

result in the children of Australians being forced to be drawers of water and hewers of wood, while others are permitted to live on vested interests and, retaining their original nationality, refuse to become Australians in sentiment and outlook. These are the people who control Russia. If anything of the sort is proposed here, I shall see to it that the people know what is suggested and, if they approve, they will do so with their eyes open. I agree with Mr. Tuckey in his contention that, before anything is done in the matter, Parliament should be consulted. I certainly am not conservative in my views, but I sincerely trust that in the event of Parliament being consulted, all members holding conservative views will be present and will see that the Commonwealth is populated with people who will marry Australians, people who will forget their race and become good Australians. Most of us, in the enjoyment of the freedom of our nation, have forgotten what our ancestors were 100 years ago. We are proud of the traditions of our country, which we must endeavour to maintain in the future. I thank members for the patient hearing they have given me and trust the motion will be carried.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.17 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 30th August, 1939.

	PAGE
Questions: Transport, Lakes area, Newdegate	429
Traffic dangers, Stirling highway	429
Electoral, Irwin-Moore, Mr. C. O. Barker	430
Betting, fines, amount imposed and amount collected	430
Motions: Betting, starting price shops, referendum as to registration and operation	430
Milk, daily rations for school children	434
Stock Diseases Act, to disallow regulations	438
Metropolitan Milk Act, to disallow regulations and schedule	443
Horse racing and betting, to inquire by Select Committee	449
Bills: Builders' Registration, 1A.	450
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 1), 1A.	450
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 2), 1A.	450
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 1A.	450
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 3), 1A.	450
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 1A.	450
Vermia Act Amendment, 1A.	450
Hire-Purchase Agreements Act Amendment, 1A.	450
Rural Relief Act Amendment, 1A.	450

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

QUESTION—TRANSPORT, LAKES AREA, NEWDEGATE.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Have tenders been let for the new transport service to serve settlers in the Lakes Area east of Newdegate? 2, If so, who were the successful tenderers? 3, Was the lowest tender accepted?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, In view of the absence of data as to quantities of goods and numbers of passengers likely to be offered for transport, the Transport Board arranged a temporary service for three months with the contractor who did the wheat carting during the 1938-39 wheat delivery season. Information gained from the operation of this temporary service will be used in making a more permanent arrangement.

QUESTION—TRAFFIC DANGERS, STIRLING HIGHWAY.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister representing the Minister for Police: 1, Have any further precautions been taken recently to minimise traffic dangers along Stirling Highway? 2, Are any further measures that might be taken held up by lack of finance?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied: 1, All precautions possible with the facilities available are taken to minimise traffic dangers, and increased motor

cycle patrols are carried out. 2, It is always possible to take additional precautionary measures if men and equipment are available.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL, IRWIN-MOORE.

Mr. C. O. Barker.

Mr. THORN asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware whether or not Mr. Claude Osmond Barker, who was elected to represent Irwin-Moore in the Legislative Assembly, was disqualified from sitting and voting in the said Legislative Assembly? 2, If Mr. Barker was not qualified to be a member of the Legislative Assembly, on what grounds was he disqualified? 3, Has the allowance paid to Mr. Barker as a member of the Legislative Assembly been refunded to the Treasury?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, No.

QUESTION—BETTING, FINES.

Amount Imposed and Amount Collected.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Police: 1, What was the total number of convictions for betting offences during the last six months? 2, What was the total amount of fines imposed? 3, How much of this amount has been collected?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied: 1, Perth area, 404; Fremantle area, 74. 2, Perth area, £13,460; Fremantle area, £317. 3, Perth area, £12,724; Fremantle area, all collected.

BILLS (9)—FIRST READING.

1, Builders' Registration.

Introduced by Mr. Needham.

2, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 1).

3, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 2).

Introduced by Hon. C. G. Latham, (for Mr. Patrick).

4, Municipal Corporations Act Amendment.

5, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 3).

6, Bills of Sale Act Amendment.

7, Vermin Act Amendment.

Introduced by Mr. Cross.

8, Hire-purchase Agreements Act Amendment.

9, Rural Relief Act Amendment.

Introduced by Mr. Watts.

MOTION—BETTING, STARTING PRICE SHOPS.

Referendum as to Registration and Operation.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco)

[4.42]: I move—

That, in the opinion of this House, a referendum of the people of the State should be held to ascertain whether or not a majority of the people is in favour of legislation to permit starting price betting shops being registered within the State, and whether starting price betting be allowed to operate within and under the law of the State in any manner whatsoever and that no legislation be introduced until the will of the people by such referendum has been ascertained.

I would like to ask hon. members, through you, Mr. Speaker, to endeavour—as I feel sure they will—to preserve an unprejudiced mind on this subject until the termination of the debate. I also desire to remind hon. members opposite that a referendum has been a plank in their platform as long as I can remember. I am sure it needs no persuasion of mine to convince members that this motion, although simple, is of very great importance, that is, if the Government or private members contemplate introducing legislation with regard to off-the-course betting during this session. If, on the other hand, they do not contemplate any such legislation, then I feel sure that the passing of the motion will give a sense of security to those who fear that their rights may be filched while they sleep, or that perhaps they will not be given that right which they possess, that is, to express their opinion through the ballot box. It has been the boast of some members—Ministers notably—and rightly so, that they have a mandate from the people to legislate. That is true. But to legislate for what? I understand that a political mandate is usually given upon a certain question or questions of policy submitted to the people before an election, and that candidates are pledged to carry out the mandate. A mandate is an order given by someone to someone else;

and it is a matter of political honour that the electors should be consulted upon questions of major importance. It may be considered, of course, that this is not a question of major importance; but members will recall that when a Bill was debated last year to deal with off-the-course betting, the galleries were filled to overflowing. Members will also recall that daily articles on the subject appeared in the Press and much publicity was given to it. Surely, such public interest should have encouraged the Government to inform the public what it was intended to do regarding this important matter. It may be that the Government has no intentions on the question, save changing its present policy and enforcing the law; but if we are to continue as we are at present with our lawless rule, then the State will be in a parlous condition.

A query is raised, why did not the Government include this all-important subject in its election policy? If the Government was sincere when it brought down the Bill last year to deal with off-the-course betting, why did the Government let the matter drop just before an election? It had not become less important; in fact, it was more important. Every week adds to its importance. More and more shops are open for s.p. betting; and, as our economic position becomes worse, so the evils which accompany the getting of easy money become more pronounced. More and more bookmakers flood our streets; more and more punters are drawn into the net in the desperate struggle to participate in the obtaining of easy money. This matter, at least in my opinion, was not made an election issue for the reason that the Government feared that if it included shop betting in its policy, it would suffer defeat. Candidates for election, especially those on the Government side of the House, angled for the bookmakers' vote on the one hand, and those opposed to bookmakers on the other.

Mr. Withers: Be generous. Say some of them did.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I will say some of them did. The most non-political-minded person can see that if the Government had included this all-important subject in its election policy, then it would have lost the church and allied votes. It would have had a hostile Press, and so would not now be sitting on the Treasury bench. I do

not know whether members on the opposite side of the House received a letter from a body known as the Citizens' Rights League; but some members on this side of the Chamber did. The letter reads—

The Citizens' Rights League, with a membership of 17,000 electors in the State, takes strong exception to the arbitrary methods adopted by the authorities in dealing with the gaming laws of this State. It is admitted that those controlling the betting shops are infringing the Gaming Act; and for that infringement they are constantly prosecuted and fined large amounts; while at the same time, and at the same place, wealthy owners of racecourses are permitted to charge large fees from bookmakers, who bet with all and sundry without let or hindrance. The Bill introduced into the Assembly last Parliament, making provision for legalising and placing under strict control all betting, was lost by a small majority of two, and this with two members absent.

This is the part that I wish members particularly to note—

It is the intention of the league to have a similar Bill introduced in the new Parliament, and your views will be appreciated.

Who gave this organisation the right to make that statement? What power have its members to make those assertions? Are those statements true?

I cannot imagine the Government's allowing the present state of affairs to continue, and in fairness to the people Ministers ought to make some pronouncement. As the Government now has a working majority, one is tempted to surmise that before the next election a measure to provide for some form of legalised betting will be introduced. Because the Government did not make this an election issue and because some of the candidates refused to face the public on this issue, I have brought this motion before the House.

We all know that the betting laws of this State are notoriously the most frequently broken of all our laws. As far as betting is concerned, we are merely under gangster rule. I want members to tell me, if they can, how it happens that the men operating in this business can flout the law with impunity. Who is the authority that protects these particular law-breakers? Who is the person that can sap the courage of Governments, of politicians and of administrators? Surely the Government cannot be proud of the fact

that the Commissioner of Police passes the doors of these betting shops daily and sees this nefarious trade being carried on and is powerless to interfere! What makes him powerless to interfere? We have a fine body of men in the police and the Government should realise the reflection cast upon them in having to pass the doors of betting shops daily, shops blatantly advertising the names of men who are becoming wealthy by breaking the law. Yet the police are unable to arrest those men except under certain conditions. Who lays down the conditions? If we as law makers prescribe the conditions, we should be ashamed. If the law needs amending, we should amend it. But we know that the law is not administered. If the law was administered, the betting shops would be wiped out of existence in a few weeks.

I have had supplied to me some interesting information about an investigation that was made in Perth one afternoon. Within five miles of the central police station, no fewer than 80 assistants or dummies in 14 different premises were practising book-making or associated therein. Over 800 people were counted in those shops on that afternoon. Ten principals unlawfully have betting tickets printed bearing their names, and not one of them has ever been brought before the court. For the information of members I should like to mention where those betting shops are situated. There are also many others, of which members are aware, but I propose to give this information so that it may be passed on to the Commissioner of Police or to those people whom members think might be able to close these places.

Premises known as :	Attendants.	No. of people on premises (approx.)
Wellington Street—J. Higgins....	4	35
S. P. Betts	5	45
Ted Fryer....	9	75
Stan Nicholls	9	80
William Street—Ted Begley	7	75
Syd. Feldt	5	60
William Street, north of New-castle Street—Fletcher	5	50
Murray Street (next Bohemia Hotel)—Stan Nicholls	8	90
Murray Street, cr. King Street—Bill Pitt	5	60
Murray Street, near Pier Street—Maloney	4	40
Murray Street, west of Maloney—W. Derby	6	70
Pier Street, cr. Hay Street—Derby's	4	45
Hay Street, opposite Town Hall—E. Smithers	7	100
Murray Street, opposite Bairds—J. Higgins....	4	60

Mr. Cross: How many private poker schools are there in West Perth?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I could not catch the hon. member's interjection.

Mr. Cross: How many private poker schools are there in West Perth?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not attend private poker schools and so I really do not know.

Mr. Cross: There is one close to your home.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I should be quite content to have the hon. member give the names of people who run such schools. I assure him that I would make it my business to help him in that direction if he would make it his business to insist upon betting shops being closed.

Mr. Thorn: It is his duty to make them known.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Government may hide behind the fact that there has lately been an increase in the fines imposed for s.p. betting, and some of the accused have been committed to gaol. Still it is of no use patting ourselves on the back and feeling that we are enforcing the law because there has been a small increase in fines. These betting shops are still in existence, and it is the duty of members of Parliament to see that they are put out of existence. There was a rumour that many of the fines were not paid. That is why I asked my question to-day, and I was glad to find there is not a big difference between the amount of the fines imposed and the amount collected. When any of these men goes to gaol, the family is kept by the fraternity of bookmakers until the man is released. He is then given a few pounds with which to carry on. Therefore the convicted persons do not feel that they are undergoing any great hardship.

The men charged with betting offences are not the owners of the premises. They are not the men who have made tremendous sums of money out of this illicit business. They are simply dummies, poor men desirous of earning a few pounds. Often they are engaged as clerks. They make false statements and the magistrates know they make false statements, and because of this hypocrisy and perjury the administration is laughed at and the law flouted. We as politicians are ridiculed. This House is

called the asylum on the hill, and some very nasty—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Because of mal-administration of this kind, democracy is falling. In all seriousness I say that mal-administration is breaking down our social system and therefore we cannot permit this sort of thing to continue. I ask members to take this question out of the political arena and allow the people to deal with it. It is an important moral question, and one on which the people should give a decision. The Government has refused to take action. We should demonstrate in deed that which we so often quote before an election, namely, our belief in government of the people by the people for the people.

Mr. Fox: The people decide matters for themselves now.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: They did not decide on this question, because it was not made an election issue. They did not get the right to come to a decision. Had it been an election issue most of the members sitting opposite would not be in the Chamber to-day.

Mr. Fox: A man is not compelled to make a starting-price bet.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: True, but it is against the law for a man to conduct a starting-price betting shop, and quite openly these establishments are allowed to exist. I hope members of the Government will be able to assure the House that such places do not exist in their electorates.

Mr. Fox: It is against the law to bet on a racecourse.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Quite so, but I am not dealing with racecourses. I do not yet know whether the Government intends to bring down legislation dealing with that matter. In any case, I would prefer that the question be referred to the people.

Mr. Cross: Would you agree to the abolition of betting on racecourses?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I shall soon have finished my speech, when the hon. member will have his opportunity to address the House.

Mr. Sampson: But he will not take it.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It might be advisable for me to bring up a few arguments against a referendum. I am not really discussing betting at all.

The Minister for Mines: You have not yet said a word about it. We have been waiting for you to mention it.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I will do so now. Members may ask whether a referendum would have any effect upon the administration. If the people voted against starting-price betting shops, would the administration become more effective? I believe that would be so, because politicians do not stand behind the present administration. That is where the difficulty comes in. If the administration knew that a majority of the people were behind them, the law would be properly administered. Members may say that the cost of a referendum would be too great. The vote could be taken at an election, and that would not cost very much. In any event, the fines that are inflicted upon those who conduct these shops could be earmarked to meet the cost of the referendum. The Government has no right to the fines now, because by law these betting shops should not be permitted to exist. If the fines were set aside for a year, plenty of money would be available to meet the cost of the referendum. It is said that we have been elected to govern the country, and that we should attend to these matters ourselves without going to the trouble or expense of having a referendum. The question arises, are we governing the country?

Mr. Watts: The present Government is not doing so.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: We are silenced on this question. We are allowing these great forces for evil to exist outside the House. We are not governing the country, but are allowing a lawless community to dictate to us. Members will recall the letter I read to the effect that "at the next sitting of the House we will have a Bill brought down." Someone is being allowed to dictate to us, and on this question we are not governing. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) firmly believes that he has a mandate from his constituency to legalise off-the-course betting shops. On the other hand, I believe I have a mandate from my electors to close those that are now in business. Which of us is right?

The Minister for Mines: The mandate

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: We are both right, but I represent many more people than does the member for Murchison.

The Minister for Mines: He represents the larger territory.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: That may be so, but he represents a very small number of people compared with the number I represent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the motion.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Wait a moment, Mr. Speaker; it has everything to do with it. It is the very point of the argument. In the Chamber our votes are equal, but I am representing many more people on this subject than does the hon. member. My electors say to me, "Close these places." The electors of the hon. member say, "Legalise them." By means of a referendum every person will enjoy an equal vote on this question. It will not be a matter of the hon. member and myself in this Chamber, where our votes are equal, but of the people as a whole having the opportunity to say what they want.

Mr. Rodoreda: So that we ought to send every Bill to the people in that way.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: That is what the Labour Party says in its platform, but never carries out.

Several members interjected.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Members by their interjections are putting forward suppositions, suggesting what I may be thinking. They do not know to what I would agree. Although our votes in this Chamber are equal, we represent different numbers of people. We should allow the community to decide the merits of this question. The member for Murchison believes this is a poor man's sport, and that the poor man should have these shops legalised. I am not in agreement with that view. Eighty per cent., if not more, of the people in this State are poor, and are living on the basic wage or less. If this is a poor man's sport as the hon. member believes, he should allow the poor men to say whether or not they want legalisation of off-the-course betting. It may be said that the issue is not sufficiently important to warrant a referendum. Since I have been a member of this Chamber almost every other member at one time or another has declared that this is a most debatable question and an important one. The question may be raised, can a moral subject like this be dealt with effectively by one person as for another. I do not think that it can. We can drag down a nation by

rotten, degrading and unwise legislation, or by weak administration, just as we can raise the standard by wise legislation and effective administration, but we cannot decide the moral life of the individual, for by divine right that belongs to the man himself.

I am sure that when a true expression of the will of the people is secured through a secret ballot, the standard of moral and political value so expressed will always reflect the standard at which the majority of the people have arrived. I have shown that owing to the representations made by varied numbers of electors in each electorate, we cannot and do not represent the views of every person. Therefore I trust members will pass the motion. If the Government does not intend to bring down legislation dealing with this question, and opposes the motion, it will show that it is not sincere in a desire to bring the matter before the electors. If it does intend to bring down legislation it will support the motion to give the people the right to say whether or not these shops should be legalised. The passing of the motion will in no way hinder the Government from seeing that the law is enforced. The shops should be closed until the Government can give effect to the will of the people on the question of whether or not they wish these shops to remain open.

On motion by Mr. Mann, debate adjourned.

MOTION—MILK, DAILY RATION FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco)
[5.12]: I move—

That, owing to the alarming reports of our medical officers declaring that at least from twenty-five to thirty per cent. of the children examined in schools are under nourished, this House is of opinion that immediate provision should be forthcoming to give at least one daily ration of milk to all school children whose parents receive less than the basic wage, or, where there are more than five in family of school age.

I am sorry I have had to move two motions one following the other. This question is not a contentious one, and the previous one with which I dealt should not have been contentious either. Every member will, I am sure, be glad to support this motion. The question need not be laboured because it has been dealt with very often in the

House. I wish to give some members an idea of the attitude of the Government. An agitation for a milk supply for children started two or three years ago, and has continued ever since. In 1936 a deputation waited upon the Minister, who was very sympathetic. The convenor was asked by the Minister to inform him of the method by which free milk was being given by the milk council to the children. The information was supplied. I have here a letter that was written to the Minister. It contains the following paragraph:—

On investigation we have found that neither the child nor the parent is concerned about the source of the milk. They accept it as a matter of course.

That does away with the idea that when in the schools children receive free milk, either the parents or the children look upon it as a charity. In October, 1936, the Minister, in replying to the letter, wrote—

The Government is prepared to give consideration to supplementing the funds so raised and thus assist the object which appears common to all, that is, the supply of free milk to children of parents receiving less than the basic wage.

On the 23rd October the Minister showed himself to be sufficiently sympathetic to ask how many children would require milk. The information was obtained from the office of the Minister for Labour. We found out how many parents were on either relief or sustenance work. We did not obtain figures regarding those who were on full-time work. The details procured refer to the year 1936, but I believe the position is more or less the same to-day. Although at one stage the numbers decreased, they increased again later on. The figures supplied to us were: metropolitan area, 6,554; country areas, 2,328, giving a total of 8,882. We received information from the Education Department indicating that the children of those people would number about 5,700. That, of course, applies to the metropolitan-suburban area and, as I have pointed out, does not refer to the children of parents who are on full-time work. In May, 1937, the Minister, who had apparently discussed the question with Cabinet and had arrived at the conclusion that it would not be possible to provide funds, wrote to the council as follows:—

I have your letter of the 9th May regarding a scheme for the supply of milk, but in view of very many circumstances relating to

finance, which render it difficult to foresee the capacity of the Government to assist, I think it wise that the organisation to which you are attached should not alter its policy in regard to the collection of funds to carry out the work it has now undertaken.

In April, 1938, a large and representative deputation waited upon the Government and furnished a graphic description of the under-nourishment of children in the metropolitan-suburban area. It was not till 1939 that a reply was received from the Minister who, in the course of his communication, said—

Quite apart from the fact that the Government has not the finance with which to carry out all such undertakings, it would appear that this question is in line with many other social undertakings which, where necessary, desirable and capable of being effectively operated, are best served by efforts of those persons and organisations promoted for the purpose.

Since then we have received reports regarding the grave malnutrition of children. Members will probably have read Dr. Stang's comments, which are most alarming. In the course of a report in the "West Australian" regarding her work, the following appeared—

During June Dr. E. M. Stang (senior Government Medical Officer of Schools) announced the results of the first stage of an investigation of the height and weight standards of Western Australian children as compared with the Australian standards established by the Commonwealth Advisory Council on Nutrition. Those results, which concerned the East Victoria Park State school, showed that in the infants' school an average of 83.52 per cent. of the children were underweight on the basis of the Nutrition Council's standards, while in the senior school 56.8 per cent. of the children were 4 lbs. and more underweight. Yesterday Dr. Stang made available the results of a similar study at the North Fremantle and Nedlands State schools.

Many people queried the norm upon which Dr. Stang had carried out her investigations. Comments were passed by many who said they did not believe there were so many under-nourished children in our midst. The "West Australian" report continued—

Since the survey at the East Victoria Park State school, said Dr. Stang, the Director-General of the Commonwealth Department of Health (Dr. J. H. L. Cumpston) was asked by the Public Health Department to suggest a table of height and weight standards which might possibly be more suitable for Western Australia than the Nutrition Council's standard. He had submitted standards which

he considered absolutely reliable and these would form the basis of the investigation. The latest standards would make the figures for the East Victoria Park State school, if anything, slightly better than were announced. Dr. Cumpston was approached because when the figures were published many people, although disconcerted and shocked by the results, were disinclined to accept them without great reserve. The figures obtained as a result of the investigation at the North Fremantle and Nedlands State schools justified her earlier statement that, while one could not make generalisations from the records so far obtained, the results should shake the community out of its complacency.

At the North Fremantle State school, said Dr. Stang, the proportion of children under the average standard weight for height was 74.8 per cent. It was decided to establish a "danger line"—

Now I come to a point respecting which I intend to ask the Government to take some action—

—the view taken being that children on or below this line should obtain medical attention to ascertain if there were clinical causes for their condition. This "danger line" was set at 10 per cent. below the average weight for height. At the North Fremantle school 29.3 per cent. of the children were on or below that line. Children attending the Nedlands State school, it was felt, should not have any lack of the necessities of life. It was found that 66.3 per cent. of the children there were below the average weight for height and that 21.8 per cent. were 10 per cent. and more below the average weight.

That is the point I wish to make. If the Government cannot find sufficient money to provide for every child a supply of milk at the school he or she is attending—and surely that is what the Government should aim at—sufficient money should at least be provided to supply milk to children on the danger-line. Dr. Collins, the Medical Superintendent of the Children's Hospital in Melbourne, believes that poverty is the principal cause of malnutrition, and in the course of a published statement said—

When patients were admitted to hospital they received the correct diet and the difference in their health was soon noticed. This work was destroyed when the patient returned home where he or she reverted to a diet lacking in nutriment value.

Their resistance was consequently lowered instead of being built up and soon they were again attacked by disease and in need of medical attention. He accepted Dr. Dale's figures showing 30 per cent. of children suffering from malnutrition.

The point should be made clear that the Free Milk Council has not worked along health lines alone, although it has accepted on all occasions the statements made by Dr. Stang. On the other hand, the council has acted on its own initiative, and found out, in given centres, the number of parents who were receiving less than the basic wage, and then, in co-operation with the teachers of the schools affected, ascertained whether the children of those parents were backward or apparently under-nourished. The information gleaned showed that about 25 per cent. of the parents who answered the council's queries received throughout the year less than the basic wage. Their children were notably under-nourished.

I have, for display to members of this Chamber in particular, an advertisement for Trufood skim milk. The advertisement shows eight large bottles of milk for one small tin of skim milk. Included in the advertisement, which is a large one, is reference to the free gifts that may be obtained in exchange for Trufood labels. At the top of the advertisement, the following words appear in large type, "Plenty of pure fresh milk at little cost." The publication of such an announcement means that the poorer people are encouraged to buy milk of the description advertised, and to give it to their children. They are encouraged to do so because of the free gifts that are made available to foster the purchase of the tinned commodity. The result is that children are not getting proper nourishment, because the milk with which they are fed is skimmed and not fresh whole milk.

Mr. Withers: Have you the analysis of the food contents of the skim milk?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: No.

Mr. Withers: That would be interesting.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I dare say that Trufood skim milk in itself is quite good, but the fact remains that it is skim milk and not proper whole milk that is so necessary for children if they are to be properly nourished. During the first session of my Parliamentary career, I was struck by a provision enacted in the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act, setting out that advertisements must indicate the true value of the article. When I looked at the advertisement for the skim milk article, the point that appealed to me most was that people would

be swayed by the display of eight large bottles of milk that could be procured from a comparatively small tin of powdered milk. Such a display would certainly encourage people on the breadline to purchase a tin of the skim milk for their children instead of whole milk.

Members will agree that it is a matter for regret that the consumption of tinned foods has increased tremendously throughout Australia. During the course of the debate on my motion, some members may contend that the explanation of juvenile under-nourishment is that parents are not providing them with the correct diet. Many of the poorer class buy tinned milk because, perhaps, they find it easier to deal with as they have not sufficient time within which to prepare the food necessary for their children. Last year, Western Australia imported from the Eastern States 1,229,915 lbs. of condensed milk for which we paid £60,000. We also imported 1,409,293 lbs. of powdered milk for which we paid £69,367. However good milk in that form may be, it cannot be as suitable for children as fresh milk. I firmly believe that all members will agree with my contention that the financing of the task of providing poor, under-nourished children with food should not depend upon collections in the street or elsewhere. I suppose he will not like me to mention the matter, but one member of this House—I refer to our honoured leader, the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald)—has adopted 25 children and provides them with free milk. That means a considerable sum spread over the full year. Such work should not devolve upon members of Parliament or the more generous sections of the community. The responsibility for feeding these children should be a community matter.

Mr. North: What is the position in Russia?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: As to any comparison with Russia, I could mention the position in almost every country in the world and show that in each instance they see that their children are supplied with milk and good food. In Australia, where we can throw milk away and we are supposed to be rich in our supplies of natural food products, we have a greater percentage of under-nourished children than any-

where else. The argument may be advanced that we are relieving parents of their responsibilities. If parents cannot afford to feed their children properly, the duty devolves upon the State to do so. If parents can afford to undertake the task, the duty still rests with the Government to see that they feed their children properly. This form is sent out by the London County Council to the parents of every child entering a school—

The school doctor has recommended that your child should receive two bottles of milk daily at school.

Think of that! Two bottles of milk are advised for children in England and we give one small bottle. The circular continues—

In accordance with this recommendation, the council will be prepared to arrange for him/her to be given milk unless you notify that you do not desire such arrangements. The present charge for milk for meals is—

Space is left for the amount charged per week to be entered. The circular continues—

—and this amount should be sent by you to the head teacher. The council is required by Act of Parliament to recover this charge unless satisfied that the parent or guardian of the child is unable to pay. If, therefore, you desire to see the Care Committee with reference to the matter, will you please attend . . .

The circular then intimates the school to be attended and the time at which attendance is required. That circular is issued by the London County Council to every parent and each year over 200,000,000 bottles of milk are supplied. The people who can afford to pay for either milk meals, clothes or medical treatment in schools are made to pay, which is as it should be. I am quite sure that people in Western Australia would be prepared to pay if they were in a position to do so. Those of us associated with the Free Milk Council are aware that many people, including those on the lowest incomes, send along a penny or twopence a week. Others say, "I cannot pay now because my husband is out of work, but if you will let my child have the milk free now, I will pay the money when my husband obtains employment." Others again pay 5d. or 6d. a week, whatever the amount may be.

I should like to read the remarks made by a few schoolteachers. I shall not read

the letters fully but will quote passages from them. Here is one from the head teacher of the Infant School in Thomas-street. She says—

I am convinced that the children concerned have greatly benefited and I should like to see an extension of your scheme so that all under-nourished children may participate.

Then I have a very long and interesting letter from the head mistress of the East Victoria Park infant school, in which she says in part—

Its food value is beyond question. Our records show the normal increase to be 1 lb. per fortnight (this on 8 ozs. daily, which is really insufficient). Where the supply ceases the child loses weight. Many other improvements are noted. The whole body seems to "pep up," eyes and skin brighten, hair takes on a gloss, and carriage is more erect. To my mind the mental and social improvement shown are most valuable. Very young children attach enormous importance to food, and the fact of their sharing in the good things of life causes them to cast off a certain hesitancy and apathy too often present in under-nourished children. Altogether they become more childlike and natural, far less quarrelsome, more responsive to the teachers' help, and their work is infinitely more satisfactory.

In conclusion, she says—

May I express the hope that it may be my good fortune to be still teaching when the State recognises its duty to the little children it so badly needs.

Members may have noticed in this morning's paper a letter dealing with milk regulations, written by a man from Mosman, who declared that the children at the local area were all well nourished, although they did not have a second delivery of milk during the day. The Free Milk Council is supplying milk to some school children in the suburb named, and that milk is being supplied because the children are definitely under-nourished. The parents are not exactly on the bread line, but in some instances they are receiving less than the basic wage. At the North Fremantle school 40 per cent. of the children receive a daily ration of milk and a portion of the quantity distributed is supplied by the Free Milk Council. The head teacher of that school writes—

I wish to thank your council for the splendid assistance it has given over the past three years in supplying free milk to so many deserving children.

He, also, would like to see the Government take on this particular work. I have a letter from the Government school at Leederville, and another from the Subiaco school, enclosing a small cheque. Many teachers from all these schools contribute money to a fund to provide free milk for these youngsters. In asking members to agree to this motion I do so with the knowledge that it is not a contentious one, and feel certain that all will support it. I know that the matter is one of finance; but the Government must find the money. We cannot continue to allow children to be under-nourished. One of two courses must be adopted. Either parents must be paid sufficient money to enable them to buy milk for their children or the Government itself must supply the milk. We cannot afford to have under-nourished children.

The Premier: What would the cost be?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The cost would be about £5,000. The Premier is seeking Federal assistance for wheatgrowers to the extent of millions of pounds. All that is required to give these children what they need is £5,000. I assure the House that there will be few wheatgrowers unless our children are better nourished. Where the money comes from I care not; but the Government must ensure that the children of this State are properly fed. For that reason I ask members to support the motion.

On motion by the Minister for Mines, debate adjourned.

MOTION—STOCK DISEASES ACT.

To Disallow Regulations.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [5.37]: I move—

That Regulations 4, 6, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27 and 75 and Form 7 of the Third Schedule of regulations under the Stock Diseases Act, 1895, published in the "Government Gazette" of the 17th March, 1939, and laid on the Table of the House on the 8th August, 1939, be and are hereby disallowed.

In submitting the motion for the disallowance of certain regulations made under the Stock Diseases Act, 1895, I do not object to all that are referred to. If some of them were amended—in certain instances only slightly—they would be quite all right. However, I am unable to move that they be so amended and my only course, therefore, is

to seek their disallowance. When I first read the regulations in the "Government Gazette" of the 17th March last, I was rather surprised to think that they had been agreed to by a body of men like those comprising the Royal Agricultural Society, particularly as members of the council of that organisation include leading stock-owners of the State. So surprised was I that I telephoned the chairman of the society. Members will understand how astonished I was when I learned that the society had not seen the regulations and did not know they had been gazetted. That the Agricultural Department, when introducing regulations of this description should fail to take advantage of the practical knowledge of members of the council of that society is a pity, to say the least of it. Every stockowner in the State agrees that the regulations for the prevention of and the coping with diseases in stock are essential. But there are many ways in which regulations, highly desirable otherwise, may be impracticable, and it is concerning the practicability of these regulations that the department should get in touch with a body like the Royal Agricultural Society before gazetting and bringing into effect such regulations as these, which, if they are not disallowed, will become law. The first regulation to which I am taking exception is No. 4 under the heading of "Interpretation." This regulation states in part—

"Cow shed" means any building or premises in which milking cows or goats may be kept.

To my mind that is a trap for the unwary. If a man happened to read the Act and saw something applying to a cow shed, I do not think he would consider it to refer to a goat. I suggest that "milking shed" should be substituted for "cow shed." If that substitution were made, a stock owner would consult the regulation in order to ascertain what particular stock was referred to. The next regulation to which I object is No. 6, which states—

The owner of any stock shall, when required by an inspector, forthwith muster his stock in some convenient place, yard, or crush as the inspector may direct, and if he is not satisfied that the whole of the stock have been so mustered, the inspector may employ any person to assist him in the thorough examination of the stock of such owner, and the expenses of, and incident to, such examination shall be paid by the owner thereof.

That is quite satisfactory up to a point, but I consider there should be an amendment to the effect that the owner of any stock shall muster such stock when required by an inspector "who has reasonable ground for supposing disease to exist in the stock." The reason I suggest the amendment is as follows: These regulations appeared in the "Government Gazette" on the 17th March last. About two weeks later appeared the gazettal of two police constables as inspectors of stock. I am not saying anything against police constables as such, but I contend that the right to determine whether stock is diseased or not should be exercised only by a qualified veterinary officer. To ask policemen to determine whether a man's stock is diseased is not fair. I recall that a few years ago swine fever occurred in the State, and the farms in the Great Southern were quarantined because of a fear that the animals on those farms might have contracted the disease.

Mr. Mann: That was done by an irresponsible man, too.

Mr. SEWARD: I have no evidence of that, but I do know that a man who called at some places was not a veterinary surgeon. Whether he was qualified to say that that particular disease had affected stock, I do not know, but he probably was not. We have to bear in mind that a man might have a grudge against his neighbour and cause his stock to be inspected. Frequently sheep are seen running round with their wool hanging off. A man seeing his neighbour's stock in that condition might suggest that the animals were diseased and ask a police constable to quarantine the property or compel the farmer to muster the sheep for examination. In those circumstances, if a man refused to do so, the inspector would have the power to do it for him, at the farmer's expense. I consider that an inspector should have reasonable ground for suspecting the existence of disease before putting a stock owner to such expense. The incorporation of an amendment to that effect would satisfy stock owners because it would ensure that the inspector obtained competent advice before determining whether stock was diseased or not. Regulation 10 states—

If it appears to the inspector that an infectious or contagious disease exists or has within the preceding 30 days existed among any stock, or on the land inspected or examined by himself or any other inspector, he

shall so determine and shall declare in a written notice to the owner such land to be an infected holding within the boundaries of which such stock shall be kept, and shall forthwith notify the Chief Inspector, who may cause notice of the fact to be published in the "Government Gazette" and in such newspapers circulating in the district or subdivision where the disease has been ascertained to exist.

Again I hold that this is too much power to put in the hands of a police constable. If the constable has reason to suspect or believe that disease is prevalent in any stock, then before he quarantines the area the owner should have the right of appeal to the Chief Veterinary Officer. I do not suggest that the chief officer should have to attend to every complaint, but he should see that a qualified veterinary surgeon, before ordering quarantine, carried out an investigation to determine that the disease really existed.

Member: What does a policeman know about diseases in stock?

Mr. SEWARD. It is not fair either to the policeman or to the stockowner himself. In all probability the owner will have had more experience in the handling of stock and is better able to decide whether the disease exists. As the hon. member interjected, what would a policeman know about diseases in stock, and in all likelihood the policeman would be a new arrival in the district and consequently would know nothing about stock and so would not even have a first acquaintance with the symptoms of disease. Quarantining would be a very serious matter to the owner of, say, a stud farm and where the stock might be ready for sale. In such an event he would be prevented from sending his stock to the market. It is only right therefore that the regulations should be amended to give an owner the right of appeal to the Chief Veterinary Officer, before the actual quarantining took place. The next regulation to which I take exception is Regulation 15 which reads—

All loss sustained in respect of any stock whilst being in quarantine, whether by accident or sickness arising from natural causes or contracted from other stock or by the destruction or detention or quarantine of such stock to prevent the spread of disease shall be borne by the owner of such stock and he shall have no claim whatever for compensation for any such loss nor for any loss sustained by such owner through the carrying out or enforcement of these regulations.

That is all very well as far as it goes, but I think it is only a reasonable thing to claim that if stock on a property—pigs, for instance—contract disease through no fault of the owner and the stock has to be destroyed in order to prevent the spread of the disease and so safeguard other people's stock, it is only fair that that owner should be compensated. The need for this was brought home to me only a few weeks ago at a conference of the Agricultural societies, where it was shown that a man in the south-western part of the State had a herd of cattle. He attended a sale of Government cattle and bought a cow unfortunately affected with contagious abortion. No fewer than 13 of his cows afterwards became affected. Surely that is not a fair thing. I have it on the authority of the Dairy Inspection Department that a man may not sell affected stock for breeding purposes. He may, however, sell it for butchering purposes. In a case like this, where a man buys a diseased cow that is sold by the Government, and part of his herd becomes affected, he should be entitled to compensation. I remember some years ago when rinderpest made its appearance, many cattle were destroyed on the authority of the Government and compensation was paid to the owners. I would not declare that those owners had a just claim against the Government because in that instance the Government was not responsible for the introduction of rinderpest. Measures should be taken to establish a fund from which compensation could be paid. But I contend that when diseased animals are sold by the Government and those animals infect other stock, compensation should be paid by the Government. In such a case the stock would be destroyed for the public benefit. The next regulation, No. 16, provides that the whole expense is to be borne by the owner. It reads—

The owner of any stock shall pay all charges and expenses connected with the inspection, transporting, quarantining, housing, sustenance, disinfecting, dipping, dressing or veterinary or other treatment of such stock pursuant to the Act or these regulations until they are, as the case may be, released from detention or quarantine, transhipped, or destroyed, and the charges and expenses for transit, inspection, and dipping shall be calculated on the whole number of stock, and where there are more owners than one each owner shall pay a proportionate share thereof. All expenses shall be paid within

twenty-four hours by such owner or owners to an inspector on demand.

I suggest that the period of 24 hours should be altered to one week or two weeks. We can quite understand that all these things provided for in the regulation have to be carried out and a fair amount of time may be necessary. Again, a man does not go around his farm with a pocket full of money and we should give him at least a week in which to pay the charges.

Regulation 17 deals with the prevention of the spread of disease and reads—

(1) Any inspector of stock may, if he deems it necessary for preventing the spread of disease—

(a) Prohibit in any district the holding of exhibitions of stock and the sale of stock in public markets and in private saleyards.

An inspector should certainly not be given power to permit the sale of stock in a public saleyard if the stock is diseased, more especially if the stock is the Government's own property. I said a little while ago that such stock was sold by the Government in the South-West, stock known to have contagious abortion, and the disease was introduced to the herds with the result that some had to be destroyed. That is not a fair thing. The Chief Veterinary Officer was asked how long it took to determine whether cattle were affected by contagious abortion and he said 24 hours. We cannot expect the Agricultural Department, with its limited staff of veterinary surgeons, to inspect all the herds of the State, but it is reasonable to ask, where herds are found to be affected, that the stock should not be allowed to go out and transmit the disease to other stock. The Chief Veterinary Officer made the astonishing statement to me that if the Government had a cow that was a little above the ordinary in value, and it was affected with contagious abortion, that cow could be sold in a public saleyard. The statement would then be made that the cow was known to have the disease and that the purchaser would take the animal at his own risk. If a private owner asked the department to inspect his stock, and the stock was found to be affected by contagious abortion, the animal or animals would be branded and the owner would be compelled to sell it, only, however, for butchering purposes. It is a surprising state of affairs that the private owner should be prohibited from doing something that the Government is able to do. It is certainly wrong, and so

I move in the direction of amending this regulation also.

No. 44 is the next regulation to which I wish to refer. I accepted the bona fides of the Chief Veterinary Officer in this matter and he took the stand that it was not necessary always to refer to the chief officer because a property would not be quarantined without his sanction. I accepted that statement and I allowed one of the regulations to go by. No. 44 reads—

Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding regulation the Chief Inspector of Stock may, subject to any condition which he may from time to time deem necessary to impose, grant written permission for the removal of cattle by land from the Kimberley quarantine area to any other part of the State.

I was inclined to move to disallow that regulation but the Chief Inspector assured me that he would not permit any disease to come out of that area. I was rather surprised therefore on reading in the newspaper yesterday the report of a deputation that waited on the Chief Inspector. This report reads—

The chairman of the South-West conference, Mr. Leslie Craig, when describing his conversation with the Chief Inspector of Stock on the matter of building up a compensation fund for animals lost through disease, told the conference that his conversation with Mr. McKenzie Clarke really had to do with the matter of pleuro-pneumonia. He understood that new regulations had come out to enable cattle to come down from the North. The onus of seeing that these cattle were clean should be on the Government and producers here were naturally very concerned about the matter. Mr. Craig said, however, that he had been told that settlers themselves would have to accept the responsibility for all diseased cattle.

Surely it is extraordinary to give a man power to allow cattle affected by pleuro-pneumonia to leave that area, and to expect the unfortunate individual who happened to purchase the stock to stand the consequences of introducing the disease into his herd. As I have said, I accepted the statement of the chief officer that this regulation would not be enforced in any way that might prove harsh, but when we read the regulation as it is, it is not a fair thing.

The Premier: What you read is probably only a condensed report of what he said.

Mr. SEWARD: The report is taken from a Bunbury newspaper. Mr. McKenzie Clarke is a thoroughly competent man. I

am aware also that the department is severely handicapped by being understaffed and that the officers' services must be used to the best possible advantage. I assume that all precautions would be taken. The stock owners, of course, have spent enormous amounts of money in building up their herds.

The Minister for the North-West: Travelled cattle are never allowed to come from pleuro-infected stations.

Mr. SEWARD: But Regulation 44 provides—

Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding regulation the Chief Inspector of Stock may, subject to any condition which he may from time to time deem necessary to impose, grant written permission for the removal of cattle by land from the Kimberley Quarantine Area to any other part of the State.

That is a regulation which has just come into force. I did not raise objection to it, and it operates now. I mention that regulation merely to show the urgent necessity for making sure that regulations do not contain powers which are not needed or which cannot be used safely. Under Regulation 26—

All stock intended for exportation shall, prior to embarkation, be examined by an inspector, who may issue a certificate of health to the exporter, for which a fee shall be paid as prescribed in the Fourth Schedule. . . .

There again, it is only a few ports from which stock may be exported, just as there are only a few points through which cattle may be introduced into the State. The power given is too great to be granted to an inspector. An inspector here is simply a policeman, or anybody who may be appointed. Every person granted such powers should be a qualified veterinary surgeon. Regulation 27 provides that no person shall introduce any stock into Western Australia from any of the Australian States or from any part of the Commonwealth of Australia without the authority in writing of an inspector of stock, instead of this being reserved to the Chief Inspector of Stock. Regulation 75, referring to swine, provides—

When any person shall have in his possession swine which are diseased or infected with an infectious disease, or showing symptoms of any infectious disease, such person shall immediately give notice thereof to an inspector, and if such swine on examination by an inspector or other authorised person

show symptoms of disease they shall be destroyed on the premises where such diseased swine are inspected, and such premises shall be thoroughly disinfected by the owner or occupier thereof under the supervision and to the satisfaction of the inspector.

That is just the same thing again. Before any stock is destroyed, or action of any kind is taken, the matter should be referred to the Chief Veterinary Surgeon, who then would make an inspection and, if he found disease, would take the necessary action. But it is wrong to give these powers to an ordinary inspector, who may have no particular knowledge of stock, or of the diseases. That is utterly unfair to the stock owner.

My last objection is to Form 7 of the Third Schedule of regulations. The form requires that when an owner dips his sheep, the certificate must be signed before a Justice of the Peace. The form might easily be widened so as to include either a police officer or a commissioner for declarations. There is an objection held, I am told, to creating justices of the peace where courts do not sit; and that is quite right. But in many country districts it is difficult to get in touch with a justice of the peace. I think the form might be signed before a police officer, a postal official, or a commissioner for declarations. This would facilitate getting forms signed.

The Premier: Under the Act a commissioner of declarations can do what is desired. Would not a classified public servant suit?

Mr. SEWARD: Yes.

The Premier: That is provided.

Mr. SEWARD: I accept that assurance of the Premier, and shall not press my objection to the form.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, then, is not moving the disallowance of Form 7 of the Third Schedule of the Regulations?

Mr. SEWARD: No, Mr. Speaker. I move the motion subject to deletion of the reference to Form 7 of the Third Schedule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is amended accordingly.

On motion by the Minister for the North-West, debate adjourned.

MOTION—METROPOLITAN MILK ACT.*To Disallow Regulations.***MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER** (Subiaco)**[6.9]: 1 move—**

That Regulations 102-105 and the new Sixth Schedule under the Metropolitan Milk Act, 1932-1936, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 9th June, 1939, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 8th August, 1939, be and are hereby disallowed. I base my objections to the regulations referred to on three grounds; and so that I may more readily deal with the objections I shall enumerate them, and as far as possible deal with each of them separately, bearing in mind, of course, their relation to the subject matter. I have no axe to grind; I am not a producer nor a retailer, and not much of a consumer. Therefore I look at the question dispassionately. My first objection is from the producer's point of view. Although the producer will suffer least of all milk vendors concerned in this vexed question, it is obvious to me that the producer stands to lose in the immediate future and has nothing to gain by supporting the regulations if he takes a long view of the industry. My reason for this assertion is that if less whole milk is consumed but the same quantity produced, the producer can, and probably will, send the unsold whole milk to factories for conversion into cheese, butter, or tinned milk; or perhaps, when the Minister for Industrial Development has Western Australian factories in full swing, milk may go to cloth factories, as in Italy, or be used for the making of bath or kitchen utensils, as in Britain and on the Continent.

What we who support the producer must not lose sight of is the fact that at present—and we are dealing with the present—our Western Australian cheese and butter factories are few. Whilst they are in their infant stage, they are and for some time will be in competition with highly equipped factories in Eastern Australia, where tinned milk especially has reached a standard of quality hitherto undreamt of.

Member: No higher than in this State.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Perhaps the hon. member interjecting is not a great drinker of milk. I am not either; but still a considerable quantity of tinned milk is consumed in my house, and I absolutely know that at present Eastern States tinned milk is much superior in quality to anything obtainable in Western Australia. Producers must also realise that owing to industrial

and other conditions the Eastern States could compete—this is a point which must be realised also by hon. members—with Western Australia successfully even if factories were established here, population being the greatest factor when expensive plants are to be installed and an economic output maintained. The surplus of any product manufactured in the thickly populated East could always be dumped in the less populated West at prices with which the West could not compete; and owing to the Federal Constitution this State would not be able to protect its native industries. Last year—I have quoted these statistics once to-day, but I shall quote them again because they are pertinent to this discussion—we imported from Eastern Australia 1,229,915lbs. of condensed milk, for which we paid £60,000, and also imported 1,409,293lbs. of powdered milk, at a cost of £69,000. Since the new regulations came into force I made it my business to ask the keeper of every shop I visited whether his sales of Eastern States tinned milk had increased. Now, strange as it may seem, the increases have taken place in those areas where the population is not predominantly on lower-rung incomes. In some stores I have inquired the reason for that. Especially I have gone into the poorer districts and asked the shopkeepers whether they have not had a great increase in the sale of tinned milk since the regulations came into force. The invariable answer has been that the poorer people take a maximum of tinned milk always. In one small store quite near here I was informed that whereas one case of "Sunshine" tinned milk was sufficient the month before the regulations came into force, last month the store sold eight cases, upon which quantity there will be a further increase this month.

It may be argued that as the producer obtains a better price for whole milk than he does for butterfat, it pays him to support the retailer by selling whole milk rather than butterfat. Now, just as I have shown that increased sales of tinned milk have already taken place, so I shall show later, when dealing with retailers, that it is almost impossible for them to sell the same quantity of milk with one delivery per day as they sold with two deliveries.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I was saying that the producers would prefer to sell whole milk rather than butter fat, and will auto-

matically have their sales reduced, especially when higher temperatures prevail. If a certain amount of milk is left on the producer's hands through these reduced sales, he will no doubt send the milk to the cooling chamber; and perhaps create a glut, when prices of butter fat will fall, and the producer will suffer a loss. This State has spent and is still spending considerable sums of taxpayers' money in an attempt to build up the milk and allied industries in the South-West. Increases in the number of milking cows have made it possible to get continuous supplies of fresh milk to the city, and this naturally is a great advantage to the city dweller. But, however excellent butter, cheese and tinned milk may be, any regulations which curtail facilities for the sale of whole milk, or divert the supply from the consumer to the factory for use in secondary industry, are, in my opinion, a national calamity. I leave this question to country members, irrespective of party, to use their commonsense and protect the interests of the producers by increasing facilities for the sales of milk and the products of their electors, rather than curtail them. I ask members not to be hustled by the lobbying of those who are representing a small minority of the people into approving of regulations which are uneconomic and which, after a great deal of harm has been done, will probably be repealed.

Now I come to the interests of the small producer-retailer. The most serious effect of these regulations will be that the small producer-retailer will be the one person to be frozen out of the industry. He is the only member left who will supply a mother—whose child's life depends upon it—with clean, fresh milk, from one cow if necessary. He is the only type of vendor left who can supply a household with untreated fresh milk twice daily, should it be desired. He is in fact the one vendor who should be encouraged by the Milk Board at all costs to deliver milk twice a day. Instead of his being so encouraged, he is harassed. He is not liked by the producer, nor is he wanted by the retailer or the wholesaler. Yet he is the one man of importance to the people of this city. In order to keep his quota he has been forced in some cases to replace or replenish his stock with higher-grade milking cows. He has also been forced to buy another dairyman's round, on pain of being

delicensed. Again the noose is tightened round his neck by these new regulations, and more are in sight when we get zoning. It has frequently been said that only 5 per cent. of the milk delivered was delivered on the afternoon round. I challenge that statement. I do not believe it to be true. It might be true of some districts, but not of Perth as a whole. A little while ago a milk vendor named Birkbeck, I think, said that 30 per cent. of his deliveries was made on his afternoon round. Only the other day I spoke to a retailer-producer who told me that 40 per cent. of his milk was delivered in the afternoon, yet a month ago this man had an afternoon round almost equal to his morning round. I myself used to take exactly the same quantity in the afternoon as I took in the morning. The producer-retailer—the smaller man—is now obliged to milk his cows—so I have been told—at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and again at midnight. He then mixes the two milkings and delivers them from 2 o'clock in the morning onwards. In some instances, the smaller producer-retailers have dismissed the afternoon carter, so swelling the ranks of the unemployed.

Some of the producer-retailers told me that they did not get a chance to vote on the regulations. They were not invited to the meeting. Although they have admitted to me that a saving has been effected in their overhead charges, they said that that reduction was offset by the decreased sales in the afternoon. Since the regulations have come into force, many customers have not doubled their morning supply; they now take either the same amount in the morning as they took formerly, or a small extra quantity, stating that they now keep a supply of powdered milk which serves them for the evening, should they require it. Therefore it is reasonable to presume that a proportion of the milk which once was part of the afternoon delivery is now left upon this small trader's hands. What can he do with it? The board is anxious for him to take it to the wholesaler; because I firmly believe that the power behind these regulations is neither the producer nor the retailer, and it certainly is not the consumer. I believe it is the wholesaler, whose livelihood depends upon keeping milk cool for as many hours as possible. I do not know whether the wholesaler is paid by the hour or the day, but what can the small retailer do? He might take his surplus milk to the whole-

saler, who will keep it cool, so that it can be sold the following day to the poor, ignorant consumer as fresh milk.

The producer-retailer is a simple type of man, unversed in chicanery or dealings not quite honest. He knows that he is not allowed to give his surplus milk away. He is aware that it will cost him extra for transport to take it to a cheese factory. Cheese factories are few and far between, and may be distant. He knows he has only a certain quota, and that even if he takes the milk to a cooling plant he must obtain permission to secure more customers. So he becomes confused. He has no animals to feed the milk to. What does he do with it? He throws it away, down the drain. While every member of this Chamber is telling a story of starving country children and starving city children, vested interests—owing to such rotten regulations and legislation—are allowing food to be thrown down the drain. Here I might say that when regulations governing food commodities are contemplated, provision should first be made for dealing with a glut or a temporary surplus. When scores of people are in want and cannot buy necessary commodities, surely common sense dictates that it is stupid and inhuman to throw away that which would feed those people. Unless the producer-retailer takes his milk to a cooling plant—which, as I have said, might be far distant—it turns sour. Many people still prefer untreated milk, and many medical men say that untreated milk, if uncontaminated, is best. Owing to these regulations, we shall find that it will be unprocurable. The board has the right to dictate to a producer-retailer whether he shall put in a cooling plant or not.

There is evidence—I not only saw this in the daily Press, but have come into contact with people who know the man—that the board has prohibited a retailer from installing a cooling plant. There may be other such cases. The board's policy, members will know, is to protect the wholesaler who has already erected an expensive plant. It might be said that milk from cooling stations is quite as good as fresh milk. I myself have journeyed from England to Australia, and on board was a mother who had placed a five weeks' supply of milk in the refrigerator for her child. Certainly the milk was quite good if given to the child immediately it was taken out of the refrigerator. The point, however, is this: we do not consume milk

immediately it is taken out of the refrigerator. By the time we use it, it has been out of the refrigerator for some considerable time. In any case, in my opinion, the value to the community of the suburban producer-retailer is gone immediately he sends his milk to a cooling plant. He was valuable to us because he could supply fresh milk at a reasonable cost. Milk from a cooler is never the same as milk that is absolutely fresh. Furthermore, a cooling plant adds to the cost of the milk; it must do so.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

I have dealt mainly with the small producer-retailers, and I now wish to say a few words about the larger producer-retailers, some of whom are located near the city. Dairies have been established in the suburbs and many arguments have been advanced against the land near the city being utilised for this purpose. Doubtless the day will come when those dairies will pass away, but at present they are of unquestioned value to the community. The policy of some of the dairies—and this is probably where the theory of 5 per cent. comes in—has been, for some time, one delivery a day. If these dairies have established cooling plants, portion of the milk is anything from 10 to 12 hours old when delivered. This, of course is very much fresher than is the milk obtained from the country. Although some dairies have delivered only once a day, they have always had the right to deliver twice a day.

Mr. Cross: But the people do not want it.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: You believe anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: How does the hon. member know that?

Mr. Seward: He knows everything.

Mr. Cross: They do not want it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Those dairymen deliver once a day because they have installed cooling plants and because they have got the people accustomed to one delivery a day. Still, they have the right to deliver twice a day. If milk turns sour, if it boils over or is upset, people have a

right to get another delivery in the afternoon. That is the whole point. They have a right to get it and should be able to get it, but under the regulations that right is denied them.

Mr. Cross: Very few people exercise the right.

Several members interjected.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I wish members would not confuse payment or money with the regulations. It has nothing to do with them. If people want milk delivered in the afternoon, they have a right to it. I am not saying how much they should pay for the service. If they have sick children who need milk, or if there are invalids who need milk, surely people are entitled to have fresh milk in their homes. The board is forcing the dairymen to supply old milk when they are capable of supplying and are willing to supply fresh milk. Why should the law dictate when necessary supplies should be delivered, so long as the community is satisfied? Soon we shall be told not only what we shall eat and drink but also how much we shall have.

Mr. J. Hegney: It might be a good thing, too.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: These regulations are Hitleresque in their interference with the food we shall eat and the time at which we shall have it. If a beer board instead of a milk board had been concerned with such impossible proposals, the board would not have lasted two minutes.

Let me now deal with the retailer. Many letters have appeared in the Press referring to the long hours worked by traders in small retail businesses. As a politician, I would be a fool if I did not realise the position of those retailers. Their condition needs grave consideration. Members are aware that in the past I have supported any scheme to advance the interests of those traders, knowing how valuable they are to the community as middlemen. Unfortunately, the House has given away so much of its power that when questions arise it has not the power to act. The arguments set forth in the letters to the Press—mostly anonymous letters—simply confuse the issue, just as some members are doing. The issue is that deliveries of milk be curtailed to one a day and that such delivery be made within

certain hours. There is no mention in the regulations that this curtailment is necessary to enhance the profits of the retailer. Not being a sentimentalist where business is concerned, I prefer to have these matters dealt with separately, and we in this House should deal with them separately. We have no right to deal with the long hours worked by the retailer and confuse that issue with the delivery of milk morning and afternoon. I realise that no trade can exist without profits, but surely infants cannot live without adequate and wholesome food, and milk is the natural food for the infant. If the retailer must receive a greater margin of profit to enable him to carry on his business, obviously somebody must pay.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a lady in the city who cannot say anything in favour of milk.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am well aware of that. There are many cranks amongst all sections and classes of people, but I am not here to espouse the cause of any crank. I am here in the interests of the consumer and the people of the State generally.

Hon. P. Collier: Did you say quack?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: No, I said crank.

Mr. Cross: We get cranks here, too.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: But not on this side of the House.

Mr. Marshall: The member for Canning should not be too hard on himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: If the retailer must have a larger profit to enable him to carry on his business, someone must pay the increased price, or the overhead charges must be reduced. We know that the price of milk in the city is already too high, and that poor people cannot afford to buy the quantity they should have. How can a man with a wife and child to support on a guinea a week pay 3d. a pint for milk? Members should realise that a pint of milk would be sufficient only for the tea consumed at each of the three meals, and that to provide for the needs of a child alone one pint a day would be insufficient. We might ask how can the 28s. man or the 35s. man provide milk. He cannot provide milk for the children at 3d. a pint. Milk is a very expensive item in the household: it is too dear for many families to indulge in.

When the Commonwealth investigators declare that the people of Perth consume less milk than those of any other capital city in Australia, the statement is quite understandable if we realise how poor the people are. The incomes of many of them will not permit of large purchases of milk. An increased consumption means one of two things—lower cost or increased income. Increased profits to the retailer come in the same ways. I should prefer to see those profits come from increased consumption. That is the natural way; we cannot have it both ways. High costs mean high prices; high prices cause decreased consumption; decreased consumption means increased malnutrition; malnutrition leads to increased taxation, and so the vicious circle goes on. The quantity of milk consumed in the metropolitan-suburban area works out at about one-twentieth of a pint per head. That is not enough for the household cat.

Mr. Thorn: Not enough for a cup of tea.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: My protest against the regulations, and that of many of the local governing bodies, has nothing to do with the long hours worked by those in the trade. The protest is that the regulations deprive the people who want milk twice a day from having it delivered twice. Before the regulations were gazetted, they should have been submitted to the health authorities. They are the persons responsible for the health of the people. Here let me say that such an important board as the Metropolitan Milk Board should have as members a majority of medical men. The reasons given in the Press by the board—the board consists of two representatives of interested bodies and others—for the curtailment of hours was that the dairymen wished it. I have already said that some of the dairymen did not vote at the meeting convened to consider the matter. That statement might be challenged. Some of the dairymen have come to me and informed me that they were not invited to attend the meeting. I have their names and addresses. Further, the board contends that if the request for curtailed hours is not granted, an increase in the price of milk will ensue. Which is the greater evil—a non-curtailement of hours or an increased price? Has the board the right to decide these questions?

In Sydney there is one delivery of milk each day. Members will see by this morn-

ing's paper that the people of Sydney are now paying 9d. a bottle for milk. When one delivery a day was inaugurated, it was stated that the price of milk would be reduced. That was the excuse given for the curtailment. However, the price has not been reduced, but the price of bottled milk has been increased. Bulk milk is sold at 7d. a quart. In London, milk can be delivered five times a day, if required, and three times a day almost anywhere, but there the vendors have 8,000,000 people to cater for, whereas we have a comparatively few people and milk is cheaper there than it is here. In Melbourne the retailers, by agreement, arranged for a single delivery—it was not done by the board—but the hours of delivery there are not nearly as arbitrary as they are here. When the retailers in Melbourne curtailed the deliveries to one a day, as they had every right to do if they so desired, they also hinted at a reduction of price. When the Victorian board zoned milk distribution, it said the price of milk would be reduced. The chairman of the board assured me that the cost of milk had been reduced by 2d. a quart, but it is notable that the reduction was not passed on to the public. The price of milk to the public of Melbourne is the same to-day as it was before the one delivery a day was instituted. Who gets the profits? I do not blame the retailer. He has been forced to instal an elaborate plant to satisfy the bureaucracy, which must affect members of the community without benefiting either the retailer or the producer. The chairman of the local milk board agreed that restriction of the sale of an article led to decreased consumption, but he believed that a restriction was preferable to an increase in price. He would not say that if he had a few children whose life depended upon milk. Increased sales of milk should be, and I believe are, the object of the board. It is only an assumption that an increase in the price may have a greater effect in decreasing sales than the facilities offered for the sale of the article would have. Increased sales would mean increased profits, and that is the way to handle the business.

I will now give some information I have had from the Victorian Milk Board to show why and how impossible it is for the retailer to decrease the price of milk because of the costs and the money that goes into the business. I will also show the amount

of capital that has gone into some of the milk businesses since the establishment of a board in Victoria. Interference by a bureaucratic body must increase costs, and that, in turn must hit the community, and eventually the producer as well as the retailer. In Victoria the average cost of a one delivery cart business ranges from £487 to £1,665; in the case of a two delivery cart business from £1,385 to £2,100; in the case of a three cart delivery business from £1,370 to £6,000; and in the case of a seven cart delivery business from £5,800 to £11,700. Regarding other large dairy business houses that were investigated the capital expenditure varied from £12,000 to £50,000. It is estimated that approximately £433,946, nearly half a million, is invested in 44 businesses in the city in question. That is the latest information I have been able to obtain from Melbourne. A report was issued in 1937 and the Milk Board gave me a copy of it. We have seen the advertisement "Drink more milk." I do not suppose anyone has taken an extra glass of milk as a result of it, because it makes no appeal to the consumer. The local board employs a large staff and this absorbs a good deal of public money. I understand the board requires about £8,000 a year with which to conduct its activities. I do not know the cost of the Melbourne board, but I have ascertained that it has fewer members than has the board in Perth. In Melbourne the board consists of three persons. The staff is not as large as that of the Perth board, although in Melbourne the authority deals with a huge population and a tremendous volume of milk. Instead of our board agreeing to restrict the sale of milk, it should return to the retailers a proportion of the funds it has acquired. If that were done, the difficulty might be adjusted without any resultant hardship upon the consumer. The board in Perth deals only with a comparatively small quantity of milk, but costs approximately £8,000 a year. Its constitution is wrong. A woman should be elected to the board.

Mr. J. Hegney: What nonsense!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Let the hon. member say that to his wife. The constitution of the board is wrong.

Mr. J. Hegney: If women were put on the board the position would be worse.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: A woman knows the requirements of a child and of a household.

Mr. Cross: Do we not know those things?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It is essentially a woman's question.

Mr. J. Hegney: The Government can put two women on the board if it likes.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am convinced that economy would be effected if these matters were dealt with by women. In another place the regulations have been objected to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing what happens in another place.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I read in the paper that some dear old gentleman said that only fussy old ladies were objecting to the regulations.

Mr. Cross: He was right, too.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I say it is the fussy old gentlemen who are looking at the question from the pocket point of view instead of looking at the interests of the children. Women should be appointed to the board, and all regulations dealing with food should first pass the medical authorities, who would not be interested in the commercial side and place little value upon it. The three members of the Melbourne board are not interested either in the production or the retail side of the business; they are interested only in the welfare of the community as a whole, and that is their function.

Mr. Cross: They do not advocate two deliveries a day.

Mr. J. Hegney: Are there no women on that board?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: They have nice wives.

Mr. J. Hegney: We are not discussing wives.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I will give the House an idea of the difference between the conditions in Melbourne and in Perth, and hope to show why we cannot imitate the system that has been inaugurated in Victoria, that of one delivery a day. The Melbourne board consists of three members, including the chairman. Their salaries are higher than are paid to members of the local board, but all the members are thoroughly disinterested either in the production or distribution of the milk. The quota system does not

operate. The producers can sell any quantity of milk they like to the vendors, who in turn can buy on the same basis. Approximately 75 per cent. of the milk that goes to Melbourne is delivered either direct from the producers to the retailers or to the consumers. It does not go through the wholesale houses as it does in some instances here.

The zoning system in Melbourne has crushed the small retailer. The system tends towards a trade monopoly, so much so that the Government is dealing with the matter by means of new legislation. Very few hot days are experienced in Melbourne. For the most part the weather is dry and the temperatures are more suitable for the keeping of milk. The roads around Melbourne are so good that the producers with their motor vans can deliver the milk direct into the city. Furthermore, the milk comes from comparatively short distances. The consumption of milk in Perth is one-twentieth of a pint per head. I refer to the metropolitan-suburban area. In Melbourne the consumption exceeds half a pint per head. Notwithstanding the comparatively good conditions and the comparatively fresh milk that is delivered in Melbourne, Dr. Dale, the medical adviser for the City Council, advocates and gives out powdered Sunshine milk. He contends that it is the least contaminated form of milk, although he agreed when I interviewed him, that, if fresh uncontaminated milk was procurable, it was the best food to give children. Dr. Dale has worked in Perth and knows the conditions under which we exist. I asked whether he considered that one delivery a day in Perth would be in the best interests of the people. He said "Decidedly not, for every person would need a refrigerator."

I now wish to refer to local conditions. The milk is old, except in the case of that which is delivered by local dairymen. It may be anything from 24 to 48 hours old when delivered. If delivery is made during the night and a child requires food at 10 o'clock the next night or at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning the milk becomes older by practically 20 hours, thus making it anything from 60 to 70 hours old. It is unthinkable that we should be giving milk to children when it has been out of the refrigerator for another 20 hours after

delivery to the city. When milk has been taken out of the refrigerator for some hours it becomes unfit for babies. Our milk comes from long distances, chiefly by trains travelling at approximately the rate of a perambulator. It is mostly treated milk, to which many medical men object, and yet the price is the same as is the Melbourne milk. Under such conditions can it be wondered that there is malnutrition amongst the children? We are asking for it. These regulations cause the milk to become older by the time it is consumed, thus rendering it unsafe for infants. They tend to reduce the quantity of whole milk sold. They encourage the sale of Eastern States powdered milk, and have been designed only to financially help a few without consideration for the health of the people generally. The regulations are opposed to the interests of the many. Milk shops are prevented from receiving a second delivery. Members may say that people can always get their milk at a milk shop in the afternoon. How could a mother, with children around her, run to a milk shop for her supplies in the afternoon? Quite recently I have seen children crossing the road with jugs in their hands, after school hours, to get milk for their mothers. The regulations encourage school children to face the dangers of the traffic whilst fetching the afternoon supply of milk; they play upon the ignorance of the public, who for the most part were unaware that the milk was already old before the regulations were framed. The age of the milk renders it dangerous to the community, especially to those who have no means of keeping it in a wholesome state. For those reasons I move the disallowance of the regulations.

On motion by Mr. Cross, debate adjourned.

MOTION—HORSE RACING AND BETTING.

To Inquire by Select Committee.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [8.14]: I move—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the incidence, management and control of horse-racing in all its forms and into betting and other practices arising out

of and incidental thereto and report upon the present law thereon, the enforcement of such law and the advisability of any revision, amendment and/or codification thereof.

This in substance is identical with the motion I moved in the dying hours of the last parliament. Although that motion was defeated by a vote of the House I understand that certain members who voted against it were in accord with it, but considered that there was not time in which to deal with such a question. I am given to understand, however, that the motion will now be dealt with on its substantive merits, and that is why I am again bringing it forward. In Western Australia there are various forms of horseracing. Originally it was a sport, and people owned horses for the purpose of amusement. In 1915 a select committee was appointed by this House to inquire into horseracing. One of the findings returned by the committee was that the racing of horses for sport had become almost negligible and the owning and racing of animals had become a business. The select committee made certain recommendations, to which, unfortunately, effect has not been given. In this State we have a body known as the Western Australian Turf Club, which has as its charter a private Act passed by this Legislature. That body controls not only its own club but the proprietary clubs. One other form of control is by means of Treasury permits for the use of the totalisators. The W.A.T.C. is a voluntary body, the committee of which is elected by members of the club. Only those with blue blood in their veins can become members of the W.A.T.C., to say nothing of rising to be members of the committee. Unfortunately it has become a moribund coterie of aristocrats who have done some most extraordinary things. The first point which I wish to make regarding this governing body has relation to its constitution. I can remember when I first came to Perth that a battle was raging concerning the competition of the unregistered race clubs. Every Wednesday, meetings were conducted at Bicton and the s.s. Zephyr, which was then known as the "gun boat," because she took all the "guns" to the races, made the trip down the river for that purpose. I understand that in those days Bicton was really the capital of the Fremantle district.

Mr. Thorn: It was known as "Robbery Park."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: No, that term was applied to Kensington Park, which was in the electorate represented by the member for Canning (Mr. Cross). I recollect that in those days if a certain horse that was not intended to win happened to pass the post first, before the jockey could weigh in somebody used to rush across, seize the saddle and disappear in the bush. Of course the jockey could not weigh in, and the second horse would be awarded the race.

Mr. Tonkin: They do it more scientifically nowadays.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, they drop weights and so on. What strikes me as marvellous is how virtuous and righteous some members of the W.A.T.C. have become since their elevation to membership of that committee. Some of these who pose as plaster saints adopt an extraordinary attitude at times. If a jockey boy should pull his horse and be caught, those individuals sit in judgment upon him! How those people have forgotten the road by which they themselves progressed in the game! From my own knowledge some of them have been right through the racing game. They worked commissions on their horses, and now they sit in judgment! They forget how they have trod the intricate road of the racing game. It is marvellous how saintly they are now in their position of authority. Should a jockey be found out and an appeal be made to these persons to be lenient to the lad, how horrified they become at such a suggestion! They adopt the attitude that they are asked to condone the introduction of something that is dishonourable and wrong regarding the turf. Not only do I take exception to the autocratic methods by which the W.A.T.C. Committee deals with matters, but to the secretive procedure as well. In the racing game there are owners, trainers, and jockeys. Naturally the jockeys are at the bottom of the ladder. Everyone connected with racing, except members of the W.A.T.C. Committee, knows that instructions are given to jockeys not to win.

Hon. P. Collier: Surely not!

Mr. HUGHES: Everyone knows that, except, apparently, one hon. member and the W.A.T.C. Committee.

Hon. P. Collier: The punters do not know.

Mr. HUGHES: To make money on the turf is a hard business. Owners have to

conform to the rules of the game. Press-men publish tips each Saturday. In fact, each paper provides six winners for the races each week-end. The effect is that the owners have to pit their skill against these professional tipsters and have their horses handled as they require.

Hon. P. Collier: We also have a person on the Melbourne "Argus" who sends tips across.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, the tips come rolling in from everywhere. In addition to the jockeys, trainers and owners, there are the bookmakers who earn their living—quite illegally—by betting at the races. Those men are up to all the tricks of the trade. Again, the W.A.T.C. Committee has adopted an extraordinary procedure. Periodically the committee has the right to license jockeys, bookmakers, bookmakers' clerks, trainers and owners. When the time arrives for the renewal of licenses, a man may find that his license is not to be renewed. He goes to the W.A.T.C. office to make some inquiries, and he is told very nicely, "Well, as far as we know, you have done nothing, but we do not think you are an asset to the turf." In such circumstances a man finds that his livelihood is immediately cut off. I believe that any man against whom an accusation is lodged, should have the allegation made to his face and be given an opportunity to combat it.

Mr. Marshall: But no direct accusation is made.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. The license is simply not granted, and the man concerned can get no reason for it. All he knows is that he has been wiped out. The officials say, "He knows why he is being wiped out." Some of these people have done so much that it is impossible to know just what action has been the cause of their being disqualified. I do not say that every time a license is not renewed, the action taken is not without good cause. Frequently there is good cause for the non-renewal of a man's license, but the great danger is that the individual affected is not acquainted with the ground upon which action has been taken against him. He has no opportunity to combat what, in many instances, amounts merely to the repetition of a statement made by a vindictive person who is disappointed because of something that has happened on the turf. In such circumstances, grave injustice can be done to people. Within

my own experience I know of various happenings. I do not believe I was told a lie when a jockey said, "Well, I have pulled horses because I was instructed to do so. In the last six months they could have rubbed me out three or four times. I can assure you that when they did rub me out I was on a trier." Of course, jockeys "pull" their horses because they are told to do so, and they would not get mounts if they did not obey instructions.

Hon. P. Collier: Instructed by the owner or the bookmaker.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. The unfortunate part of it is that the livelihood of these people is taken away from them when their license is not renewed, and yet no reason is given for the action taken against them, nor are they even allowed to state their case in reply. Naturally such a procedure lends itself to unfairness, and enables those vindictively inclined to take their revenge. Although racing is described as the sport of kings, not all the people in racing are kings. Frequently an owner squeals when his horse is beaten, and blames the jockey and the trainer. Often no blame is rightly attachable to either the jockey or the trainer. I know of one instance where a jockey said to the owner, "This horse is a squib and won't win. Put someone else on him and see if he can win on him." The owner replied, "No, he is all right." The horse did not win, but the boy was disqualified. Subsequently the horse was proved to be a squib. I am satisfied that the boy on that occasion did not "pull" the horse.

An unfortunate aspect is that people can go along to members of the committee, allege that somebody "pulled" a horse, and action is taken accordingly. The accusers do not have to face the person against whom they make the allegation, nor do they have to produce evidence. I cannot understand why the W.A.T.C. should be afraid to say to a man against whom action is taken, "We are not giving you your license again because you have done something contrary to our regulations." If that were done, the man concerned would have an opportunity to answer the allegations made against him. Moreover, considerations of fair play and reasonableness would be met if the club's inquiries were open to the light of day. The public and representatives of the Press should be allowed to attend the hearings. If a man is charged in the Police Court with

having used insulting language, he is liable to a fine of £2. The law provides that a charge must be laid against him and the hearing must be in open court. The defendant has the right to engage someone to represent him, and if he is convicted he is liable merely to a fine of £2. On the other hand, if a man associated with racing has to face such a charge, his license may not be renewed, or he may be disqualified. His fate then is not a matter of a fine of £2 but the equivalent to the loss of hundreds of pounds. Despite the risk of such a severe penalty, the man has no opportunity to ascertain the nature of the charge laid against him; he is not accorded an open trial, nor is he permitted to engage someone to represent him. I ask members to consider the position of a jockey who is summoned to appear before the W.A.T.C. Committee. What chance has the average lad of stating and maintaining his case before the stewards or the members of the committee of the W.A.T.C.? Frequently the lads are not able to do so, and in consequence much injustice is wrought. The answer may be—I know what it is—that this procedure has been adopted in Victoria, England and elsewhere and that it would be difficult for the W.A.T.C. to prove the charge laid against the individual concerned. I agree it would be difficult for the club to prove an allegation made against a person. Often the police have difficulty in proving allegations against criminals. We do not, however, say that because of that men accused should not be given a fair trial. What we do say is, "Better that a hundred guilty men should go free than that one innocent man should be convicted." Why should this private institution have the right to say, "We are going to try somebody and condemn him without giving him a chance to defend himself"?

Mr. Marshall: Where do they get that power?

Mr. HUGHES: Under the Western Australian Turf Club Act power is given to make regulations governing the rules of racing, and the committee has made some regulations which, in my opinion, it had no authority to make.

Mr. Marshall: Do the rules or regulations come before this House in the same way as other by-laws do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. Hegney: They are laid on the committee's own table.

Mr. Marshall: That is not bad.

Mr. Thorn: So long as they lie on the table, that is the main thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for East Perth may proceed.

Mr. HUGHES: Another great difficulty about this body is that members who sit in a judicial capacity on other people own racehorses themselves, and are frequently in the position of being concerned in some of the transactions involved. There was a celebrated case in which a jockey boy and a trainer were disqualified on the eve of a Christmas meeting. The horse was owned by someone in an influential position on the committee.

Mr. Rodoreda: The chairman, was it not?

Mr. HUGHES: Under the rules of the organisation, unless an injunction were granted, the owner's horses would not be allowed to run. I think it was proper that an injunction should have been granted, because an appeal was pending against the decision of the stewards, and had that decision been reversed on appeal, and the trainer and the horses excluded from the Christmas meeting, a grave injustice would have been done. So I quite agree that the granting of an injunction was a proper procedure. Strangely enough, however, the trainer obtained an injunction and the jockey boy did not.

Hon. P. Collier: So it meant that the horses could race, but the jockey could not ride!

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. I think the Turf Club should have said, "We intend to grant an injunction, but it will apply to both parties. We are going to allow the boy to ride for the Christmas meeting, just as we propose to allow the horses to run, and if the appeal fails they will suffer whatever penalty they deserve." But this was a shocking case of discrimination. Turning from the Turf Club to the proprietary clubs, although the latter are called clubs, they have no members; they are not registered under the Associations Incorporation Act or under the Companies Act. No one has ever succeeded in discovering who are the members of the Belmont Racing Club, the Canning Park

Racing Club, or the Goodwood Racing Club, for the simple reason that there are no members.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are proprietary clubs, are they not?

Mr. HUGHES: They are one-man clubs. There is this to be said for the Western Australian Turf Club: the members are not running it as a business. They are not conducting it for private profit. No matter how much money the Turf Club makes, no profit accrues to the members. All the profits are used to effect improvements to the club's course. To that extent it is a quasi-sport, which is as it should be. Nobody should be allowed to have a monopoly of racing for his own private advantage, but the proprietary clubs are run for private profit. The four people who own the proprietary clubs take all the profits. If they indulged only in racing and did not associate the sport with gambling and betting, no very great harm would be done. But through their association with the Turf Club they have the right to use the totalisator, and they have assumed the right to have betting on their own courses. To bet is not unlawful. What is unlawful is the conducting of a common gaming house, and keeping a place that people frequent for the purpose of betting. The moment the owners of these proprietary race clubs and the Western Australian Turf Club set up bookmakers on the courses, they set up a common gaming house, and thus violate the law. But although Parliament has laid down that common gaming houses are against the law, someone in authority has taken it upon himself to suspend the law and to say that policemen shall not interfere with a common gaming house run either by the Turf Club or by an owner of a proprietary club. As a matter of fact, I have been to one of these common gaming houses when a race meeting has been in progress, and have seen three or four policemen in attendance.

Mr. J. Hegney: Having a bet?

Mr. HUGHES: They have been there not to arrest anybody for conducting a common gaming house but to assist the proprietor to maintain order amongst his patrons, to direct traffic, and to ensure that the proprietor's law-breaking proceeds in a perfectly orderly manner. So that we have an officer of the law engaged in assisting a lawbreaker to carry on his illegal business. Consequently,

the law is reduced to a farce. Whatever the law is, it should be applied to everybody without fear or favour.

Mr. Marshall: That is right.

Mr. HUGHES: But although I say that, I believe the law should be tempered with mercy, lest it be brought to our own door. The moment one person is allowed to break the law, another person who is prosecuted for doing the same thing is victimised, because he has been singled out for discrimination. Such practices bring the law into disrepute. We should say whether or not we intend to have betting on racehorses. If we decide against betting on racehorses, the law should be enforced. There are 80 members of Parliament in this State, and I believe all of them are in favour of the abolition of proprietary race clubs. Why should three or four individuals in the State have acquired the right to run racing clubs and associate with an illegal business, and have the assistance of the police to carry on that business; whereas if another citizen were to hold a foot-running meeting at Subiaco and allow betting at such races, immediately he would be prosecuted? Why should those individuals have that privilege? I think the Turf Club is responsible for this condition of affairs, because it could say to those people to-morrow, "We are not going to give you any dates." The Turf Club allots eight dates per annum to each club, and reserves the balance for itself. It could say to those clubs to-morrow, "We are not going to give you any dates because you are running your clubs for private profit." That would put an end to proprietary club racing. I do not consider racing is a sport, any more than acting is a sport. Racing is an industry that might be classified under the heading of amusements. If people are to have races, there must be horses, and the horses must be trained by experts. If horseracing is performing a public service as an amusement industry, it is entitled to proper protection against unfair competition, and should be governed by legislation to ensure its being conducted properly. Some people prefer to go to pictures; others choose to go to races. To my mind those are two branches of amusement. The only difference is that pictures are cheaper. The race clubs complain a good deal about the competition to which they have been subjected, but what have they done to popularise racing or bring it within

the reach of the man in the street? I do not think the Turf Club and the proprietary clubs have shown very commendable enterprise or progress in respect to the development of their own industry. They could do a lot more to popularise this sport. Associated with racing is betting. As I said previously, there is nothing illegal about betting, and I do not consider there is anything immoral in it. One man has 10s. and likes to give it to a picture-theatre proprietor for the purpose of viewing pictures. He is merely spending portion of his income on an amusement. If another man has 10s. and likes to give it to a bookmaker for the purpose of watching a race, he too is merely spending his money on amusement. I do not think there is much prospect of any return for the expenditure in either transaction.

Mr. J. Hegney: Do you think the race-goer is amused?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly. To watch a horse-race is good sport.

Hon. P. Collier: If he gives the money to a man in the shop, what amusement does he derive?

Mr. HUGHES: That comes later. There is a certain amusement in listening to a chap enlarging upon a horse-race. I think the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) will agree that the finishes are better over a wireless than they are on the course.

Mr. Marshall: I will say they are!

Mr. HUGHES: And closer, too.

Hon. P. Collier: It is thrilling over the air.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think anybody will make money by backing horses either on the course or off the course.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: Amongst my acquaintances I know only one man who can honestly say that over 25 years he has made a profit from backing horses and he is an expert who does nothing but study form.

Mr. Raphael: Give us his name so that we can get in touch with him.

Mr. HUGHES: There would be no sense in giving the hon. member winners, because he would go away and back his own fancy, and lose his money.

Mr. Raphael: You are pretty right there, too.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course, the odds are too great against the punter.

Mr. Wilson: No fear; too little.

Mr. HUGHES: If a man spends that portion of his income which he can devote to amusement, and loses it on a race, and does not go beyond that, no grave harm is done, but we are aware that when a man has the idea he can make money out of horse-racing there is a danger of his failing to keep his investments within his means. There is a very strong urge for the man to go beyond his means. A number of people go to racecourses and there has been an intense campaign to popularise racing. The newspapers do a good deal in this direction. When I was in South Australia recently the Premier of that State gave a very fine reply on the subject of the betting business. The leading daily newspaper contained a very solid leading article against the evils of starting-price betting, but when you turned over that page there were many columns of information about horses, their form and prices. So we found three-quarters of a column of virtue on one side of the newspaper and many columns devoted to vice on the other. If members read our own newspapers, they will find there an intense propaganda conveying to the people information about racing, the prices and the form of horses. And, as I have said, every week there are published the anticipations of the technical experts who prophesy what is going to win. In addition to the newspapers, we now have an intensive campaign over the air. We cannot turn on the wireless without listening to an expert giving the latest information and all the details about racing. This is all propaganda to encourage people to indulge in betting, and of course it is producing the natural result, an increase in gambling.

Hon. P. Collier: The wireless information is carried into the homes where the children hear it. The National station should be ashamed of itself.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and with the wireless a person is in the position that frequently he is obliged to listen to racing news whether he likes it or not. One cannot be jumping up continually to turn the wireless on and off because someone has decided to deliver a speech or a dissertation on horses. So one has to listen to matter of that description whether he likes it or not. The wireless is a much more powerful propaganda instrument than even the Press, because in the Press one can make some

effort to read what is contained in its columns. With the wireless, however—

Hon. P. Collier: And the station switches off a high-class musical programme to give you the description of a race.

Mr. HUGHES: So we find that the propaganda is carried right into the homes. What can we expect but an increase in betting and gambling? One of the matters that has been brought forcibly home to us in our daily activities is the way in which foreigners come here and establish themselves, and before we know where we are, we learn that they are in a substantial way. Those people are out-distancing our own at every turn. They come here and in the course of a year or two they are occupying substantial positions. Our own people, or many of them, are over-doing the betting business. They have no time to think about their own material welfare, or even public affairs or matters of State importance; no, they are too busy keeping up to date with the form of horses, and the latest information that may lead them to pick a winner on Saturday. I might here give an illustration. During my last election campaign I made what some people thought was a very rash bet. I offered to bet £50 that no bookmaker could pick one winner on each of 10 consecutive Saturdays. That bet was not taken up and it is still open. Races take place every Saturday, and oftener sometimes, and all that those who fancied themselves as successful tipsters had to do was to pick one winner on 10 consecutive Saturdays to earn £50 from me. They would have had nothing else to do in life except to study form.

Hon. P. Collier: That would involve 10 minutes' work covering 60 races on the 10 Saturdays.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and I could not get anyone to take up the bet. There are many people who are experts at racing and have nothing else to do, except to acquire the latest information about horses. Frequently, these people have jockeys and trainers in the bag and so they know what is tied up, and consequently what is not likely to win. So with everything in their favour not one of those people was game enough to back his judgment for a paltry £50, an amount that, to them, was equivalent to a threepenny bit to me. So I ask again what chance has an ordinary punter with those experts who

are not even game to take up a bet of the kind that I offered to make? After I made that offer, everywhere I went someone asked me whether it had been taken up. There were some general discussions at the meetings as to whether a person could or could not pick one winner on each of ten consecutive Saturdays. Just as in the case of the Italian Government's war debt, nobody was interested. I have been told by a prominent Perth bookmaker that mine was not a sporting offer because I was sitting on velvet. He said that there was not one chance of anyone successfully backing a winner on ten consecutive days. And the man who told me that has spent a lot of time on the turf. His concluding words were, "I would not take it on." So, I repeat, what chance has the average citizen of picking winners?

Hon. P. Collier: No chance at all. They are all mugs.

Mr. HUGHES: I have been trying to convince the people of that. When I was young, I was told that there were no prospects of showing a profit out of racing; but I was obstinate and I had to find out for myself. If a person thinks he is going to make money by going to the races or by backing horses in starting-price shops, he is making a grievous mistake. If a person goes to the races with the fixed idea that he will not make money, and treats it as an amusement and keeps his losses within his capacity, he is not doing any great harm; he is merely spending some amusement money in a way that suits him. Under such conditions no one will say to him, "You shall not have your amusement in the way you desire." If a man wants to spend his amusement money on racing, we should let him do so; we should let each one as far as possible have liberty of choice in that direction, at any rate to the extent his pocket will permit.

As a result of the intensive campaign against betting, we have had the establishment of betting off the course—known as starting-price betting. In the 1915 report that I have, there is a recommendation that something should be done to suppress street betting. The shopkeepers who are prosecuted, in my opinion, have an unanswerable case to the extent that they are only breaking the law in the same way

as the race clubs are doing; they are breaking it by keeping common gaming houses, and when they are prosecuted they are singled out for a discriminatory enforcement of the law. These people can point to the fact that on one side of the river a few can conduct a common gaming house and that that few will be prosecuted, while those who conduct similar operations on the other side will not be prosecuted. They have a just cause for complaint.

Mr. Raphael: And one is fined £75 and the other £1.

Mr. HUGHES: Not only that, but the law is brought into disrepute, and it has corrupted the administration of justice in this State. We have this farce: warrants are issued for the raiding of certain premises alleged to be common gaming houses, and immediately out of the Police Department information is conveyed to the people who are going to be raided, so that they can be prepared. It will be seen that there is complete collaboration between those who are enforcing the law and the law breakers. Of course the information is paid for; secret information is not handed out for nothing. No one would be so unsophisticated as to believe that. Then we have the spectacle that the officers of the Police Department go along daily and arrest men for committing a crime which they know the men have not committed. The magistrate sits on the bench to enforce the law and fines the man. He, too, knows that the person before him is not guilty of the charge to which he has pleaded guilty. It has its effect. We have the complaint amongst starting-price bookmakers that they are squeezed at both ends; they have to pay for the information and they have to give tips on the one hand and pay the fines on the other, and there is great discrimination in the enforcement of the law. In my electorate four shopkeepers were prosecuted and charged with keeping common gaming houses for which the penalty is six months' imprisonment or a fine of £200. Men are also prosecuted for betting in the street and the maximum penalty for that offence is £20. I said to the Commissioner of Police, "Why don't you treat them all alike; if you are going to prosecute them for betting in the street, let them all be on the same footing, so that one cannot feel that he is being singled out for special treatment." Of course the

Police Department knows who run the betting shops. I do not think that in every case the department knows the real owner. It would be a revelation to the Western Australian people to learn the names of the owners of some of these shops. So we have now the spectacle of a man being fined £100 for conducting a common betting house in Perth, and of another man being fined £10 for doing the same thing at Fremantle. From whatever angle one views the business, it has become a travesty of the law and a travesty of justice. And it is destroying the morale of the police force. I would like some of the betting squad to be put on oath and given freedom of speech to tell what they know. They could supply the House with some highly useful information. We should learn why it is that one lawbreaker goes scot free while his fellow lawbreaker over the road is penalised. In relation to a recent case in Perth I may mention that there were two betting shops within 50 yards of one another. One shop was raided, the police going past the first shop to raid the second, whose tenant was mulcted to the extent of £100 for doing what his neighbour 50 yards away did with impunity.

I wonder whether there is not a scheme now afoot to use the law for the purpose of eliminating small men from the business and creating a monopoly for three or four big men. Things are coming to a pretty pass when our laws are administered in that fashion. For my part, I have nothing against starting price bookmakers. I hold that when they conducted an intensive campaign before the last general election to get their shops licensed, they were doing nothing wrong. They wanted certain legislation to benefit themselves, and in order to get that legislation they flooded members of Parliament and other people with propaganda giving reasons in support of that desire. This, according to my views, they were perfectly entitled to do. They went even further, offering to pay members' expenses if they could rely on getting the votes of those members.

The Premier: No, no!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

The Premier: No, no!

Mr. HUGHES: Let us have an inquiry to find out.

The Premier: That is always your cry. Making suggestions you cannot prove is an old game of yours.

Mr. HUGHES: Let us find out where the fund to which the bookmakers contributed went.

Mr. Withers: Perhaps it went in paying fines.

Mr. HUGHES: Not a penny of it went in the payment of fines.

The Premier: Can you name one member who got an offer of that description?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

The Premier: Well, let us have it.

Mr. HUGHES: No; not at the present stage.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Did the member accept the offer? That is the main thing.

Mr. HUGHES: No.

Mr. Wilson: Who was it?

Mr. HUGHES: In making propaganda the bookmakers did what they had a right to do.

The Premier: Also in offering bribes to members?

Mr. HUGHES: They offered to pay members' expenses.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Election expenses, you mean.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Other organisations are doing the same thing every day. As a matter of fact, the bookmakers' is not the only organisation that subscribes to the expenses of members of Parliament, either.

Mr. Withers: Tell us who the members are.

Mr. HUGHES: I wonder whether, after all, that is a crime. If an organisation feels that a candidate shares its views and favours the legislation it desires, then, even if its judgment is a little prejudiced by personal interest, is there anything wrong in its spending money to secure the return of such a candidate? Has not that been going on from time immemorial? One of the farces about our electoral system is the £100 limitation put on members.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes. I refused to send in my return, just to show that the regulation is a farce.

Mr. Sampson: Others were not afraid to send in returns.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not refuse to send in my return; but I failed to furnish it in time, and I got a threatening letter as to what would happen to me.

Hon. P. Collier: So did I.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are getting away from the subject.

Mr. HUGHES: If I had known that the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) was leading the van, I would have been only too happy to follow him.

Hon. P. Collier: I was alone, apparently.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: Naturally, the vested interest created is valuable. The right to conduct starting price betting shops must be a valuable right, or the fines that have been paid could not have been paid. If the big men in the business can get the small men eliminated and a monopoly concentrated in their own hands, that will be a tremendous thing of course. I do not think betting shops are needed so that persons who cannot go to the course may have a bet. The starting price punter is determined to bet on the races. In other words, he is determined to give away a certain amount of money each week. If we cannot stop him from giving his money away, we should provide means by which he can contribute it to some worthy cause. I believe the State could introduce a system of totalisators whereby the starting price bettor would be able to give his money away just as now, but the profits would accrue to the State and be put to good use. I venture to say that people who frequent betting shops would be happy to subscribe a quarter of a million annually to the State through properly conducted totalisators. They would raise no objection whatever to the introduction of that system, because it would be a merely indirect form of taxation, and something easily conducted and giving the same service as bettors get now, while the profits would come to the State. Totalisators would not conduct wireless propaganda, nor employ an expert to tell the people what is going to win.

Much conflict of opinion exists, as well as much conflict of interest, in relation to racing, its control, and the betting associated with it. I would not care to be too dogmatic about what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. To enable a sound judgment to be formed on those matters a great deal of information would have to be collected, partly from people who have private interests to conserve, axes to grind. Those in control of racing missed their opportunity while the other people were putting out their propaganda. They should have put forward their case by circularising members of Parliament with information in

support of the views held by the controlling bodies. That is a proper and right course to pursue when the subject is coming before Parliament. The sensible thing is to put up to members of Parliament information supporting one's case, so that legislators may have full information upon which to form a judgment. I submit that racing and matters associated with it—the intense publicity campaigns, the intense wireless campaigns, and the ramifications of betting—are long overdue for a comprehensive overhaul. Legislation dealing with racing, betting and associated features should be re-examined. Exhaustive inquiry should be made with a view to garnering all the information available and giving everyone who has an interest the opportunity to present his case in circumstances where it can be combated by opposing interests, the evidence thus being tested.

I repeat, an inquiry is long overdue. A select committee of this House would do valuable work, and would gather much helpful information. It may be said that the inquiry should be by a Royal Commission instead of by a select committee. For my part, so long as the job is done, I care not by what means it is done. In my opinion there is not great need for a Royal Commission in this case, because nobody is being hurt and nobody's personal interests are at stake. The inquiry would be one of an abstract, impersonal nature, the object being to gather information for the use of members of this Chamber. The inquiry could well be undertaken by a select committee of the House. Accordingly I move the motion standing in my name.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.13 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 31st August, 1939.

Address-in-reply, eleventh day—conclusion	PAOB
Adjournment, special	458
	478

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eleventh Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [4.32]: The seventeenth Parliament opens in an international atmosphere of tense suspense and anxiety. The allegedly civilised nations of the world are standing to arms, and may be engulfed at any moment in a terrible struggle which may permanently disable, and perhaps destroy, every nation participating in it. The present frightful position has been preceded by an unprecedented campaign of hideous cruelty and persecution against thousands of innocent men, women and children. The British nation stands solidly behind its leaders, and all thoughtful people will fervently pray that the statesmen of the democracies will guide the nations away from the threatened international catastrophe.

The Commonwealth has suffered a severe loss through the passing of the late Prime Minister, Mr. Lyons, who, through a lifetime of service to his native State and to the Commonwealth, built up a sound reputation for honesty and integrity of purpose. The sudden passing of the late Premier of Tasmania, Mr. Ogilvie, is a very severe blow to that State and to the Commonwealth. In this State the sudden death of Miss May Holman came as a severe shock to every section of the people. Miss Holman worked unceasingly in many public activities in this State. She was a champion of the underdog, and devoted her life to the social advancement of women and children. As a woman member of Parliament, she set a very high standard of efficiency, which will be very difficult for other women to emulate.

Members' criticism of the Government's financial administration has followed along