, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions: Necessitous farmers—1, Commonwealth advance: 2, Chaff supplies	1641
Mining, Western Mining Company's reservations	1641
Papers: Agricultural Bank, resignation of G. M. Cornell	1642
Bills: State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 3a	1642
Workers' Homes Act Amendment (No. 3) further report	1642
Electoral, Com.	1642
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, returned	1660
Native Flora Protection, 1a	1660
Financial Emergency Tax, 2a, Com. report	1660

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (2)—NECESSITOUS FARMERS.

Commonwealth Advance.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the total amount made available by the Commonwealth Government for necessitous farmers in Western Australia during the last three years? 2, What are the total disbursements from the fund for—(a) sustenance; (b) machinery—duplicate parts, and other necessary farm equipment; (c) stock; (d) fodder for stock; (e) any other purposes? 3, Have the advances made from the fund been debited to the respective farmers, either in part or in whole? 4, What amount is still in the fund or funds?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Amounts made available by the Commonwealth Government are:—1933, £46,021 of the Wheat Bounty was set aside for necessitous farmers, the balance payable on acreage basis; 1934, £70,609 of the Wheat Bounty was set aside for necessitous cases, and the balance payable on acreage basis; 1935, £137,500 for necessitous cases. 2, (a) and (e) 1933—£46,015 for sustenance, 1934—£68,705 for sustenance, 1935—£76,178 (sustenance £74,513 and seed wheat £1,665: see also answer 4, 1935); (b), (c) and (d) Nil. 3, No. 4, 1933 £6, 1934 £1,904, 1935 £61,322—of this amount further expenditure totalling £36,360 has been authorised and further claims are still being dealt with.

Chaff Supplies.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND asked the Chief Secretary: To elucidate the answers to questions asked on the 29th October respecting chaff—1, Was the £11,840 (Question 1) paid from an advance made by the Federal Government for necessitous farmers? 2, Will the Minister name the definite fund from which advances were made to the Agricultural Bank for the purchase of chaff for distressed farmers? (Vide Question 6.) 3, What penalty was imposed for the cancellation of the 2,800 tons of chaff referred to in Question 14?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, I.A.B. funds. Also, the Commonwealth Government approved of the unexpended balance (£8,513 7s. 5d.) of Additional Farm Labour Funds (which was made available in July, 1930, and which ceased to operate in September, 1931) being utilised. 3, As the Government will again be in the market for chaff to assist settlers in the drought areas, it is not considered in the farmers' and public's interest to give details other than to repeat that up to 18s. 7d. per ton was gained by the farmers on the cancellation.

QUESTION—MINING.

Western Mining Company's reservations.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT asked the Chief Secretary: 1, (a) What area in square miles of reservations of greenstone country is now held by the Western Mining Corporation, Ltd., in this State; (b) what principal goldmining centres are included in the reservations; (c) when do the