

Government who always contend that payment should be by results! And the Bill is supported by men who are always standing for piece work, for contract work, for payment by result. There are to be no more contracts between the employer and the employee. In future the diver is to get the same payment, whether he raises one ton or 10 tons of shell. It is a direct incentive to the men to go slow, and entirely contrary to the system recognised in the industry in which the Colonial Secretary is privately engaged.

The Colonial Secretary: No, that only obtains in the newspaper offices. Will you let me explain?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Certainly, I shall be glad to hear it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause aims at the exercise of greater control over the men engaged in the industry. It is intended to prohibit the payment of commission on pearls fished, but not on pearl shell. I move an amendment—

That after "tender" in line 2 of Sub-clause 2A the words "or pearl fisher other than the person authorised by the licensing officer to open shell," be inserted.

It is competent for the shell opener to be paid a bonus, but it is not competent to pay any bonus to the diver or the diver's tender.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I suggest that progress be reported to enable us to consider the amendment.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.51 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 1st November, 1922.*

	PAGE
Standing Orders Amendment, report of Committee	1298
Return: State Children's Court, Education cases	1298
Bills: Attorney General (Vacancy in Office), 3a....	1300
Married Women's Protection, 3a. ....	1300
Administration Act Amendment, report	1300
Licensing Act Amendment, 2a. ....	1300
Dairy Industry, 2a. ....	1306
Closer Settlement, 1a. ....	1317
Pensioners (Rates exemption), 2a. ....	1317
Motion: Machinery Inspection Regulations	1318

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

## STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.33]: I am instructed by the Standing Orders Committee to report as follows:—

The committee held a meeting to-day to consider the resolution passed at yesterday's sitting and decided to recommend that a new Standing Order be adopted by the House as follows:—"Suggested new Standing Order 186a. Notices of amendments to a Bill when in Committee will not be receivable at the Table until a Bill has been read a second time. In special cases, however, with the authority of the President, they may be printed as an addendum to the Notice Paper before the second reading debate is concluded."

I move—

That the consideration of the report be made an order of the day for to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

## RETURN—STATE CHILDREN'S COURT.

*Education cases.*

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.35]: I move—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(a) the number of education cases brought before the Perth Children's Court from January, 1922, to date; (b) the number of convictions, together with the penalties imposed; (c) the number of cases dismissed, and the reasons therefor; (d) any special facts connected with any of such cases.

I have been asked to move for this return for the purpose of getting facts, mainly on account of a statement which the Minister for Education made to a body of school teachers recently. Within the last week or two, a lady member of a parents' association made a statement to the effect that the Children's Court had dealt harshly with poor parents who failed to send their children to school. She cited a case and, on investigation, it has been proved that there was absolutely no foundation for the statement made. In the case quoted, no fine at all was inflicted; yet she condemned the court for acting harshly and imposing a heavy penalty. No notice would have been taken of that had it not been that later on a deputation of school teachers waited upon the Minister who, in his reply, made a statement that he agreed with the teachers and disagreed with the action of the Children's Court. A Press report of the teachers' interview with the Minister stated:—

The first question dealt with the problem of irregular school attendance and the attitude of the Children's Court bench towards parents brought before it for breaches of the compulsory clauses of the Education Act. The depu-

tation sought the amendment of the Act to provide for a minimum penalty of £1 for a first offence. Several instances were cited in which the Children's Court bench had ordered the convicted parent to pay only nominal costs, even though the offender had been convicted on similar charges many times previously.

As a matter of fact, out of 44 cases this year, only two were for second offences.

It was contended that the departmental officers were discouraged by this attitude of the Court, and that parents found it to their advantage, financially, to keep children at home to work, and pay the "ridiculous" penalties imposed by the Bench. Speakers emphasised that teachers were obliged to give to children who were irregular attendants energy and time which had to be taken from what was due to the remainder of the class, which was therefore detrimentally affected. Mr. Colebatch said that the Children's Court took a view of these things with which he did not agree. It took the attitude that in certain cases the parents could not afford, without assistance from the Charities Department, to send their children to school.

It will be found when we get this return that these statements are altogether without foundation. Of the 44 cases arising out of all the thousands of children who go to school, only two involved second offences. One of the parents kept his child at home for the purpose of profit for which offence he was fined the maximum penalty of £1. In the other case there was some excuse and the parent was fined 10s. In other cases fines of 5s. were imposed, representing the maximum penalty allowed by the Act for a first offence. It is a curious thing that a great majority of the cases brought up by the truant officers are in regard to children of the poorest of the poor, and yet the teachers want this heavy penalty imposed. Some women have to go out to work two or three afternoons a week. Sometimes there is a child sick in the home and another child is needed to look after it while the mother is at work. Is it expected that the bench hearing these facts will impose heavy penalties? Another class of case which comes before us is where children are suffering from ailments such as whooping cough. It would be criminal for the mother to send such children to school. The truant officers, however, bring these parents up. They say "It is true you have sickness in the home, but if you had gone to the teacher, you would have got exemption." These people do not know the rules and regulations and they do what any ordinary person would do, namely, keep their children home, which in such cases is the proper thing to do.

Hon. J. Duffell: Do not they furnish a certificate?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In some cases it has been suggested that they should furnish a certificate, but fancy asking poor people to pay 10s. 6d. for a doctor's certificate or people who are receiving 27s. a week from the Charities Department to pay a fine of £1!

The bench would be wanting in their duty and would be unfit for the position if they acceded to these requests. The principle which guides the bench—and I maintain it is the proper principle—is that where it is a first offence and there is a reasonable excuse—perhaps the parent does not understand the regulations—the regulations are explained and a nominal penalty only is imposed. The fact that there have been only two second offences this year shows that the warnings issued by the bench have proved effective. Where people keep their children home improperly and without reasonable excuse, the law should be and is enforced. Members of the court have asked me to move for this return in order to show how many people have been fined, how much they were fined, and what excuses were offered; and when the return is forthcoming, I am satisfied it will show that the court, instead of doing what they ought not to have done, have exercised a very reasonable discretion.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.45]: I have no objection whatever to the motion. I am very sorry if anything that I have said should have hurt the susceptibilities of the members of the Children's Court. I think I have good reason for saying that no one has been a more ardent supporter of that court, or a greater admirer of its work, than myself; but I take it that it is up to me, if on certain subjects I hold different opinions from members of the court, to say so. I have the opinion that it is very questionable whether these cases are wisely referred to the Children's Court. They are referred to that court, but to my mind it is extremely doubtful whether they are cases which should come before the Children's Court at all. The offences are offences committed by adults, and in my opinion it is a mistake not to compel the parents to answer for their offences before the ordinary courts. In only one case out of the 44 has the maximum fine of £1 been imposed, and that was on a sixth conviction of the offender. He had been convicted five times previously.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is the largest number of convictions you can find.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: But this offender was fined six times altogether. If an offender of that kind had come before an ordinary court, he would have reached the maximum fine probably on the second or third conviction. In another case an offender on his fourth conviction got up to a fine of 10s. When it came to a fifth conviction, he was let off with a caution, the excuse being that the father was out of work. I do not think excuses of that kind should be accepted for not sending children to school. If the circumstances of the family are such that State aid is required, we have State organisations which give it. Of these 44 cases, 41 resulted in convictions being recorded. I do not think there was one case in which the court was of the opinion that the charge should not have been brought. The court

agreed that these 44 cases were properly before it, and as a matter of fact the court convicted in 41 of them. In the other three cases special reasons were alleged, which I have no doubt were quite all right, but which in no way reflected upon the truant officers for bringing the cases. Those cases were adjourned on payment of costs, to give the parents an opportunity of seeing whether they could not manage their children better. Another case, which was adjourned without payment of costs, was that of a widow who had come from the Eastern States fairly recently and had not sent her child to school in Western Australia at all. Apparently, however, all the cases were properly brought before the court. I did not tell the deputation that I considered a minimum fine of £1 should be provided for. In fact, I said I would not ask Parliament to make any amendment of the law. But I did express my own opinion that it would tend more to secure the regular attendance of children if parents who did not send their children to school were brought before an ordinary court, because I did not think it was a matter peculiarly for the Children's Court. The matter really has nothing to do with the children. The hon. member no doubt will tell me that in certain cases application is made to send children to institutions. That is absolutely the work of the Children's Court. But it really has nothing to do with compelling children to attend school.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is a matter of neglect on the part of the parents.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Absolutely the neglect of the parents.

Hon. T. Moore: Not always. Some children take some sending to school.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is a different matter altogether, and one which depends on the child. In the 41 cases in which convictions were recorded, six parents were fined 2s. 6d., eight 5s., one 7s. 6d., two 10s., and one £1; 19 cases were cautioned and ordered to pay costs. My particular point was that these cases of repeated convictions ought to have been more severely dealt with. That is my opinion, but I have no objection whatever to having the full return in terms of the hon. member's motion presented; and I wish him and the other members of the Children's Court to accept my assurance that if I may have a difference of opinion with them regarding a certain matter, I am still a strong supporter of the court and a great admirer of the work that it does.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan—in reply) [4.51]: The reason why the Children's Court takes these cases is that under Section 13 of the Education Act, 1905, if the court is satisfied, when the case comes before it, that the parent has used all reasonable efforts to cause the child to attend school, and the child is beyond his control, the court may, without inflicting a penalty, order the child to be sent to an industrial school until it reaches the

age of 14. If any other procedure were adopted where a child is incorrigible and ought to be sent to an industrial school, difficulty would arise. For that reason all these cases for years past have been taken at the Children's Court. It does not matter very much, I think, which court hears these cases, because I think any court would take a reasonable view. The Minister quoted the case where a child was let off because the father was out of work. Would it be a fair thing for the bench to impose a fine where the father is out of work? Are we going to take the last few shillings that may be left in the house in order to pay a fine to the State, thus taking the food out of the mouths of little children? What good purpose would that serve? I only want the facts. I think that if hon. members get the facts in each of these cases, as they are to be had, nine out of ten members will say that the court in every instance did the proper thing.

Question put and passed.

#### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Attorney General (Vacancy in Office).  
Passed.

2, Married Women's Protection.

Returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

#### BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

#### BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. A. BURVILL (South-East) [4.57]: Viewing the Bill from a reform standpoint, I think there are many commendable features in it. The three magistrates to act as a board in all cases are, I consider, a distinct improvement on the present system, because we shall have uniformity of decision, thus avoiding the anomalies arising from the hearing of cases by local magistrates in each of the various districts. The tightening up of the bona fide traveller section is very much needed. I welcome, too, the proposal to penalise people who, not being railway travellers, take advantage of the opening of railway refreshment rooms when trains are in. Then there is the abolition of bars on dining cars—an excellent amendment. It is also a good move to bring the control of refreshment room licenses under the general licensing authority, instead of permitting them to remain, as they are at present, almost independent licenses. The amendments referring to increased accommodation, greater cleanliness, and provision for meals, represent steps in the right direction. I also approve of the

provision to prevent lads under 21 years of age from obtaining drink. That is one of the best reforms contained in the Bill, and will do away with lads being taught to drink while their characters are largely unformed. On the other hand, some features of the Bill are not in the best interests of the community. There is the alteration, proposed by Clause 16, under which a temporary license may be granted to any club holding a sports or race meeting. This provision I regard as a retrograde step, and one which will go a long way towards nullifying the clause whereby lads under the age of 21 are to be prevented from obtaining drink. Under such conditions it would be a very difficult matter to enforce that clause. Moreover, I consider the fee of £1 for a temporary license utterly ridiculous. If the clause is carried, the fee should be fixed very much higher. Again, Clause 17 proposes to allow wine growers to sell any wine made in the State, and not merely wine of their own production. This will mean in practice that a man owning a small vineyard, or the occupier of a small vineyard, who makes a barrel or so of his own wine, can sell any wine at all so long as it is grown in the State. Greater restrictions are to be put on wine licenses in the city, and screens at the doors are to be abolished in the city; but in the country a wine grower is to be able to sell any wine whatever grown in the State without even paying a license fee. A man can hire a motor car and go into the country, and then at one of these vineyards he will be able to obtain wine by the quart bottle. The clause in question should be deleted altogether and in Committee I propose to move in that direction. The two main features of the Bill are the State-wide poll on the prohibition issue, and the abolition of the local option poll in favour of a licenses reduction board. Under the 1911 Act it was possible, on a local option poll every three years, to increase, continue or reduce licenses, without compensation. There has been but the one poll. Objection has been taken to it on the score that certain districts which obviously ought to have voted reduction did not do so, while other districts, with no serious occasion for reduction, voted that licenses should be reduced. Now they are all to be permanently precluded from voting reduction. The righteous are to be made suffer for the guilty. Reductions effected by the licenses reduction board will carry compensation. Under the existing Act 10 years' grace was given in lieu of compensation. It would be far better if the money to be paid by way of compensation were paid into the revenue of the State. Clause 18 provides for increased licenses and for the issue of new licenses where no licenses exist, but no provision is made for reduction of licenses on a vote. Why should this be? Because certain districts are abstemious, they are to be stopped from decreasing their licenses and,

in fact, probably will have an increase, because the reduction board will decrease licenses in only those districts having smaller populations per hotel and which did not vote for reduction at the last poll. Again, the licenses reduction board cannot act for two years. In the first year it has to get the funds, and if in the second year it decides in February to close an hotel, the decision will not take effect until the following January. In Committee I will move for a three-fifths majority in respect of increasing licenses, so as to conform with the three-fifths majority provided for the prohibition vote. I prefer a district local option poll to one State-wide. The temperance people would have been well advised to have stuck to the existing Act. The objection to district polls is that a district voting "dry" will have hotels on its border. That is puerile, for the magistrate or the license reduction board could be empowered to adjust the anomaly. It would be a tremendous advantage to the State to have some districts dry, for then the State as a whole would soon see exactly how prohibition worked. I prefer a three-fifths majority, so long as it cuts both ways. If the voters will not go to the poll, that should not be allowed to render the poll void.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Would you advocate compulsory voting?

Hon. A. BURVILL: Yes. I believe in a three-fifths majority because there is bound to be trouble from the minority.

Hon. T. Moore: You do not believe in majority rule?

Hon. A. BURVILL: There is bound to be trouble with the minority. Practically all of them will be men who drink. They will consider the result of the poll an interference with their rights, and a great number of them will proceed to break the law. Therefore, in order that there should be justification for enforcing the law, we should have a substantial majority. If the majority be a large one, it will offer a strong temptation to certain people to flout the law and exploit the minority, whereas if the minority be only small the temptation to take the risk will not be nearly so great. The reason why the law has been so frequently broken in America is because of the minority being large enough to make it worth the traders' while to provide liquor for them. The entertainment of the people should be more seriously considered by temperance advocates. The pubs supply a deficiency in the public arrangements for pleasure. If we are to do away with the pubs all at once, without having increased facilities for wholesome pleasures, we are bound to find trouble. Recreation is necessary, but we should dissociate it from the evils of drink, and so make public sport attractive. I am a prohibitionist, but I think if the temperance people did more in the way of catering for the social entertainment of the people by sports and wholesome pleasures, they would achieve better results. Once we get prohibition on a three-fifths majority, the trade will

have to influence the people before it can hope for a three-fifths majority to win back the traffic.

Hon. J. Duffell: Would you be in favour of compelling those who do not want a drink to have a drink?

Hon. A. BURVILL: Certainly not.

Hon. A. Duffell: Of course not. You are one-eyed.

Hon. A. BURVILL: More than I are only one-eyed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Some people cannot see at all.

Hon. A. BURVILL: From the point of view of the Government, the Bill is largely a revenue-producing measure. In that respect it is already a partial failure. From the temperance viewpoint it lacks much. I would rather see the old Act tightened up a little and continued.

Hon. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.12]: The Premier, in introducing the Bill in another place, said—

We believe the trade should be reformed in the interests of the State. We have endeavoured by this Bill to hold the balance fairly between the contending parties. We also want to get a certain amount of revenue—

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Is the hon. member in order in quoting from "Hansard" of this session?

The PRESIDENT: Unfortunately I did not hear what he said. The hon. member must not quote debates of the current session.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I merely wanted to refer to that because it is, I take it, the basis on which the Bill was drafted.

Hon. J. Duffell: You can quote from it without reading it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Paraphrase it.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. members must not advise new members how to get round the Standing Orders.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is the basis of the Bill, and it is from that standpoint we are looking at it. We have to recognise that, as a result of the amending of the Bill in another place the Premier has lost the revenue he proposed to get, and we have to consider what the effect is in respect of reform. While certain restrictions have been introduced, it is questionable whether there have been any real reforms. There are in connection with drink certain evils urgently in need of reform, but which the Bill does not touch. Take as an illustration the man who indulges in excessive drinking: Apart from the provisions under what are known as the old "Dog Act," there are none for dealing with a man who is impoverishing his wife and family by excessive drinking, provided he does not bring himself under public notice. There are many men who indulge in drink to such an extent that their families do not get the benefit of the weekly wages to which they are entitled. Consequently they are made to suffer. There is no provision in the Bill for them. The Bill provides for a licenses reduction board. This was made a great ques-

tion at the recent referendum. The advocates of the liquor trade made a great point of this board, and expressed the opinion that it had been effective in Victoria in reducing licenses. There is a considerable amount of truth in their contention. Whilst it may reduce licenses, will it reduce drinking? I shall be glad to receive evidence on that point. Whilst licenses may be reduced the trade will be distributed amongst a smaller number of houses to the great benefit to the survivors. The anti-liquor people ask that all licenses should be dealt with. There is a certain amount of advantage extended to both sides by this Bill, but when we weigh the advantages with the disadvantages it appears that glaring evils have been ignored in the desire to satisfy the wishes of the two contending parties. Another evil has been overlooked in this Bill. There is the case of a man who has been working in the bush for a long time and who comes to town. It is not uncommon for a man to "blow his cheque in." He hands his cheque over to the publican and drinks until it is finished.

Hon. J. Duffell: He comes to town for a "bender."

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, there is not much left of his cheque by the end of the time.

Hon. J. Cornell: If he is satisfied, why worry?

Hon. H. SEDDON: It takes such a man a long time to recover. Very often he does not recover until he has had a hair of the dog that bit him.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: How do you know that?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have seen men's lives ruined through such a practice. These are evils which should be remedied and might be considered in Committee. The eating-house and the boarding-house licenses might well be dispensed with. It has been the experience of people outback that these licenses are used for sly grog selling. The difficulties of the police have been increased because of such licenses. No damage would be done to the trade and no loss inflicted upon the community if these licenses were abolished. On page 6 of the report of the Royal Commission, reference is made to the strength of alcoholic liquors. Although the Act provides for a minimum strength of liquors, there is no provision for the making of a maximum strength of alcoholic liquors. It would, therefore, seem desirable that a maximum should be fixed from the point of view of benefit to the community and the health of the people concerned.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: The Bill does provide for that.

Hon. J. Duffell: See Clause 123.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Other matters might be brought in under that heading. The report deals with the anomalies regarding the strength of whisky, wine and beer. It points out that—

A bottle of whisky costing from 10s. to 12s. 6d. contains only 2½ times more alcohol than the same quantity of sweet red

wine, which may be retailed at from 1s. 6d. to 2s. It also contains three times as much alcohol as beer, which is sold for 1s. 2d. per bottle.

These anomalies might be corrected. From the health standpoint it is generally held that if the strength of liquor is reduced it is better for the person who indulges in it. With regard to the issue of temporary licenses for sports and race meetings, it appears that the proposal is rather a dangerous departure. These licenses are now held by a publican who knows the law well and can be held responsible for any breaches. It is now proposed to issue licenses to irresponsible bodies, such as sports committees and the like, and these people cannot be so easily brought to book. It is not an easy task to bring an organisation to account for a breach of the law, whereas in the case of a licensee, the Act can be enforced because of the conditions of the license. With regard to new licenses, members might well look back to the 1911 Act. When that Act was framed, arrangements were made for the taking of a poll in 1921. That poll was taken on the basis of continuance, reduction, no license, and increase. There was also another provision for deciding the question of State control. These four questions were dealt with in the 1921 poll, but people confined themselves practically to two issues, reduction and continuance.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: State control had the majority.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In no instance was increase carried and yet provision is made in the Bill for the issue of new licenses. That is in direct defiance of the wishes of the people. Had the community intended to vote for increase, it is reasonable to assume that increase would have been carried. We are now proposing to restrict the people to two issues, continuance or reduction. The provision for new licenses is, therefore, out of court.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Would not the country be entitled to increased licenses with an extra population of 75,000 people?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Certain districts are obviously over-licensed. Until this difficulty has been overcome the only way in which the Licensing Court can deal with new licenses in a district, is to transfer licenses from over-licensed districts into those which have carried continuance. I do not consider there is any mandate from the people for the issue of new licenses in any district which has carried reduction. New licenses should only be transferred licenses. A peculiar anomaly arises in this part of the Bill. Provision is made for a majority of the adult residents in a definite area to obtain new licenses under certain conditions. Reference is made to a "majority." In another part of the Bill reference is made to a "three-fifths majority" deciding the question of continuance or prohibition. If a three-fifths majority is fit to deal with the question of continuance or prohibition, it is also fit to deal with the

question of new licenses. If a majority is sufficient to act in the case of new licenses, then it is sufficient to decide the question of prohibition or continuance. That is an anomaly which should be rectified. As a House of review we shall be held up to ridicule if we allowed these anomalies to pass.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: The party to which you belong subscribed to the majority rule.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am quite satisfied with the majority rule.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: The man you defeated was not.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member interrupts too much.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I will now deal with the revenue clauses. The Act provides for five per cent. from sales, to be devoted to the revenue of the country. The intention of the Government by this Bill was to obtain a revenue of 10 per cent. There is a difference of opinion as to the desirability of raising revenue from the trade. Many people consider that revenue from this source is derived at the expense of the weakness or degradation of members of the community; that it is therefore wrongly obtained and should not be used by the Government. There are other ways of looking at the matter. We might consider it from the point of view of the price which the trade can afford to pay, or we might consider it from the point of view of getting the best return to the State. It might also be considered from the point of view of the cost of the trade to the State. The best principle to adopt in this matter is the principle of conferring the greatest good upon the greatest number. That is a democratic principle. We have to consider other factors which may be brought to bear upon the question. The first point in connection with the price the trade can afford to pay deals with the drinking section of the community. There is another section which is not concerned about the price, and the provision in the Bill in relation thereto does not conform to the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number. The question of getting the best return for the State requires some amplification. Besides the revenue point of view we must consider what it costs the State in a direct way. We cannot take the indirect cost because that raises a number of debatable questions. Evidence was given to the Commission as to the direct cost to the State, and replies to questions asked in this House show what the cost has been to the several departments of State. There is no evidence on this point contained in the report of the Commissioner of Police. Certain figures are given which represent a sound basis for calculation. There are certain departments which are affected by the trade—the Department of Justice, the Police Department, the Gaols and Public Health Departments, the State Charities Department and the Lunacy Department. The extent to which these departments are directly affected should be

taken as the basis for calculation as to the revenue to be derived from the trade. The figures given in relation to these departments are almost invariably based on conservative lines. It is not often that a departmental officer errs on the side of over-estimating his expenditure: it is rather the other way. It is estimated that the Department of Justice will cost £35,360, the Department of Gaols £25,350 and the Police £174,964. The police figures are corrected. The Commissioner has received certain sums from other departments to enable him to carry out the specific duties that devolve upon the police. It is only fair in estimating the cost of the Police Department to take these figures into consideration. I have therefore taken the police figures at £174,964. The Public Health Department's quota works out at £128,526, the Lunacy Department's at £91,758, the State Charities Department's at £95,466 and liquor inspection at £1,368. In the report it is pointed out that the number of cases in which drunkenness is ascribed as the cause, provides the basis on which the percentages are fixed. These, averaged over a period of 10 years, work out at 46.6 per cent. Last year it was 45 per cent. A perusal of the report by the Commissioner of Police shows that the 45 per cent. is amplified by a further 4.8 per cent. which is incurred in the cost of administering the Licensing Act. That will be increased still further under the Bill. I have taken the basis of calculation at 46 per cent. and I think that is a reasonable charge. In the same way, the Lunacy Department would work out at 36 per cent., on the figures given to me in answer to questions I put to the Minister in this Chamber. Regarding State Charities, it is pointed out that one of the biggest factors rendering necessary the existence of the Charities Department, is the question of drink, so, making allowance along these lines, I am justified in taking 36 per cent. as the basis in connection with that department.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: If drunkenness is the effect, what is the cause?

Hon. H. SEDDON: In many cases drunkenness is the cause as well as the effect. In many cases where it is the effect, we find that investigations in the United States show that it has resulted in psychological exhaustion.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Have you experienced that?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I can understand hon. members in this Chamber experiencing it, considering the various questions they have to deal with. However, this is a very considerable and actual factor that must be taken into consideration. These percentages would work out as follows: Department of Justice £16,265; Gaols Department, £33,032; State Charities Department, Public Health Department £12,350—I am assuming 10 per cent. as the basis, because I consider that is a fair ratio to fix,

bearing in mind the various functions performed by that department—Lunacy Department, £33,032; State Charities Department, £34,367 and the liquor inspection £1,368. Naturally, the last mentioned item will be increased if the Bill be passed. The total of these various calculations reaches £190,000 odd. The Premier said that 1 per cent. on sales would mean, roughly, £11,000. Taking that estimate and applying it to the proportionate cost drink bears to the State expenditure as a whole through public departments, the percentage reaches 17 per cent. rather than the 10 per cent. which the Premier indicated was his basis for the revenue to be paid by the trade. I consider the only way we can estimate the basis is by considering the cost to the public. It is only fair to ask that the trade should bear that cost which it casts upon the public. While this Chamber cannot deal with the question of finances, it can make a recommendation to another place. There is no doubt the Bill will be amended very considerably during the Committee stage in this Chamber and we can easily include a recommendation to another place that they take into consideration the cost to the community arising from the liquor trade, in fixing the basis upon which these charges should be levied.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Have you worked out how that would affect the charges in connection with the different licenses?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Mr. Holmes has already drawn attention to that aspect in calculating the increased charges it was desirable to impose at the cost of the Federal Government. It was pointed out that the effect of increasing the charges considerably would mean, by the operation of the law of supply and demand, a decreased consumption of liquor per head of the population, which it is agreed would have a very beneficial effect upon the community. As to the Licenses Reduction Board, this was the trade's long suit at the last poll. The experience of Victoria has been quoted extensively and it is true that the number of licensed houses has been reduced very considerably as the result of the board's operations in that State. We have no direct evidence in reports, to show the actual effect on the consumption of alcohol per head of the population in Victoria. We must recognise on the other hand that one of the greatest factors in reducing the consumption of liquor has been the curtailed hours of trading both here and in New South Wales. That has been demonstrated as a very important factor in bringing about this desirable result.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: In Victoria they close at 6 p.m.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, but there is no definite evidence in reports from Victoria showing what effect the reduction in the number of licensed houses has had on the consumption of liquor there. Another point to be considered relates to the 2 per cent. charge which is to be levied under the Bill for the purpose of providing compensation. This percentage is to be provided by those engaged

in the trade. This is for compensating hotels which are closed by the board. This, with the 5 per cent. charge, it is urged, makes a very considerable levy on the trade. We have also to take into consideration in dealing with the 2 per cent. charge, that this really represents a capital charge or an investment which benefits those hotels which survive. The closing of hotels benefits those that are permitted to remain in existence and, therefore, we are justified in assuming that the 2 per cent. is a capital charge or an investment rather than we are justified in regarding it as a mere charge upon the sales of liquor. The question upon which presumably most members are concerned, is that of the poll. We must recognise that in 1911 provision was made whereby 10 years' grace was given to the trade, and there was to be no compensation at the end of that period. That was a concession which has been adhered to and it is observed in the Bill in that there is no question of compensation coming from the public funds. It was also provided that a poll should be taken every three years after the expiration of the 10-year period. In the Bill before provision is made for a poll every five years which extends the time limit very considerably. There are certain arguments which may be used against that extension and which I think will act very materially when dealing with the question of licenses reduction. There is also the three-fifths majority provision which many of us regard as a considerable handicap. Again, we must have regard to the provision for a State wide poll. These three restrictions are imposed on the referendum. It has always been contended that a referendum shall be submitted to the people on a basis that is as untrammelled as possible. If we do not pursue that course but submit the referendum under conditions which are regarded by many people as unfair or loaded, we will inevitably throw back the question into the arena of Parliamentary debate. That position is regarded as undesirable. The idea of legislating for a referendum was to take this question away from Parliament and let the people decide for themselves. If we introduce limitations and handicaps in regard to the referendum, the effect will be to take the whole matter away from the arena of public decision, because the people will say that, owing to the unfair conditions imposed, Parliamentarians must deal with the question themselves. Such handicaps constitute an infringement of a vital democratic principle. The adoption of such an attitude is liable to react on matters of much greater importance to the people as a whole. If we submitted a question which was of much more importance to the people, and regarding which strong feelings were held by sections of the community, the result would be an outcry from one end of the State to the other. There are other arguments in favour of a referendum being submitted to the people under the freest conditions possible. If we read English history it will show us that all the great questions

of reform have been dealt with on the basis of a simple majority. The first and second Reform Bills, the repeal of the Corn Laws, the abolition of slavery, and the granting of universal franchise, are examples of questions which have been dealt with on a simple majority.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Were those dealt with by referenda?

Hon. H. SEDDON: No, not by way of referenda, but in Parliament. Had those questions been referred to referenda there is no doubt that the reforms would have been carried out at a much earlier date. Anyone studying the conditions of England when the first Reform Bill was brought forward, will appreciate the unrest and the discontent, almost amounting to a state of revolution, that forced the Government in those days to pass the Bill despite the views of members who were obviously against the Bill. Had that question been submitted to a referendum, that reform would have been passed much earlier than, in fact, it was passed. As to the repeal of the Corn Laws, that was a reform long overdue and would have been given effect to long before, had it been referred direct to the people themselves. As it was, the feeling was so strong that the people returned to Parliament men pledged by an unmistakable mandate to secure that reform and so renew the economic balance in England. Coming to Australia and Western Australia, the first and second conscription referenda, which involved a question of human life that is far more important than a question of the liquor law, were referred to the people on the simple majority without imposing any handicaps such as those suggested in connection with the Bill. There was no question of a three-fifths majority in those cases. Then there were other larger questions than those dealt with in connection with the liquor trade. In fact, all precedents of our Parliamentary practice and the recognition of democratic principles show that there is no argument for placing restrictions on such questions, but that referenda of this nature should be submitted to the people free and untrammelled as possible. Another matter that has been referred to by hon. members is the possibility of a snatch vote. It has been pointed out that if we require a three-fifths majority of the people to go to the poll, it is possible that a minority of people may secure an enactment such as prohibition before a majority of the people are ready for it. Let us look at the figures and see how it would work out. Take the case of an abnormally low poll, such as one consisting of 18 per cent. of the electors. Members have been returned on such a low poll.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Not on the goldfields.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No, we fight our battles pretty severely there. If a three-fifths majority were imposed in connection with such a poll, it would mean that 7 per cent. would be able to counteract the views of 11 per cent. of the voters. If the question is so little a matter of public concern that only 7 per cent. could be found to support it, that 7 per cent.



should not be allowed to outweigh the votes of 11 per cent. as I have suggested.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why should 11 per cent. be able to bring about prohibition?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Why should 7 per cent. be able to prevent the carrying of a decision in such circumstances? We think a serious handicap has been imposed upon the taking of this poll. The trade is able to command a considerable amount of money in support of its interests. When a member is elected to Parliament he is limited regarding his expenses, to a certain amount. There is no question of such a limitation on the money that can be spent in connection with the fight under the Bill. When the poll was taken in 1921, every penny we used was subscribed by people who were not in any way financially interested in the carrying of the referendum. We found that the other side were able to get money when they wanted it.

Hon. J. Duffell: And some who promised to pay have not paid up to this day.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am sorry to hear that. On that account, we could not secure a single motor car for hire. The only ones we had were two which were lent to us for the day and we did not know we could secure them until the day of the poll. We issued an appeal to our supporters asking them to make their own arrangements about going to the poll, and it is remarkable that there was a balance of only 360 out of a 50 per cent. poll in favour of continuance. These handicaps are real; they are vital. Of course there are vested interests and the representatives of those interests are prepared to spend funds liberally in securing the vote of every possible supporter that they can get their hands on. I admired their organisation in Kulgoorlie; it was splendid. I have often envied it since. Under these circumstances, to argue on a question of anything more than a simple majority, is to impose on those who are trying to bring about a change of public opinion, a handicap which is unfair. The minimum number of members required to decide a question in this House is 10, and six members may carry any Bill through. Thus on ordinary subjects we find that 20 per cent. of the members of this Chamber can settle a question. On that basis it is fair to argue that in connection with any appeal in the future, a voting strength of 20 per cent. should be sufficient to determine it. Here is a question which concerns the whole community and which is creating greater interest as time goes on, and it is reasonable to believe that the poll in connection with it will become greater from year to year. This has been the experience in America. When the question was first submitted the polls were small, but as time went on they became greater and the majorities were more decisive with each successive poll. There have been some scathing articles published from time to time regarding the effectiveness of prohibition in America. I was considerably surprised to read an article in the "Bulletin" of the 5th October, in the middle of which article it was stated that prohibition had proved of some good

for the working classes. That was an important admission coming from a source which was opposed to prohibition. The effect of prohibition in America has been to increase the savings bank deposits of the working classes, and another effect has been to induce the working man to make better use of his income than he did formerly, whilst the standard of the comfort of his home has increased. Money is now being spent wisely, and thereby employment has increased. Also on account of the increased bank deposits there is more capital available for the development of industries, and so from that point of view as well, the whole community is benefiting. Why, therefore, should we not allow the people of the State to declare by a definite majority that they will give prohibition a trial? I contend that if the United States retained the 18th amendment for ten years, every country that is competing with America in the commercial exploitation of the world would be compelled to swing into line. Americans are not the least efficient people. They are the finest engineers in the world to-day. And what have they done under the effects of prohibition? They built the Panama canal. The canal was built under conditions of absolute prohibition, and if any person attempted to introduce liquor during the progress of that great work, he was banished from the prohibited area. Now as to the question of efficiency. American efficiency has placed that country in the position that she is able to place her goods on the markets of the world at prices that other countries cannot approach. In our own country, even under a high tariff, we cannot approach America. What will be the result of the increased efficiency brought about by the introduction of prohibition? It will give America still greater advantages. Other countries must either reduce their working classes to a degree of comfort which is lower than that existing, or they must swing into line and follow the example of America. This is a serious argument which the House must consider. We have to regard the well-being of every citizen, and if the arguments which I have advanced are proved—and I contend they are being proved every day—we must consider the subject seriously. In any case, it will be fought in spite of any attempt made to the contrary in the arena of Parliamentary debate.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, debate adjourned.

## BILL—DAIRY INDUSTRY.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. MILLS (Central) [5.52]: Although we have a few butter factories in the State, there is no doubt that the dairy industry is still in its infancy. It is proper, therefore, that we should in the early stages endeavour to put the industry on the right

track. I do not see that any objection can be taken to that course by means of legislation, provided that the law is administered fairly, and that the inspectors who will be charged with the work of administration will, instead of acting harshly, endeavour to assist and teach the farmers their business. We know that the best butter comes from the best land. It does not mean that because we have plenty of feed that we shall get the best article. My experience is that the richer the land, the better the cream, and consequently, the better will be the butter produced. We are being told continually that the South-West is the home of the butter industry. I do not wish to detract from the quality of the country in the south-western part of the State in that regard, but I consider that the Wheat Belt can compete with it, and that it can produce as good butter and perhaps butter of a better quality than the South-West. Moreover, the Wheat Belt is ready at the present time for the production of butter. If you have a paddock containing an area of good land, and also some land which is poor, the stock will soon show which they like better. Our wheat areas throughout the State, along the Eastern line, the Great Southern line, and north as far as Geraldton ought to be great butter-producing districts, if they are given the opportunity. I hope that opportunity will come soon. We have it on the authority of Mr. Macfarlane that with the aid of refrigerators, and by controlling the temperature of cream, butter can be made anywhere, even in the Kimberleys. That, therefore, explodes the belief that butter can be made only in the South-West. I would like the Government, with a view to encouraging the industry, to devote a considerable amount of attention to the wheat lands, and not solely to the present centres of activity in the South-West. During the summer months butter can be made where there are refrigerators, but it is the carrying of the cream that is the difficulty, and the Government as far as possible should provide louvered vans for this purpose, instead of doing as they do at the present time, place the cans in brake-vans with potatoes, onions, and other produce. One clause of the Bill says that first-grade butter for export must be pasteurised. My opinion is that in every case it should be pasteurised, whether for export or not. I cannot see why every grade should not be pasteurised. I know this, that Western Australia has been the dumping ground for the second-grade butter made in the Eastern States. I admit we have had a fair quantity of first-class butter, but the greater percentage has been second grade. The people in Perth may get first-grade butter, but those who are in the country receive butter which is not always first-class. With regard to butter made in our own factories, it is proposed to insist that it shall be marked when it is intended for export. But, I ask, why should it not be marked for local consumption? The people would then know what they were buying.

Hon. T. Moore: If they can taste they will soon know what it is like.

Hon. J. MILLS: It has been said that in the Wheat Belt butter can be made only for two or three months of the year. We have proof, however, that one dairy sent cream to the factory all the year round. That farmer knew his business, and installed milking machines, and by properly feeding his herd of 30 or 40 cows, has succeeded in doing what some people said was not possible. Of course the difficulty is that towards the end of the summer trouble does arise by reason of the absence of green feed. That trouble, however, can be overcome by the erection of silos. We know of course that the construction of silos is expensive. The Agricultural Bank should render assistance in that regard, and I have no doubt the assistance will be forthcoming if proper representations be made. With regard to margarine, it should always be margarine and nothing else. Its manufacture should not be encouraged. Personally, I prefer dripping.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Margarine is good dripping.

Hon. J. MILLS: It is very often bad dripping. At the several State farms the Government should establish small dairies where farmers could get instruction. The stock here should be of the best quality and bulls could be distributed from this source. The adoption of a course of this description would prove valuable, because we know that many farmers when making a commencement are nervous. Moreover, they are not capitalists and they have to begin cautiously. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [6.0]: I do not propose to offer any great objection to the Bill. It would appear to be another attempt to set up an army of inspectors to tell the public they shall do so and so or shall not do something else.

Hon. J. Mills: We have the inspectors now.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have some inspectors.

Hon. T. Moore: We shall need more.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes. If we wish to develop this country, we shall not succeed if we are going to be constantly interfered with by all sorts of people. One would not mind if Parliament stipulated, or the Government provided that the men sent out as inspectors were properly qualified men who understood their work. But, as a result of political influence and otherwise, we have all sorts of men foisted on the country as inspectors, and some of them have no right at all to be dictating to other people. As regards margarine I do not know that I have heard anything about its being injurious.

Hon. T. Moore: Do you ever eat it?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: A lot of people do eat it.

Hon. T. Moore: But you do not.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They know what they are eating.

Hon. T. Moore: They do not look so well as you.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not wish to be rude, but if I said "One fool at a time," it would not be inappropriate.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member not to interrupt.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Margarine is not injurious, it is a good wholesome food.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is injurious if you eat too much.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is not so good as butter.

Hon. A. Burvill: Why camouflage it as butter?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is a lot of camouflaging of butter, but there is no necessity for that in the South-West. I have seen butter camouflaged because of the dry weather and the dry feed.

Hon. A. Burvill: It is not camouflaged so much as margarine.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Will the hon. member keep quiet? I wish I could camouflage him; it might improve his appearance. I have seen butter camouflaged and coloured in such a way as to make palatable what was unpalatable. The colouring added to the margarine is admitted to be not injurious. Nineteenths of the cake bought in the cake shop is made attractive in appearance by the use of colouring. You, Sir, no doubt have often had to use curry for Brownie bush cake in order to make palatable a dish that would otherwise have been unpalatable. I suppose the next step will be to legislate to prevent curry being used for that purpose, and where is this sort of thing going to stop? Let me give an instance of what some of the inspectors do. In the Lower Murchison, where the conditions are such that lice on sheep cannot exist, an ultimatum has gone forth from the Stock Department that dips must be erected throughout this drought-stricken area. I could take members there to-day and show them men carting lime and stone—in some instances horse feed is being bought—in order to put down dips to dip the sheep, and there is not the slightest necessity for dipping. The Stock Department must have something to do. They have to build up the department, and so they send out an instruction that every sheep in this area must be dipped. A peculiar position arises here, showing how one section of the community suffers at the hands of another. These pastoralists have to pay 29s. for lime for use in the construction of these dips, but the farmer who wants lime to put on his land gets it for 7s. To show the absurdity of the dipping regulations, six or seven years ago, when Sir Rupert Clarke's estate in Victoria was resumed by the Government, I bought 5,000 ewes. I landed them at Fremantle under the very nose of the inspector. They were infested with lice and tick, and I took them into this Murchison area, and within seven days there were no lice or tick to be found on any of them. These inspectors are merely harassing and annoying people engaged in our primary industries, and for what

reason? Merely to build up a department. Regulations will be required; they will have to make the department pay. The North is an ideal place to grow coconuts, but no coconut shall be turned into coconut oil and no coconut shall be used to make margarine, because it might interfere with some tinpot dairy down South.

Hon. E. Rose: This Bill merely refers to colouring.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If it can be provided that the colouring used in margarine is injurious, I shall not have another word to say; but when we know that everything to-day is camouflaged, why should we single out this particular industry which is of some importance to the State? The best margarine is made from beef fat, and there are tons and tons of it at Wyndham being turned into tallow and sent out of the country. This beef fat might well be turned into margarine and sent here and made palatable for consumption. Margarine made from beef fat would not require any colouring, because the product comes from rich pastures.

Hon. T. Moore: It is not bad stuff, either.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But no, this cannot be done. We have to build up the industry in the South at the expense of the community as a whole. I would not mind if that were the only object of the Bill, but right behind this Bill is the building up of a department, a department which must be made to pay and which never will pay so long as the officers at the head of affairs have to increase their staff in order to increase their positions and gain increased salaries. So long as this condition of affairs prevails, and it does prevail, this department can only be made to pay at the expense of our industries. Our industries are already handicapped sufficiently without our passing such tinpot legislation as this.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [6.0]: I am surprised that Mr. Holmes is not giving more generous support to the Bill. His attack upon the Government and Government inspectors was quite unjustified. The Minister, in moving the second reading of the Bill, made a statement which was perfectly true, namely, that this was one of the most important Bills requiring our consideration. The Licensing Bill is occupying our attention, but no measure could more greatly redound to the benefit of the State than this one. Those who have followed the progress of dairying throughout the length and breadth of Australia know what happened in Victoria years ago. When that State was practically on the verge of bankruptcy and everything else seemed to fail, the cow came to the rescue. It is a well known fact that the late Sir Thomas Bent said he never met a cow without taking off his hat to it, because the cow had been the salvation of the State.

Hon. E. Rose: He also assisted the industry with bonuses.

Hon. J. EWING: New South Wales, too, is a great dairying country. In New South Wales I myself engaged in dairying, and I am convinced that the advancement and pros-

perity there, notwithstanding the great mineral wealth of that State, has been largely due to the development of the dairy industry. In the district in which I lived, carrying on my profession as a surveyor, I had a farm with 60 cows, and they were a source of very great income and pleasure to me. During the years I was there I took an interest in questions of dairying and factories. The district in which I lived owned its prosperity to dairying and to nothing else. When I first went there to live, the industry had not attained any magnitude; in fact, the estate had only just been subdivided and settled by a large number of dairy farmers. It was a favoured part of the State, enjoying a splendid climate and excellent water, which, together with the good herds obtainable, made the district wonderfully prolific and prosperous in a very short space of time. Much has been said about the carting of cream and getting it to the market in a good condition. In New South Wales we used to send our milk direct to the creamery so that it arrived in splendid condition. There the cream was separated and the farmer took his skimmed milk back home for the calves. In this way the best results were obtained. That system is not practised here. I look forward to the day when we shall have creameries rather than butter factories, and if settlers would only send their milk direct from the cow to the creamery and have it separated there, they would eliminate all the difficulties that at present arise in connection with the condition of the cream.

Hon. T. Moore: That is a stage which the dairy farmers in the Eastern States have passed through and left behind.

Hon. J. EWING: Perhaps some better system has been inaugurated, but I am not aware of any better system.

Hon. T. Moore: There is the trouble of getting the milk there.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And the trouble of getting the skimmed milk back to the farm.

Hon. J. EWING: No doubt that is a serious objection which would be raised here. In New South Wales farmers used to start off at dawn and drive seven, eight, or 10 miles to the creamery, deliver their milk, and then return home for breakfast. Unless our settlers are prepared to do this, we cannot get what I consider are ideal conditions for butter making.

Hon. T. Moore: Why did they give it up in New South Wales?

Hon. J. EWING: I do not know.

Hon. T. Moore: I do; because it involved too much work.

Hon. J. EWING: No amount of work should be too great in order to get the best results from one's labour.

Hon. A. Burvill: Our group settlements will lend themselves to that scheme.

Hon. J. EWING: When we get closer settlement in any portion of the State and provide creameries, we shall get better results than are being obtained to-day. At present the cream is allowed to stand for two

or three days, very often in a temperature which is quite unsuitable; then it is taken to the factory, and surprise is expressed that it arrives there in an unfit condition.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The same would apply to the milk.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. EWING: Before tea I was speaking on creameries as opposed to butter factories, and I made certain statements which, in my opinion, are worthy of consideration by the Government and by those who are developing the dairy industry of this State. But I am satisfied that there are reasons, and very good reasons too, why this particular position does not obtain to the same extent in the Eastern States now as it did in the days to which I have referred. Nevertheless I believe, as Mr. Burvill reminded me by interjection, that the developmental policy of the present Government, their policy of group settlements, will largely assist towards the position I have outlined. If it is possible for the milk to be brought direct from the milking shed to the factory, I am satisfied that a better grade of cream, and therefore butter, will be produced. There is no doubt that Western Australia offers a great field for dairy production. The Minister, in his second reading speech, informed us that this State, during the year ended on the 31st December, 1921, imported butter to the value of £500,000, and margarine to the extent of £67,000—a million pounds of margarine worth £67,000. That being the case, there is no doubt whatever that great opportunities exist for those who are developing the dairying industry not only in the South-West, but in other portions of Western Australia. We are not, however, looking only to supply the wants up to the £500,000 or £600,000 which I have mentioned. We hope that in years not far distant Western Australia will be able to export to the Old Country and other parts of the world in competition with the Eastern States. That is what we are aiming at, and in my opinion this Bill will be of great advantage to the people of Western Australia and to the dairying industry when the time for exporting has come. At present the Government are endeavouring by this Bill to control the dairying industry, as the Minister has said, from the cow to the factory. These of us who know the dairying industry in the South-West and elsewhere in the State, are aware that those who are developing the industry have had a very hard task. I do hope that this measure, if passed, which I think will be the case, will not prove a harassing one to the farmer. Mr. Macfarlane drew attention to the cases in which the farmer was put to great disadvantage by reason of health regulations. After a time the health authorities recognised that they were exceeding what was necessary, and some amelioration took place. This Bill gives very great powers to the Minister in the way of making regulations. I hope he will not consider it necessary to allow his inspectors to apply those regu-

lations in a manner which will be detrimental to the development of the industry. Where a farmer has reasonable premises and is carrying on his business in a reasonable way, it is not necessary, until we reach the export stage, that the dairy should be put in absolutely perfect order, so that everything in the garden will be lovely. The chief thing that must be aimed at for the present is cleanliness, in order to get the cream to the factory in the best possible condition and to make the best butter possible. Every day we hear of cases where the farmer, in other directions, is asked to do more than is necessary. I hope that will not be the case under this Bill. Such strict regulation of the industry will be required only when we come into competition with such butter-producing countries as Denmark, or a district like the Richmond River of New South Wales. I happen to know the Richmond River district, and it was never thought in the days when I was there, 30 years ago, that it would be a dairying district at all. It was rather regarded as a district for the growth of sugar cane. However, it has become one of the most wonderful dairying districts in Australia. The lands are excellent, and beautifully watered. It is gratifying to know that in portions of Western Australia export butter is being produced that is equal, if not superior, to anything that is produced elsewhere. The grading clauses of the Bill are very necessary indeed; and I am perfectly satisfied, although Mr. Rose has some idea of their proving deleterious to butter factories at Bunbury and elsewhere, that if the hon. member will consider the matter carefully he will be able to frame an amendment to meet the cases he has in view. I can realise that some injustice might result under Clause 11 to the Bunbury butter factory and its producers.

Hon. E. Rose: To all butter factories.

Hon. J. EWING: I believe the position under that clause will be that the penny bonus which now goes to those who are shareholders will go to all who supply cream to the factory. The idea of the Bill is to get all who produce cream to become shareholders in the factories in their respective districts. If that can be brought about, some good will result. Now, as regards agriculture, the pastures are going to be almost entirely responsible for the production of first grade cream. In New South Wales and Queensland where large areas are under irrigation, the conditions are possibly more advantageous for the production of fodder plants and grasses. Those who have seen the districts in question will realise that we have to work up our lands properly, and must obtain the succulent feeds now existing in the Eastern States if we are to produce a class of butter that can compete with theirs. The most wonderful grass in the world, to my thinking, is English rye. That grass grows magnificently in New South Wales. However, it requires a good rainfall, or, failing that, irrigation.

Hon. T. Moore: You will get too much rain for it in the South-West.

Hon. J. EWING: I am quite satisfied that that will not be the case. When I was dairying

in New South Wales, where I had a selection, I know that after six weeks of dry weather we were always crying out for rain. I had some beautiful patches of rye grass, and the morning after rain there would be a wonderful growth, and in a week there would be succulent feed. No portion of Western Australia is likely to be found too wet for the English rye grass. The wonderful advantages of the South-West with regard to grasses are well known to all hon. members. We know what the clovers and the lucerne are doing there and how wonderfully the poor lands there are being turned into good pastures. I can only reiterate what I said after the Parliamentary trip of last session, that the poorest land I saw during that trip was producing marvelous subterranean clover. It was knee-high. There is no portion of the South-West, moreover, that will not produce subterranean clover, under proper conditions of drainage and irrigation. During this debate references have been made to the Geraldton, Eastern and Narrogin and other districts. There seems to be some idea that the development of the South-West is the only project in the minds of the Government. We know that is not the case. The Government are to-day spending more money in the wheat belt than in the South-West.

Hon. G. W. Miles: In the South-West Division?

Hon. J. EWING: I hope they will continue spending money there, the money that is required for the development of that portion of our State. There should be no feeling that one part of Western Australia is being developed to the disadvantage of another part. The part that should receive immediate attention is that which is best adapted for the purpose in view. It must be known to the Chamber that the great South-West is the greatest part of Western Australia from a dairying point of view.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Not at all.

Hon. J. EWING: I should have said, except the great North-West.

Hon. T. Moore: The South-West is the only part you know.

Hon. J. EWING: With the exception of the North-West, I know Western Australia from one end to the other; and I have read so much about the North-West that I am very sorry I have not been able to visit it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why do you not advocate development for all parts of the State?

Hon. J. EWING: I am quite satisfied that if dairying can be carried on in the North-West, it will be carried on there, and successfully too. It is well known that in the South-West the rainfall is very heavy, and a heavy rainfall is essential to the dairying industry. Those who have travelled the country between Bridgetown and Manjimup, that glorious country which the Premier is going to develop, I hope, a very short time, say that it is the ideal country for dairying. They declare that it is a very wet country, rain falling during almost every month in the year. All the wonderful pastures of which I have

spoken will be produced in that country, and I venture to predict that in the years to come the lands between Denmark and Bridgetown will be the most wonderful part of Western Australia from a dairying point of view.

Hon. T. Moore: What has happened at Denmark in years gone by?

Hon. J. EWING: I do not know that; but I do know the territory to which I have referred, and I say it only requires to be cleared.

Hon. T. Moore: It was cleared once, and the scrub grew up again.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I thought coal, and not dairying, was to be the salvation of the South-West.

Hon. J. EWING: I would not dare to make any reference to coal because you, Mr. President, would at once call me to order. Perhaps on some future occasion I may be able to satisfy the hon. member with regard to coal. I am now endeavouring to deal with the South-West and other portions of Western Australia suitable for the development of this great industry of dairying. It must be known to hon. members that the butter factories in the South-West are excellent establishments. They have splendid machinery and plants, and all they require is that cream shall come in in proper condition. Now, Mr. Willmott will appreciate what I am going to say about the Brunswick State Farm.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Where is that?

The Minister for Education: That is where the fruit-trees used to grow.

Hon. J. EWING: I am going to refer, not to the fruit-trees, but to the Ayrshire cattle which I saw at that farm when I visited it, shortly before it was abandoned. It is almost a sin that the Government should not have continued to breed those beautiful cattle for dairying purposes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Where are they going to get the cattle for closer settlement?

Hon. T. Moore: From the great North-West.

Hon. J. EWING: That was referred to by Mr. Baxter. He said we could not get the cattle necessary for the group settlers. However, the Premier, a far-seeing man, will no doubt see to it that the necessary cattle are forthcoming. However, the interjection only aids my argument, which is that if the Government had continued the good work at the Brunswick State Farm we would have had a magnificent herd of cattle for distribution among the new settlers.

Hon. T. Moore: The Premier could not have been very far-seeing to have shut down the farm.

Hon. J. EWING: If the Government raised a herd of dairy cattle to distribute amongst the farmers, much good would result.

Hon. T. Moore: More State enterprise!

Hon. J. EWING: There is no State enterprise about it. The object would be to provide the nuclei of private herds. The Government could materially assist in that direction. Mr. Moore and Mr. Macfarlane both thought

the Bill premature. As I have pointed out, if under the Bill regulations prejudicial to the industry are enforced, some harm may result. However, I hope the inspectors to be appointed will be careful not to harass those attempting to build up the industry. We want men capable of instructing the dairy farmers.

Hon. T. Moore: There is nothing in the Bill about that.

Hon. J. EWING: Yes, inspectors are provided for, and it should be the aim of the Government not so much to inspect as to instruct, and so teach the dairyman how to conduct his dairy. Mr. Holmes holds that the manufacturers of margarine should be permitted to imitate butter by the use of colouring matter. But that means unfair competition with butter, so I think it wise to prevent the manufacturers colouring margarine, and so preclude the possibility of its being sold as something equal to butter. If the Bill be sympathetically administered, it will greatly advance the interests of the State. It is, however, important that we should build up the dairying industry. No other industry deserves greater encouragement. From my knowledge of dairying I am convinced that those engaged in it have a very hard and arduous task. They work from daylight to dark. As the result of the introduction of milking machines, and of the general advancement in conditions, the lot of the dairy farmer has somewhat improved, and I hope that there will be introduced still greater labour-saving appliances which will remove the necessity for the dairy farmer working 18 hours a day.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What about the Factories Act?

Hon. J. EWING: The hon. member who thinks a farmer works only eight hours a day is making a great mistake. A dairy farmer of a generation ago worked almost 24 hours a day, and the younger men now in the industry are working 12 and 15 hours per day. There is no law to prevent a man with a view to improving his position working longer hours than are prescribed in Arbitration Court awards.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: They go around and wake up the fowls at Bridgetown.

Hon. J. EWING: I am convinced that the Government are moving in the right direction in bringing down legislation of this kind, and I will give the Bill my hearty support.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.54]: I would not have intervened in this debate but for remarks which have fallen from Mr. Holmes. I am going to speak about the Bill from a point of view not yet touched upon. At first sight it might seem that I know very little about a Dairy Bill. I deny that. The Bill has been discussed from the point of view of the great South-West, the great North-West, and the wheat belt, but I have heard very

little from the point of view of the consumer. I am perfectly certain that from the point of view of the consumer Western Australia will never come into its own as a dairying State until some such Bill, as this becomes law; because unfortunately a great deal of Western Australian butter on the local market is of a very inferior quality, and is not only unable to hold its own in the export trade, but cannot even hold its own in the local trade. The Bill presents a remedy in the grading of cream and the ensuring that it reaches the butter factory in proper condition. Until those improvements are effected, we shall never have a thriving butter industry. As to margarine, a commodity rather highly appraised by Mr. Holmes, but which I am afraid he has never tasted, it was my misfortune during the war time to have to consume a fairly large quantity of it. It is not a satisfactory substitute for butter. In the first place it does not possess the palatability that good butter should have. Of course good margarine is better than bad butter. The drawback to margarine is that it is deficient in certain obscure chemical substances known as vitamins, which are essential to the proper nutrition of the body, especially in respect of young people, infants and children. It is because of that deficiency that margarine can never be a proper substitute for butter. If children are denied butter and those qualities supplied by vitamins, and if they are not made up in any other fresh foods, there arise those diseases known as scurvy and other ailments called deficiency diseases of which, of course, we have gross instances in countries like Austria, which unfortunately have been on the verge of starvation. It is because the babies and children of Australia have been deprived of those vitamins which are present in butter and cream to a large extent, and also in other fresh foods, that we have seen those terrible pictures of the infants of Austria. Of course that condition, fortunately, has never prevailed in Western Australia, because people here, if they cannot get butter and cream, do get other substances which contain those valuable vitamins. Consequently, it is a crime against the people when something is passed off on to them as butter, something which does not contain those nutritive properties; the people are being defrauded, because they are unconsciously relying on what they consume as butter to make up those nutritional processes, and if they do not get butter the children suffer. May I say a word in defence of that unfortunate person, the inspector? As it is a dairying Bill, I suppose it would not be inapplicable if I mention that the word "inspector," to Mr. Holmes, is like the proverbial red rag to a bull. I am going to speak in defence of the inspector, because he carries out very important functions. Especially does he do so in the inspection of milk, cream and butter, because, as we know, all kinds of diseases can be communicated to people by the agency of

those substances. The inspector is undoubtedly fulfilling a useful function.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: A qualified inspector is.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: With reference to margarine, and the question of whether colouring matter should be allowed in it that would enable it to be passed off as butter, I am informed by the health authorities that, so far as wholesale and retail traders are concerned, there is no difficulty. Microscopic and other means of analysing which they possess enable them to check the difference between margarine and butter. If the trader palms off a substance as butter which is really a type of margarine, they will be able to detect it quite readily, and prosecute him. In fact, they say there is very little, if any, of this type of fraud committed by the trader. There is one person they cannot get at; that is the person who keeps a restaurant, boarding house or hotel and who palms off upon his lodgers margarine as butter by using some colouring matter. It is only for the protection of this class of sufferer that it is necessary to prevent the colouring matter being added to margarine. If the trader does commit a fraud of this kind, he can be readily detected, prosecuted and properly dealt with. As to the composition of margarine I fancy it started off as a compound of vegetable oil. Probably in the course of trade and with the improvements that have been discovered for making it more palatable, fats, perhaps beef fat, have been added to it. If the Leader of the House will look up the definition of margarine as it appears in the Health Act he will find that it is something like this—it is a substance used as a substitute for butter and is not composed wholly or almost entirely of milk fats. That definition does include those cases in which margarine is made from beef fat. Even if beef fat were added, it would not contain the same amount of vitamins or food properties as is contained in fresh butter. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [8.3]: I realise the necessity for a Bill of this description. A good deal of the butter which has been manufactured in the State is not up to the standard required by the consumers. The Bill is also necessary, because many consumers in Western Australia have a prejudice against Western Australian products, and prefer something which comes from another part of the Commonwealth unless the local article is practically forced upon them. Much of the butter that has been produced in the State has been equal to the imported article.

Hon. T. Moore: No.

Hon. H. STEWART: Some factories have turned out inferior butter, but that has not happened in all cases. It is necessary to have regulations with regard to factories, the standardisation of products, the supply and grading of cream, and to ensure that a uniformly good article is produced. There are

two points to which I desire to draw the attention of the Minister. We are giving a great deal of power to the department in connection with the organisation of the industry. Every department of State, particularly those dealing with the organisation and marketing of any primary products, or the products directly resulting from our primary industries, must realise that every endeavour should be made to regulate for a high grade article, and to see that the cost of production is not unduly raised so as to prevent us from competing with the outside world when we overtake the home consumption. We know what the position has been with regard to butter in the Eastern States and last season's fruit crop. The registration of premises in connection with dairy produce, is already, in a way, provided for under the Factories and Shops Act of 1920. Under that Act these premises are subject to registration and are liable to inspection. This Bill also provides for the registration of the premises and for the payment of a fee which is much greater than is the case under the Factories and Shops Act for similar premises. The Bill provides for a second registration by another department. Unless we withdraw these particular premises from the Factories and Shops Act we shall have two departments authorised to deal with the same set of premises. The definition in the Factories and Shops Act of 1920 was made extremely comprehensive but, in spite of the enormous scope given to the definition, it was apparently not sufficient to satisfy the Minister in charge of the Bill. One subsection of the definition dealing with a factory as it appears in the Factories and Shops Act is as follows—

Any building, premises, or place where steam or other mechanical power or appliance exceeding one horse power is used in preparing, working at, or manufacturing goods or packing them for transit.

Another subsection reads

Any building, premises or place in which articles or goods which are intended for human consumption are manufactured or prepared for sale, but shall not include the kitchen of any shop of the class mentioned in the Fourth Schedule;

Any premises which come under either of these definitions is a factory. The exemptions provide—

That the term factory does not include any building, premises or place in which the occupier manufactures or prepares dairy produce from the products of his own herd. Under this definition these premises and these persons are already exempt but it does not exempt the premises that this Bill seeks to register. In paragraph (d) in the exemptions the Act says—

Any building, premises or place used exclusively for pastoral, agricultural, orchard, vineyard, or garden purposes.

It is a moot point as to whether that exemption covers dairying. Although we tried to

be particularly careful in framing that paragraph, I do not think that a building which is used exclusively for agricultural purposes would be considered as covering the words mentioned in this Bill, namely, "premises used for dairy produce, factory or store." We should not allow this Bill to pass if the interpretation can be put upon it that the Agricultural Department has power to make regulations and to cause the inspection of buildings, while the authorities controlling the Factories Act have a similar power. It is a point that requires careful consideration. I hope we shall make this position clear.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [8.12]: I agree that portion of this Bill is already provided for under the Factories and Shops Act of 1920. Section 18 of that Act provides—

That except as hereinafter provided, it shall not be lawful for any person to occupy or use as a factory any building, premises, or place unless the same is duly registered as a factory under this Act.

In this Bill it is provided that premises have to be registered. Another set of fees has to be paid, although one set of fees is already provided for in the schedule of the Factories and Shops Act. In Committee I propose to move in relation to Clause 25 that the words "fees to be paid in connection therewith" be struck out. This will leave it to the Minister, if he is satisfied that ample provision does not already appear in the Factories and Shops Act, to lay down a schedule of prescribed fees in this Bill. We have had some experience with regard to giving departments power to prescribe fees. We have really given them power which ought to be held alone by Parliament. I suggest to the Minister that in view of the division on another set of fees it might be well for him before the Committee stage is reached to frame a schedule to this Bill prescribing the fees, if it is necessary to prescribe fees in view of the schedule appearing in the Factories and Shops Act.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [8.15]: I support the second reading of the Bill. I have been very interested in the remarks of hon. members as to the possibilities of various portions of the State in connection with the dairying industry. I agree that in the South-West we will be able to produce butter and other dairying products sufficient to cater for our own requirements and for the overseas trade as well. It was reported in the Press that I interjected that there was a butter factory at Wyndham. I want to see one there; there is none there to-day. I pointed out that we wanted the problem in the North handled as well as in the South-West Division. I have said before that the Kimberley Division will provide all the butter, cheese and bacon that Australia requires if that part of the State is handled properly. To-day we find that nothing is done regarding the northern por-



tion of the State, where we have only 7,000 people, but the Government bring forward legislation to deal with the South-West Division only. It is time the Government were awakened to the fact that there are possibilities in the North equal to those in the South-West, if not better. I wish to read an extract from a report furnished by a Government officer in support of what I have said regarding the northern districts. In the course of his report this officer said—

I take it the first great essential for dairy herds is a good class of fodder and an ample water supply. Here in East Kimberley nature has provided both in abundance. Right up the Ord River from Wyndham, then north to the sea line and east to the Northern Territory border, is country that would surprise anyone who, like myself, is only acquainted with the South-West and goldfields portions of our great State. Here on the tablelands is a vast stretch of thousands of square miles of country watered by rivers, creeks, springs, and lagoons. These, I am told, are nearly all permanent. We are now well in the dry season, this being the end of July, and I certainly see no indications to the contrary. The country is mostly undulating and flat with outcrops of lime and sandstone hills. The natural grasses that these plains and valleys are carrying are simply astounding. In the open mess-mate country you have the sugar grass. It grows like a heavy crop of wheat and attains a height of from 10 to 15 feet. I am told if it is cut green when in flower and has reached the height of 8 to 9 feet, it makes a splendid ensilage, it being very rich in sugar, as its name indicates. It would give a yield of at least three tons to the acre. At the present time this crop is harvested by fire, for when it ripens and dries off, the cattle will not eat it and, like the wheat farmers' stubble, it is burned to clear the ground for next season's crop. There is this great difference, however, no ploughing, sowing and harrowing is required. Nature does all this for the man in Kimberley, and within three weeks of a burn-off, you have fresh young grass from the roots six to eight inches long. The same result would follow if the crop were cut and stored at the proper time. I saw some of this grass that had been cut for hay two years ago and it was perfectly sweet. On the river and creek flats there are various other finer grasses, the rice, kangaroo, and a species of Flinders and Kimberley couch (this makes a splendid hay); all of them good stock feed and suitable for hay and ensilage. It will be said that Wyndham is too far away from market, meaning Perth. It is only a few years ago since the same was said about some of the wheat lands; to-day the market for wheat is the world's market and we trust that in a few years' time the same will be said of our butter and other dairy produce, and

if Wyndham is 2,000 miles from Fremantle, it is 2,000 miles nearer Singapore and other great Eastern markets, and when all is said and done, it is not the amount we use inside the State but the amount we export that goes to square the ledger. At the present time, homesteads are 25 to 30 miles apart on country that should have one on at least 1,000 acres. What a benefit this would be to the State! It would be the creation of a new province in which there are few engineering difficulties as regards railways. One port, Wyndham, is already there, another excellent port could be made at Elephant Hill, which has a splendid water way and deep water right to the foot of the hill, as will be shown by my charts and the sounding taken by Captain Harris. I have purposely only spoken of the country I have seen. Mr. Haly, the stock manager of the Wyndham Meat Works, has been in this district for 20 years as stock inspector and manager of Moola Bulla State station. He informs me that practically the whole of East Kimberley is equally good. I have put in this report with a view to helping the Lands Department and pushing on the great policy of filling up our rich empty spaces with as large a farming and producing population as they will carry.

If the Government will bear that in mind when framing a policy for Western Australia and not only for the South-Western Division, it will bear fruit.

The Minister for Education: The Bill is not for the South-West only; it is for the whole State.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I know it is for the whole State, but a great deal has been said about the South-West and that is the only portion of the State to which the Bill will be applied at present. Perhaps I had better not say anything more on the question of the North as it seems to raise the ire of the Minister for the North-West, who has done nothing for that part of the State.

The Minister for Education: Mr. President, I must object to a remark of that kind. The hon. member made what I considered was an incorrect statement and I corrected it by saying that the Bill was for the whole State. What right has he to make such a remark?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I withdraw the statement. I thought the Minister was taking exception to my action in quoting the possibilities of the Kimberley Division for dairying purposes. I want to point out that the North has been neglected and while some people say that the Premier has vision, I think many of the people will live to curse the Mitchell Government unless something is done to develop that part of the State. If that is not done, the Japanese will take it over and our children will be working for the Japanese within the next 50 years.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN (West) [8.20]: Before voting for the second reading of the Bill, I would ask the Leader of the House to explain where the interests of the producers and the consumers come in. I think the Bill is wrongly named and instead of being a Dairy Industry Bill, it should be called the Butter Factory Industry Bill. Right through the measure, I fail to see where the producers or the consumers are protected. Every precaution is taken to see that the persons who start a butter factory have their interests well conserved. Before voting for the second reading, I want to hear from the Leader of the House where these two interests are protected and not neglected.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The public are protected.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Last night Mr. Holmes mentioned in connection with another Bill that it was a State monopoly. We found that it was a State-created monopoly. I am wondering whether this Bill does not mean another State-created monopoly. I fail to see where the Bill protects the dairying industry at all, although it certainly protects the man who invests his capital in butter factories. There is a danger here and we should be guided by past experience. If there is no protection for the producer, who, after all, is the person we should consider first, I think it is the duty of this House to see that he is protected. That man produces cream and, so far as I can see, he has to send it to the factory and the only person who can determine what value the butter fats represent is the manager of the butter factory himself.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Cannot the man check the manager's valuation?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: How can he do that? He has not the instruments.

Hon. J. Ewing: The inspector would do that.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The inspector does not do that. He has a right to go to the butter factory and inspect the instruments and see if they are in order and if they are out of order to rectify them; but the only person who assesses the value of the butter fats is the manager of the factory himself. Butter factories are established in isolated positions and if an inspector goes to Northam, for instance, he may not arrive there when the cream is brought in, consequently he will not be in a position to say what may be the value of those butter fats. We do not know what the regulations may contain for the Bill only refers to "regulations as prescribed."

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How do you propose to overcome that difficulty?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I am not here to propose any such thing.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Yes, you are.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: That is the job of the Government who brought down the Bill. It is not for me to suggest how the difficulty should be overcome.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why don't you suggest an amendment?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Protection should be given to the producer and the consumer.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are here to do that work the same as anyone else.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: We will look after that aspect in Committee. Before voting for the second reading of the Bill I think the Minister, if he desires to have my vote, should point out where the Bill protects the interests of both the consumer and the producer. When considering the position of the industry we must take into consideration the situation that has arisen in connection with other industries such as the manufacture of condensed milk. In Australia the industry is practically under the control of Nestlé's, or the Swiss Milk Company. One by one the condensed milk factories were bought up and to-day we are entirely at the mercy of that particular company. I can see what will happen with our butter factories. It is a simple thing to get the control of the butter market. Then these factories will amalgamate and instead of having a lot of competitors and many butter factories throughout the Commonwealth, we will have one huge combine who will fix the price to the consumers. When discussing the Bill it is just as well that we should know where it is leading us to.

Hon. J. Cornell: Where some think it will lead us!

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The fact is that this is a State-created monopoly and it will later become a Commonwealth-created monopoly and then it will be "good-bye" to the consumers. Mr. Rose referred to margarine. I will vote for a clause which will do away with the colouring of margarine because I do not believe in it. The argument advanced by Mr. Rose was that margarine was chiefly composed of cocoanut oil which was manufactured by black labour. I am opposed to black labour whether it be in the production of cocoanut oil or of anything else. If it is wrong to use an article produced by black labour, we must remember we are assisting people who are employing black labour on ships and crippling our shipping industry.

Hon. E. Rose: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: If it is wrong to use margarine because it is composed chiefly of cocoanut oil, which is produced by black labour, it is equally wrong to cripple our shipping industry by patronising ships employing black crews.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [8.29]: In view of the generally favourable reception given to the Bill, I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the House for any lengthy period and, notwithstanding the remarks that have been made by one very excited member, I propose to confine myself as closely as possible to the Bill. Certain members have indicated their intention of moving amendments in Committee and in order that an op-

portunity may be given to hon. members to consider those amendments I do not propose, should the second reading be carried, to take the Bill to the Committee stage until Tuesday next. I suggest to those hon. members that they should take advantage of the opportunity to place their amendments on the Notice Paper. Reference has been made to the question of fees provided for in regulations. In only one instance is there provision for fees and that is referred to in the clause dealing with registered premises. Even then it is provided that the fee shall be limited to £1. If that were all, I would be inclined to take up the attitude that there was no necessity for any further schedule, but there is need to consider the point raised by Mr. Stewart and Mr. Lovekin with regard to registrations under the Factories Act. It is a matter that I will look into. It seems to me, particularly in view of paragraph (b) of Section 4 Subsection 3 of the Factories Act, in which exemption is given in the case of a person preparing dairy produce from the products of his own herd, the presumption is strong that the factory, as we contemplate it here, must be registered under the Shops and Factories Act. However, that is a matter that can be looked into. Reference has been made to inspectors, and in moving the second reading I pointed out that there is only one officer engaged in this work, and that at the present time he is referred to as a dairy supervisor, whose duty it is to go about instructing and helping rather than merely inspecting. The intention is to appoint one other officer who will also possess qualifications which will enable him to instruct rather than inspect. I do not think that anybody who knows the Director of Agriculture, Mr. Sutton, or the dairy expert, Mr. Hampshire, will imagine that those officers will do anything to hamper people engaged in the industry.

Hon. H. Stewart: They may die, or go.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Of course, and if they die or go I trust that we shall be able to get in their places men of equal enthusiasm. I may point out that quite recently these officers arranged for a course of instruction at the university, and that that was taken advantage of by a number of employees at the factories. In this connection I would like to reply to the remarks made by Mr. Holmes. There is no member in this House who would be less likely to be intentionally unfair than Mr. Holmes, but I think the remarks he made regarding the officials and inspectors were, to say the least of it, ill considered. He illustrated his case by a reference to regulations which he said had been issued in connection with sheep dips. The Chief Inspector of Stock is a man who, I think, commands the respect of those engaged in the pastoral industry. At one time he was elected by those engaged in that industry to a position of great honour and distinction.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But what about the regulations?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Holmes connected his remarks with the appointment of inspectors who, he said, would be likely to be detrimental to the industry, and he left the impression on my mind that just now, in this period of drought and difficulty in the lower Murchison, regulations have been issued compelling persons to provide sheep dips in districts where sheep lice cannot live. I have had little time to investigate the matter, but I am definitely informed by the Chief Inspector of Stock, through the Minister for Agriculture, that nothing of the kind has happened. There is a general obligation on pastoralists when their sheep become infected with tick, to dip them. Some two years ago, because of an outbreak of tick or because of certain reports that there was an outbreak of tick—I have had no time to make a complete investigation—a regulation was framed compelling the provision of dips in certain areas within 30 miles of the coast line in the neighbourhood of Geraldton. That, I do not think, can affect the lower Murchison. I am definitely informed that no other regulation has been framed, and nothing has been done recently to compel squatters in the Lower Murchison to provide dips. I hope the hon. member will pursue this matter until he settles it to his own satisfaction, because I am absolutely certain that neither the Chief Inspector of Stock, nor the Minister for Agriculture, would for one moment tolerate harassing conditions being imposed upon producers in any circumstances, much less in the unfortunate circumstances in which the sheep breeders of the Lower Murchison find themselves at the present time. When an hon. member suggests that an officer like Mr. Weir, the Chief Inspector of Stock, merely for the aggrandisement of his own position, has set up a big department around him, and has imposed harassing regulations upon people who are suffering from a severe drought, it is up to him to make quite sure of his ground, and if he finds that he is wrong, he should be the first to let the fact be understood.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I wish I could answer you now.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member will have ample opportunity to do that. I am speaking from information I have been able to gather during the tea adjournment. If it were a fact that at this time of drought and difficulty in the Lower Murchison, a department is imposing upon sheep breeders unnecessary and harassing conditions, I would support the hon. member in any action he might take to expose those officers, and to prevent a recurrence of such a state of things. I do not believe that the inspectors to be appointed under the measure we are discussing will be other than helpful, and I am sure it is not the desire of Mr. Sutton or Mr. Hampshire to build up an extensive department. I am convinced it is their earnest desire to help and foster the dairying industry. Mr. Rose took exception to Clause 11. We can deal with that more fully when we reach the Committee stage.

Mr. Baglin wanted to know whether the producer was protected. Mr. Rose takes exception to Clause 11 because it protects the producer too much. There are two interests to be considered, the man who supplies the cream, and who is merely the supplier of the cream, and the man who is the supplier of cream and also a shareholder in a factory. Both those interests have to be fairly considered. The framers of the Bill say that Clause 11 does justice between the two. It allows the factory to make an equitable charge, covering all expenses and a reasonable margin of profit which will be properly distributed amongst the shareholders. But it also insists that the producer who is not a shareholder shall, after all reasonable expenses have been met, receive the full reward for the butter fat contents of his cream. I am quite ready to admit that the shareholder is entitled to consideration. Whether the clause gives too much to the producer and too little to the shareholder, or whether, as the framers say, it is fairly put up, we can decide later. Another clause which undoubtedly affords protection and assistance to the producer is Clause 14. The next clause requires the manager of every dairy produce factory every month to forward to the Department of Agriculture, and to suppliers of cream, a statement showing the quantity and value of each grade of butter made in the factory and the quantity and value of cream which the suppliers have been paid for. There again is the element of protection for the grower. I do not see that we can go further than that. If any hon. member can suggest further protection for the producer, the suggestion will be considered, because the aim of the Bill is to protect the producer. Then the hon. member asks where the consumer comes in. It seems to me there is ample protection for the consumer as well, first in the branding of butter so that he shall know what grade of butter he is buying. There is also provision for the prevention of margarine being sold to the consumer as butter. There we have further protection for the consumer. So far as the hon. member's references to a State-created monopoly are concerned, I confess I do not understand them. There is no suggestion of a monopoly under the Bill. There is nothing to prevent anyone starting a butter factory. There are other matters to which I need not refer at this stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

#### BILL—PENSIONERS (RATES EXEMPTION).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [8.42]: Mr. Potter in introducing the Bill did not

advance any sound reasons for the passage of the measure. He seemed to rely solely on sentiment. In that regard the hon. member is unfortunate, for if we are to rely exclusively on sentiment, he should amend the Bill to provide that pensioners "may" be exempted instead of using the word "shall," and then rely on the sympathies of municipal corporations or road boards to extend concessions to pensioners. I would like to assist the hon. member in achieving what he desires, but I fear there are difficulties in the way that it will not be easy to surmount. Therefore, I urge him, before replying, to make further inquiries so as to be able to assure the House that if the Bill is passed the result which it is desired to bring about will be attained. If the concession be granted I would like to have the assurance that the Federal Department will not read into the regulations which I have carefully perused the altered circumstances of the pension holder. This might mean that relief would be granted to the Federal Taxation Department instead of to the pensioners. Among other things the hon. member said the Bill contained no suggestion that the State or any section of the community are in any way to be taxed, and he added that the rates referred to in the Bill would be deferred. That might be applicable to the metropolitan area where a pensioner has a house of some value which would stand an accumulation of rates for a number of years, without fear of their exceeding the value of the house, but in my district the accumulation of a few years' rates would exceed the value of the property. If the corporation could not then recover the amount of rates due, a section of the community would be called upon to make good the shortage.

Hon. G. Potter: Do you object to that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not objecting, but am pointing out difficulties in the way of achieving the hon. member's desires. I do not wish to find, after the measure has been passed, that we have done something to assist the Federal Government. The Kalgoorlie Municipal Council have had this matter under consideration and they point out that 336 pensioners live within a two-mile radius of the G.P.O. There are 260 pensioners living within the Kalgoorlie municipality. Most of them own the premises they live in, and in some instances two pensioners live in the same house. Assuming that there are 200 premises occupied by pensioners, the average annual value of each house or camp would be about £14. The municipal rates are 3s. 3d. in the pound and the water rates 1s. 6d., making a total of £3 17s. 6d. It will be realised that in a matter of five or six years, the accumulation of rates would exceed the value of the property. The hon. member said the rates would be recoverable on the sale of the property or the death of the pensioner. If the property were owned by an invalid or old-age pensioner, assuming that the rates did not exceed the value of the property, there would be no objection except in the case where two

or three pensioners lived in the one house. This Bill employs the term "owner." There is an old-age pensioner whose wife has been an invalid for 15 years. If on the death of the pensioner the property were sold, and the balance handed to the widow, a difficulty might arise. People are not entitled to the old-age pension until they attain the age of 60 or 65 years, and it would be for only a few years that the rates would be deferred; but this would not apply to people in receipt of the invalid pension. An invalid pensioner might be quite a young person and the value of the property would be eaten up by the accumulation of rates. Is it wise for Parliament to practically place in escrow property of this description? It would be equivalent to saying that a pensioner's property should be placed in escrow, and that any debts accumulating would be collectable on the death of the pensioner. I would like an assurance from Mr. Potter that the difficulties pointed out might be overcome by the introduction of amendments. Some corporations would be fairly sure of securing the accumulation of rates, but with others it would be a Kathleen Mavourneen—"it may be for years and it may be for ever." The Bill provides for deferring the rates on water and sewerage. There is a sewered area in the metropolis, but this does not apply to vast portions of the State. I would like the same concession to be applied to the sanitary or pan rate which is the equivalent service charged for outside the metropolitan area. As regards water rates, I would like it made clear whether the exemption is to apply only to water allowed in respect of the value of the property or excess water also. On the golf-fields people have to pay 10s. a year meter rent, which is not payable in the metropolis. If we exempt from the payment of water rates pensioners who live in the metropolitan area, those resident in distant parts should be exempt from this meter rent. An important point raised last evening was in regard to a mortgage on a property. This will need careful consideration. I hope these difficulties can be overcome. I would like an assurance from Mr. Potter that he will go further into the matter and, if the difficulties can be overcome, I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. G. Potter, debate adjourned.

#### MOTION—MACHINERY INSPECTION REGULATIONS.

To disallow.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. J. Cornell—

That the whole of the amended regulations of the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921, laid upon the Table of the House on the 10th day of October, 1922, be disallowed.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [8.54]: In view of the fact that an absolute majority

of members of the Council voted to disallow the regulations dealing with machinery inspection, I had hoped that the department, in submitting a revised schedule, would have given consideration to the opinions expressed by members. I can only regard it as a joke on the Council that the Department should have submitted amended regulations which affect only some five or six of the 58 charges stipulated previously. I regret now that I was so generous as to confine my objections to certain charges; I am sorry I did not move to disallow the whole of the regulations. The regulations came into force on the 3rd July last. On Tuesday, the 1st August, they were laid on the Table of the House, and on the 22nd August notice of motion was given to disallow them. The regulations were rejected on the 19th September. Ten days later there appeared in the "Government Gazette" a new set of regulations to take effect from the 19th September. They were laid on the Table of the House on the 10th October, and objected to on the 24th October. The fees, although disallowed by this House, have been practically collected by the Government as from the 3rd July. I wish to deal briefly with the amendments made by the department. As regards boiler fees, the old regulations provided that boilers of 8 h.p. and under should pay £1. Under the new regulations which were disallowed, the starting point was 4 h.p., showing a reduction of 50 per cent. in the first grade, and the department provided for five grades where formerly there were only three. The boilers of maximum size are the ones on which the charges have been reduced, some of them by 10s., and they number about 40 throughout the whole State. This demonstrates the very small amount which the department are prepared to give away. I also complained that when there were two or more boilers the same fee was charged. Formerly the department charged 25s. for a second boiler of the largest size, and £1 for each subsequent boiler. The department have reduced these charges by 20s. and 15s. respectively for subsequent boilers where two or more are grouped. The new regulation is of such a nature that practically no one will be able to get any benefit from the altered rates. The regulation provided that for two or more boilers inspected on the same day in the same building or on the same premises and within a distance of 400 yards, a lower rate should be charged for the second and each subsequent boiler. In the new regulations tabled, the scale of fees was the same for every boiler. The department have made an alteration which reads—

When two or more boilers over 10 and not exceeding 20 horse power are directly connected with another from the same main steam pipe and form part of the same nest of boilers, and are inspected on the same day, the full fee shall be charged on the first, and for every additional boiler 45s.

The point is that the whole of the boilers have to be connected with the same steam

pipe, and that they all have to be inspected on the same day; otherwise the owner of the boilers cannot be allowed the difference in the fees. In the case of a large nest of boilers being tested, it is impossible to perform the whole of the work on the one day. Therefore the allowance in fees cannot be secured. If it is a mine or a factory where the boilers are used, they will be used at different points where the machinery is working, and therefore will not all be on the same steam pipe; and thus again the alleged allowance will not apply. I have had complaints sent to me by mining companies which have as many as 14 and 20 and 22 boilers. It is impossible to have all those boilers examined on the one day. No one inspector could do it. Further, there is not an instance where the whole of the boilers are on one steam pipe. The concession, therefore, represents an attempt to fool or mislead the House. The next reduction to which I desire to draw attention is that of 10s. on the highest grade of loco. traction boilers. I venture to say there would not be a dozen boilers in the State affected by this reduction. The fees which the 1904 Act fixed for digesters provided for one grade. The amended regulations provide for two grades, and every digester; but the fees remain as heretofore. As regards vulcanisers, I claim that it is unfair to make a charge for every vulcaniser—say the vulcaniser used by a dentist, which is so small that it can be put in one's pocket.

The Minister for Education: Is there no exemption?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is no exemption. No size is specified. Even what one might term toy vulcanisers are subject to a fee of £1 or 10s.; and that is quite unwarranted. The same thing applies to steam jacket vessels. They remain as heretofore. In addition, as regards those which are very light and therefore cannot have the number and name chiselled in, there is increased expense in the way of metal plates. The regulation as to groups of machinery has been amended by again deleting the highest horse power groups; that is the 300. The fee which was charged for the 200 group is now applicable to the 300. I think the regulation would cover 200 groups to the extent of 10s. The number of groups covering that horse power would obviously be very limited, and the concession granted by the department is therefore particularly small. Formerly there were five groups in the machinery section. Now we have nine groups, which fact enables the department to collect the higher fee on so many more grades. Instead of conceding 10s. they have given very little indeed. In respect of machinery not worked by steam, a reduction of 10s. has been made. I previously protested against the duplication of fees as applied to winding engines. The department have made a concession in that direction; but, as I pointed out on a former occasion, there are not more than eight or 10 winding engines in the whole of Western Australia driven by motors. The depart-

ment provides that no fee shall be chargeable except that mentioned in the schedule for the motor driving the engine, whether this motor drives one engine only or other machinery as well. That makes it perfectly clear that a winding engine such as I refer to is to be exempted. But then the department provide a fee of 10s. as heretofore for each Holman hoist, and also a fee of £1 for each cylinder of a diameter of more than six inches. Apparently there is a fee for the hoist and a fee for the motor. The point I wish to make quite clear is that the department have granted the concession, but not as regards any of these hoists, which are found more especially in the metropolitan area. The Chamber of Manufactures and other people object to the method of arriving at the amount of the fee, because it is based on the horse power. They claim that it should be based on the diameter of the drive. The next reform granted refers to machinery driven by steam. The largest winding engines in the State, those exceeding 18 inches in diameter of cylinder, are confined practically to the Golden Mile, the Sons of Gwalia, and one or two mines on the Murchison. Practically none of these largest winding engines are to be found outside the mining industry. On those engines we have a reduction of 10s., where the maximum size of engines are the minimum in number. Whilst the department charge fees for engines not driven by steam, there is no fee at all for an engine driven by steam even up to 1,000 horse power, unless it is a winding engine. It is very necessary to have winding engines inspected; but whilst the department charge a fee for anything under five horse power in the case of a motor, they will examine nothing driven by steam even if it is up to 1,000 horse power. I also object to charges for special work, and on the last occasion I quoted some instances where what I considered unjustifiable charges were made against the Sons of Gwalia mine. The section in question places very wide powers in the hands of the department, and some of the owners of machinery are complaining bitterly that the powers are being used to raise revenue otherwise than contemplated by the Act. The department provide that where the special inspection is required, it shall apply to every place where there is machinery, secondhand or new, in a machinery corporation yard. There are only a few of those yards in the State, and they are all within tram fare distance of the office of the Machinery Inspection Department. The charges made, however, exceed a tram fare; and, furthermore, the time of the departmental officers is charged up. The owners of the machinery complain that such charges are made on them, and that immediately a boiler has been sold, it is inspected again at the premises of the new owner, and another inspection fee is charged. I fail to see any justification for the second fee charged for what is really one inspection. I have here a very strongly worded protest

in the form of a letter addressed by the Western Stock and Trading Company Ltd. to Mr. Willmott, dated the 18th October last. Mr. Willmott is not speaking to this motion, but he had something to say, when the question was before the House previously, concerning what had happened in his province. He says he can verify everything stated in the letter. I will read the letter, and leave hon. members to form their own opinions as to whether it discloses bungling or worse on the part of the Machinery Inspection Department—

Re Inspection of Machinery Act. I understand that you have spoken on the amending Bill to above during its progress through the House and have instanced the case of a Greenbushes resident concerning the way in which fees have been charged to him for a special boiler inspection when same could have been carried out at a considerably lesser rate. We ourselves have had a somewhat similar experience, as on the occasion when an inspector visited Greenbushes for a special inspection to inspect Messrs. Barrymore's boiler, the writer was returning from Greenbushes with another inspector, who joined the train at Balingup, whilst a third inspector left Greenbushes on the previous night on his return to Narrogin, after going from that centre to carry out a special inspection for the writer. Neither Barrymore's nor our own special inspection was warranted, seeing that Inspector Stone was available at Balingup during the time these two other special inspections were made. The department knew of his whereabouts, and could have instructed him to proceed to Greenbushes to carry out the inspection required by ourselves and Barrymore. Instead of this, at a cost of approximately £25 to ourselves, Inspector Ross was ordered to proceed from Narrogin across country to Greenbushes to carry out the inspection required by us. Over £20 could have been saved to us, and almost a similar sum to Barrymore, had the department exercised a little common sense. Inspector Stone could easily have been requested to do these two special inspections, thereby avoiding the necessity of bringing Inspector Ross from Narrogin and Inspector Lees from Perth to the same centre within 24 hours. Under Section 30 of the Act Mr. Barrymore could have been granted a temporary certificate on payment of the ordinary prescribed fee, and subject to the production by him of the report signed by himself as owner and a first class engine-driver to the effect that the boiler was capable of withstanding the pressure desired. It appears that the advantages to be gained under Section 30 of the Act by the owner of a boiler is not pointed out by the department when inspections are requested. We take it that this section was framed with

a view to avoiding unnecessary expense to users of steam power. It would have been a simple matter for the chief inspector to have drawn both Barrymore's attention and our own to the provisions thereof. The only conclusion we can come to in the matter is that it was the chief's deliberate intention to withhold the information. In saying this we have good grounds for doing so. Some little time ago we had two boilers at our yard in Palmerston-street, and we were about to sell same to Messrs. Bunning Bros. We requested an inspection to be made. The two boilers were inspected at the same time by the same inspector, and the inspection occupied about half a day. We received the department's accounts for the inspection in due course, and included in the charges made were telephone calls at head office, tram fares of the inspector, two special inspection fees, and two days' wages. If this is not robbery, we would like to know what is. The fee itself is supposed to cover the inspection and all charges incidental thereto, otherwise what is the fee for? Under the proposed amending Bill now before the House, the charges proposed are outrageous. The old Act prescribed a stated fee, but under the new amending Act it is sought to cover up the robbery that has taken place during the past two years. We, as well as others we have spoken to on the subject, consider that the fee alone should cover the cost of boiler inspection, except when it is necessary for long distances to be covered by the inspector, when ordinary travelling expenses would be willingly paid. We do not, however, see any justification for debits for the following services: telephone calls, inspector's wages, afternoon teas, and so forth. The Act was primarily framed for the protection of life for persons having to engage in the use of machinery. It was never intended that it should become a taxation department. A point worthy of bringing under your notice is the unreliability of some of the inspectors' reports. Quite recently we were instructed to put in 38 tubes in a boiler, each of 2½ in. diameter. Had we done this we should have been mulct in a loss of £80, as the correct size of the tubes was not given. We were also told to swell the end of the tubes to go in the boiler at one end, which we did, but had to swedge them back again in order to get them to fit the boiler, as the swelling was not necessary. Again, the above tubes were condemned unnecessarily, as the tubes so condemned are still in our possession and are quite equal to the new ones we put in. The inspector who condemned them was about two and a half hours inspecting the whole of the above in practically semi-darkness. In that time it was impossible for him to see the condition of the tubes. A single tube was not even withdrawn from the boiler so that its condition could be seen, but looking at the fire end of the boiler he judged the condi-

tion of the tubes from the protruding ends in the fire box. This little mistake on the part of the inspector also cost us £70. The same inspector has recently inspected a boiler for the group settlement scheme and passed it for a high working pressure. Inspector Stone inspected the boiler later when it came into his territory and refused to grant a certificate for the pressure allowed, and the result is chaos. Some 12 months or so ago we had a boiler inspected at Fremantle and passed for a certain working pressure. This boiler was later sent to Harvey, where it was found that the front portion of the boiler was practically worn out, and immediately a hammer was applied to a weak part it went straight through. This little mistake on the part of the inspector cost us £12, our profit on the sale of the boiler. In view of these experiences, is it any wonder that the public, or as a matter of fact, users of boilers, are antagonistic to the Inspection of Machinery Department, leaving out altogether the autocratic and bombastic manner in which the Chief Inspector carries out his duties? In the interests of steam power users we trust that you will make reference to some of these matters when the Bill is being considered in the House.

That is about the strongest letter I have seen dealing with the Inspection of Machinery Department. I have here also, dated 25th August, a protest from the Eastern Goldfields Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association, which embraces practically all the firemen on the Eastern Goldfields and a majority of the higher grade engine-drivers; also one from the Kalgoorlie Certificated Engine Drivers' Union. This is what the union says—

The PRESIDENT: Do you think it necessary to read the whole of it?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I will read only a brief extract, as follows:—

The union takes the strongest possible exception to the heavy charges made for certificates, and earnestly hopes that no delay will take place in the ventilation of the grievance.

Originally there were only four grades. These have now been extended to eight, and the fees on application and issue of the certificates have in several instances been increased 50 per cent. To this the men take strong exception, as also to the fee on application and the fee on issue of certificates to firemen. I believe the whole of the reductions made by the department under the altered regulation do not cover more than about £250. When last we were discussing this, the Leader of the House, in defence of the department, pointed out that they wanted an increase of 40 per cent. I showed by my figures that the increase amounted to 90 per cent. The concessions granted are all to the larger type of machinery, of which there is a minimum number, and the amount of money involved is very small. I claim that the

charges are excessive, and that the department has not given the consideration due to the protests made in the House. I hope the regulations will be disallowed.

On motion by the Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.24 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 1st November, 1922.*

	PAGE
Resignation: Mr. J. J. Simons ... ..	1321
Question: Industrial Award, engineers' ...	1321
Select Committee, Carl Leschen case, to fill vacancy	1322
Bills: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 1A. ...	1322
Western Australian Bank Act Amendment, 1A., Select Committee appointed ... ..	1322
Closer Settlement, 3A. ... ..	1322
Light and Air, report ... ..	1322
Attorney General (Vacancy in Office), returned	1344
Married Women's Protection, returned	1344
The Perpetual Trustees, Executors' and Agency Coy. (W.A.), Ltd. (Private), 2A. ...	1344
Annual Estimates: Votes discussed, Agricultural Bank, I.A.B., Soldiers' Land Settlement ...	1322

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

RESIGNATION—Mr. J. J. SIMONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the following communication:—

The Hon. the Speaker, Legislative Assembly, Perth.—Sir, Herewith I desire to tender my resignation as member for East Perth in the Legislative Assembly. Yours faithfully, J. J. Simons.

It will be necessary for the Premier to move a motion declaring the seat vacant.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the seat be declared vacant.

Question put and passed.

## QUESTION—INDUSTRIAL AWARD, ENGINEERS.

Mr. MANN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Are the Government among the respondents to and bound by the award made by the Commonwealth Court of Arbitration on the application of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, dated 26th June, 1922? 2, Have the Government applied the terms of the award to their employees affected? 3, If not,