

cer's recommendations. The amendment is unnecessary. In actual practice it will not achieve any result, but is likely to set aside the unjustifiable fears of some people in the insurance world—there is no necessity whatever to get excited about the matter—I shall not object to it.

Mr. WATTS: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "after."

An abundance of caution, to which the Minister referred, might be necessary if some other Minister were in office. I can understand the necessity for some superintendence by the Government Actuary respecting regulations dealing with technical insurance details. My intention is to move for the insertion of the words "obtaining the approval of the Government Actuary."

The Minister for Labour: That would make him, in effect, the Government.

Mr. WATTS: The member for Pingelly drew attention to the position that could arise.

The Minister for Labour: A new form of Hitlerism!

Mr. WATTS: Some such provision should be included because the Minister has pointed out that although the Government Actuary may be consulted, no notice need be taken of his views, although he is the officer appointed to advise Governments on statistical and actuarial matters. In view of the Minister's remark, I shall propose the insertion of the word "recommendation," not "approval."

Amendment on amendment put and negatived.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9, 10—agreed to.

Progress reported.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—WAR TIME LEGISLATION.

Prime Minister's Telegram.

THE DEPUTY PREMIER (Hon. H. Millington—Mr. Hawthorn): Before we conclude to-day's sitting I desire, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to make available to the House the contents of a telegram received from the Prime Minister, which will supplement the information that I gave the

member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Triat) yesterday. The telegram reads—

Commonwealth Government would greatly appreciate if your Government would defer price fixation legislation and action pending matter being discussed at conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers in Canberra this week. You have no doubt seen the announcement that Commonwealth Government proposed taking immediate action and desired to co-operate fully with State Governments. You will appreciate it is essential that principles and procedure should be uniform.

In view of the interest taken in this question, I deemed it advisable to make that information available to members.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 12th September, 1939.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	560
Question: Government Departments, appointments, and expenditure on plant	560
Ministerial statement: War between Britain and Germany	561
Bills: Geraldton Harbour Works Railway Extension, 1R.	570
Swan River Improvement Act Amendment, 1R.	570
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, 1R.	570
Testator's Family Maintenance, 1R.	570
Guardianship of Infants Act Amendment, 1R.	570
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 1R.	570
Motion: Metropolitan Milk Act, to disallow regulation	561
Adjournment: Special	570

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to Supply Bill (No. 1), £2,500,000.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

Appointments, and Expenditure on Plant.

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many appointments have been made since the 1st April, 1939, to the Public

Works Department or other departments of—(a) Architectural assistants, (b) Estimating and/or cost clerks, (c) Building supervisors, (d) Foremen, etc.? 2, How much has been expended on building plant, including scaffolding, gantries, cranes, hoists, trucks and tools, etc.?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, (a) Architectural assistants: Public Works Department, 1; Workers' Homes Board, 1; Railway Department (necessary to replace retired officers), 2. (b) Estimating and/or Cost Clerks: Timekeeper-Cost clerks, 4. (c) Building Supervisors, 1 (this was to replace retired officer). (d) Foremen, nil. 2, Expenditure since 1st April, 1939, £579 10s. (Expenditure on building and plant, including, scaffolding, gantries, cranes, hoists, trucks and tools, etc.)

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—WAR BETWEEN BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West [4.40]: When the House last sat less than a fortnight ago, we all fervently hoped that the threatening catastrophe of war might be averted. Events, however, have proved stronger than our hopes, momentous decisions have been made by the British and Commonwealth Governments, and the occasion of our first meeting since the adjournment marks the ninth day of Australia's association with Great Britain in the conflict with Germany. It would be futile to attempt to predict the nature of the contribution that the people of this State might be called upon to make for the successful prosecution of the war, but whatever it may be, we cannot do better at present than carry on our normal activities as far as possible in an endeavour to avoid any dislocation of production and employment. This will entail co-operation of the very highest order by all sections of the community.

That this co-operation will be readily forthcoming is already shown by the assurances given to the Premier by the Leader of the Country Party and the Leader of the National Party that their supporters are prepared to subordinate everything to their efforts to assist the Government in carrying on in the difficult times ahead. Civic authorities, too, have indicated their full support. The Government intends, so far as possible, to avoid bringing

forward any motions or measures likely to cause serious political controversy. Needless to say, the Government is prepared to do its part to the limits of its ability. As members are aware, the Governments of the Commonwealth and States have already reached a basis of co-operation on all the immediate steps that are considered necessary to ensure the national safety of Australia. The House may therefore expect to deal, at an early date, with legislation arising out of the decisions reached at the Premiers' Conference. Pending the return of the Premier, I cannot indicate how far-reaching that legislation may be. If it is necessary for Parliament to treat such legislation as urgent, I am confident that the Government will enjoy the fullest co-operation of every member of this House in ensuring the prompt and immediate dispatch of business.

Members: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The British Commonwealth of Nations has taken a stand based on right and justice in international affairs that will test our capacity in many directions, and I feel I am voicing the sentiment of every member and of the people generally when I say that, as a unit of the Commonwealth of Nations, we are determined to do everything in our power to bring the struggle to a successful conclusion.

MOTION—METROPOLITAN MILK ACT.

To Disallow Regulations.

Debate resumed from the 30th August on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (East):—

That Regulations 102, 103, 104, and 105, and new Sixth Schedule made under the Metropolitan Milk Act, 1932-1936, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 9th June, 1939, and laid on the Table of the House on the 8th August, 1939, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.47]: Before discussing the motion, may I welcome the Chief Secretary upon his return to the House in apparently good health, and express the hope that it will so continue during the strenuous times ahead. I was delighted to hear his statement about the conduct of business in

this House, and the work expected of us in support of the Government for doing all things necessary to play our part in the conflict with Germany. I feel sure that he has voiced the opinions of every member of this House, and that he has 100 per cent. of the members behind him.

When Mr. Baxter moved his motion for the disallowance of these regulations I felt somewhat perplexed because it opens up two distinct issues. On the first of these I am quite at one with Mr. Baxter that the Metropolitan Milk Board should not be permitted to usurp the privileges of Parliament, or interfere with the functions of the Arbitration Court, by endeavouring to bring about by regulation a change in the hours for delivering milk. At the same time, I believe that the arrangement for one delivery a day might prove possible and satisfactory. The view I take is that the public has not raised any outcry against the curtailment of deliveries, but has accepted the alteration in the right spirit and is suffering no inconvenience from the limitation to one delivery a day. These considerations place me in an awkward position because, if I cast my vote in favour of disallowing the regulations and thus preserving the right of the Arbitration Court to prescribe hours, I shall be opposing the principle of one delivery a day and taking an attitude that I have no desire to adopt. However, the months have gone on and different thoughts have occurred to me, and I feel that I now view the matter in a somewhat clearer atmosphere than before. The regulations have operated for three or four months, and the people concerned have now accepted the one delivery per day. I also realise that within a few weeks Parliament must deal with the Metropolitan Milk Board Act on the question of its extension, when amendments can be considered. In view of these circumstances I have now decided that I must deal with the political aspect of the matter, which aspect has been raised by Mr. Baxter. This involves my voting against the regulations for the once a day delivery. The disallowance of those regulations will not cause material changes. People will merely revert to the old conditions temporarily, until Parliament decides the question. Again, the Transport Workers' Association has applied for an amendment of the carters and drivers' award. That amendment supports the board's contentions.

Hon. G. Fraser: But the proposed amendment affects only a portion of the industry.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The carters and drivers' award is a consent award, and the employers and employees governed by it have agreed upon the once a day delivery. They have also agreed that the consent award must operate differently from awards in other industries. I own to a suspicion, strengthened by recent experiences, that the Minister, the board and the union have made up their minds that the once a day delivery shall operate. It could have been put in operation just as easily three or four years ago. The Carters and Drivers' Union, fearing there is a chance of this motion being carried, through its secretary moved the Arbitration Court, last Monday fortnight, for an alteration of the award so as to provide a 44-hour week, the working of a straight shift by milk carters, and overtime and work on holidays to stand alone, and to be paid for separately. These things will represent an additional burden on the distributors, and go a little further than the board's regulations now under consideration. Having all those factors in mind I feel that I can both satisfy my own conscience and afford the people an opportunity to test out the once a day delivery. Thus there will be no great shock caused by the disallowance of these regulations. A difficulty that crops up is that the matter is being put to the House only from the industrial side. The question of public health is not being discussed at all.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And that is a highly important aspect.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Who will contend that old milk is just as good as new, or recently-drawn, milk? Such a contention would be absurd. To say that old and new milk will not be mixed when cows are milked twice daily and delivery is made only once daily is equally absurd. Yet the Honorary Minister thought I would support him in that contention. Parliament has given the milk industry a regulating Act, and the board has fulfilled Parliament's will pretty satisfactorily. The board has lifted milk producers to a highly profitable position. I am sure that our milk producers are receiving higher prices than any other milk producers in the Commonwealth.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do you consider that they are getting too much?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No. However, the Act has to be amended. It is not a perfect measure. It should be on a different basis. There should be better representation of the various industries involved. The regulations under it are six years old, which means that they are antiquated. I repeat that what is now proposed by these regulations could have been done six years ago.

Hon. L. Craig: You agree with the regulations, then?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yes. I believe in one delivery per day, but not in the hours of delivery suggested by these regulations, from 1 a.m. onwards. In that respect the regulations do not give consideration to hygienic conditions and the health of consumers.

Hon. L. Craig: But those hours are the cool hours of the morning.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yes. When a carter goes out, he takes the milk in ten-gallon drums. The householder has the milk delivered to him as from 1 a.m. in pints and half pints. In summer time the atmosphere is then up to 70 degrees.

Hon. L. Craig: Cooler than any other part of the day.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: At that time the temperature of the milk is a fine temperature for the development of bacteria. Under those conditions the householder will be worse off than he would be with a delivery at 5 o'clock in the morning, when he would get hold of the milk much more speedily than under the proposed regulations. Therefore I disagree with the board in respect of hours of delivery. Bacteria form a serious element in the condition of milk. Milk contains many forms of bacteria; and, as the Honorary Minister well knows, numerous infantile troubles, such as summer diarrhoea, are caused largely by milk that is not quite fresh. Under the regulations milk will be allowed to stand in a temperature of 70 degrees or more; and the temperature in the house, with no convenience other than the wet cloth the Chairman of the board suggests people can use, will be higher still. The development of bacteria doubles in 20 minutes. It is also a well-recognised fact that many forms of bacteria enter the system, and that evacuations remove only a third of the bacteria contents. This affects the health of the people, though in

a slow way, and is the reason why milk, fruit and vegetables are advocated as a corrective to conditions existing in the bowels by reason of the fact that various foods, and also bad milk, give rise to deleterious bacteria.

When the Act was before us it did not receive proper consideration at the hands of members, that is to say, the distribution side was not dealt with as it might have been. Parliament made it a producers' measure, and the result has been that the operations of the board, acting under the legislation, have been in the interests of the producer. Thus the aspect of the health of the community, as well as the practical side, have not received that attention to which they are entitled. With regard to the mixing of milk to which reference was made by the Honorary Minister, it is definitely known that the value of milk can be gauged very accurately in the mixing. If close attention is paid to this, I am satisfied that no harm can be done to the health of the community. Milk can also be better controlled in the bulk than by asking householders to keep it in small quantities.

Hon. L. Craig: Would afternoon deliveries, in the heat of the sun, be harmful to the milk?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: There is danger both ways, but I should say that it should be given to the consumer when he is about, and when he can give the milk immediate attention, rather than that it should be delivered at an early hour of the morning when the consumer is asleep. There are many ways in which the milk is handled. I do not know what is meant by "warm milk," whether it be water-cooled or just drawn from the cow. Water-cooled milk goes to the depots where it is brine-cooled. Even if there were small chests at the farms or in houses, they would not be good enough for the purpose of cooling, because the milk would have to stand in bulk and would take a long time to cool. With brine-cooling, however, the control is safer. There is also pasteurised milk, which has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. From experience I am convinced that brine-cooled milk properly controlled and held is about the safest, and the consumer receives it in good condition. It has been said, for and against, that this is entirely

a question of what the local conditions are, and that the whole question can be dealt with in a commonsense way. On the question of milk prices I should like to read a paragraph published in the "Australian Milk and Dairy Products Journal" of the 1st May, 1939. Under the heading "Milk Prices," the following appears:—

Following the reduction of 2d. a gallon in the wholesale price of milk to the farmer, the Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Hogan) has approved of a resumption of the investigation which the Milk Board made in November, 1937, into the retail distribution costs of milk in the metropolitan area. At that time the Board found that, irrespective of profit, the cost of retail distribution was 10d. a gallon for loose milk and 4d. a gallon more for bottled milk.

Since then the basic wage has gone up to the extent of 6s. or 7s., while the hours of the employees have also been reduced, and yet the position remains the same where the producer is concerned. The statement continues—

The Retail Dairymen's Association claims that increased costs compel them to get 1s. 2d. a gallon above the wholesale price for loose milk and 1s. 4d. on bottled milk. In other words, they claim that if they could obtain bulk milk for nothing, they would still require to charge 3½d. a quart for loose milk and 4d. for bottled to cover service costs and allow a reasonable profit. In the course of the inquiry, which has now been ordered, expert accountants will examine the operating costs of large and small dairies. The Board hopes to discover whether the numerous mergers which have taken place in the past two years, with resultant consolidation of retail delivery rounds, and the application of the zoning system have had any result in reducing costs of distribution.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do six dairymen there go into one block?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do the figures you have quoted refer to zoning?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No. In the same journal there is a short article referring to investigations made in Sydney by Mr. J. Gormlie of Pompoora, South Australia. This gentlemen visited Sydney on behalf of producers of milk for the Adelaide City Supply. The article reads—

While in Sydney, Mr. Gormlie had interviews with the chairman of the Milk Board (Mr. Nesbitt), the secretary of the Dairy Farmers' Co-op. Milk Coy. (Mr. Place), and executive officers of the Primary Producers' Union, all of whom, he stated, before he left on his return to Adelaide, had been most

helpful in placing at his disposal authoritative information likely to be helpful to South Australian milk producers in their efforts to improve conditions in their industry.

Mr. Gormlie said that producers of milk for liquid consumption in Adelaide are receiving an average return of about 6d. a gallon—though some were receiving 6½d.—and under present conditions it was not expected that they would be able to hold even that price.

The milk was being retailed in Adelaide at 2½d. to 3d. a pint—equal to 1s. 8d. to 2s. a gallon—but the big distributors, who sold it to the vendors at 10½d. to 11d. a gallon, were not making much out of it.

It will thus be seen that there must be in control a board that understands some of the difficulties; and the difficulties are many. If novices are put in charge, only confusion will result. Consideration must be given to all the interests and eventually we must put a measure on the statute-book that will give the consumer the satisfaction he is entitled to receive for the money that he has to pay. Mr. Gormlie went on to explain that he had been greatly interested to learn the price paid to producers by the Sydney Milk Board and the amounts of the margins allowed by the board to the wholesale distributors in Sydney. He added that he was taking back to South Australia with him a mass of information that would be of much interest and he hoped of considerable value to his fellow milk producers in that State.

The whole question has caused me some concern. My desire is that the board should have every opportunity to test the one-day delivery. I have no wish to confuse that matter with any political issue that may be raised by the motion. I feel, however, that the political issue at the moment is greater than the one-day delivery, which might be jeopardised. Parliament, however, should be asked to ratify the proposals, but in the meantime I intend to support the motion.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [5.11]: I do not wish to cast a silent vote on this question. The Honorary Minister when speaking to the motion attributed party motives to Mr. Baxter and some of his supporters. The hon. gentleman should know that this is a non-party House, and I am certain that the majority of members here try to live up to that principle. Mr. Baxter, however, is in a rather different position

from the rest of us, because for some years he was leader of the House, and so we look to him for a certain amount of guidance. For instance, when a question is brought up I listen attentively to the Minister who may be introducing it, and then I wait to hear what Mr. Baxter has to say. I weigh the evidence and the arguments of both gentlemen and try to arrive at a decision. On this question with which we are now dealing there are two points that we should consider. Mr. Baxter is of the opinion that the Minister is interfering with the Arbitration Court. The Minister has approved of the regulation and so I suppose he must have approved of the board's action. The second question that occurs to my mind is whether it is better to have one delivery a day or two. I have read the Act, and find that paragraph (c) of Section 30 sets out that the board is charged with regulating the supply, sale and distribution of milk to consumers in the metropolitan area. I may be wrong, but it looks to me as if the Act gives the board power to make regulations as to the time when milk shall be distributed. Therefore I cannot agree with Mr. Baxter that the board has exceeded its powers in making these regulations. The next point is whether one delivery a day is sufficient. My family has lived in Perth for over 20 years and only during the last few years have we had a refrigerator. Before that we used to keep our milk cool in a small square water bag which was hung on the back verandah. On only two occasions—so I am informed—did the milk go sour, and that was on account of heavy thunderstorms.

Hon. A. Thomson: You were lucky.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: My mind goes back to our experience in Carnarvon, which has a very hot climate. In that town we received milk only once a day and I have no recollection of anybody complaining about the one delivery. Judging from my experience, therefore, I should say that one delivery is sufficient. Another point that has occurred to me is that the delivery of this milk occupies the time of a great number of young men who, in the near future, may be required for more important duty than that of the delivery of milk. As Mr. Macfarlane has pointed out, the Act governing the board will be before us within a few weeks. Why not let us have a full dress debate on that occasion? We could con-

sider this matter when we are deciding whether we shall vote for a continuation or a repeal of the Act. In view of that circumstance, and also because the regulations have been complied with during the last few weeks, I suggest to Mr. Baxter that to disturb the existing situation would be bad business. Let us permit the regulations to remain in operation for a few weeks and learn their effect. If that effect is unsatisfactory, we can take steps to alter the position when we are discussing the Act.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you approve of the board's overriding the Arbitration Court awards? There is an award in existence.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: If an award exists—

Hon. C. F. Baxter: There is one.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: But the Act gives the board power to determine when milk shall be delivered.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then what is the use of an award?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am sure I do not know.

The Chief Secretary: There is no question of interference with an award.

Hon. G. Fraser: The Arbitration Court prescribes the wages and conditions that shall obtain in the industry. The time of delivery is a different matter altogether.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The Act gives the board the right to decide how the milk is to be distributed. Surely the hours of delivery are an important consideration in the method of distribution.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What is the good of the Arbitration Court then?

Hon. G. Fraser: The Arbitration Court deals with wages and conditions of labour.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I cannot agree that the Arbitration Court should be involved in the question of hours of delivery.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Then why did the union apply to the court?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Perhaps the union made a mistake, or maybe its interpretation of the Act is different from mine. As I read the Act, it gives the board the right to prescribe the hours of delivery. Consequently I must vote against the motion. In doing so, I suggest again that we go into the matter thoroughly when the Act is before us for review in a few weeks' time.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.19]: I have listened with interest to this debate. I endeavoured to approach the matter with an open mind but, as Mr. Macfarlane has said, unfortunately the motion has been dealt with by some members purely from an industrial point of view. The Milk Board was appointed with a view to its improving the conditions of the producers and assuring them a reasonable opportunity to obtain some return for their labour. Before the appointment of the board, the producers had no Arbitration Court to which to appeal. The statement has been made that the Court has nothing to do with the hours of the delivery of milk, but I maintain that it is able to stipulate the hours of delivery by virtue of the fact that it can make an award by which the hours of labour of the men employed in the industry are regulated. Consequently, those who say that the board is not over-riding an Arbitration Court award are wrong. Mr. Angelo stated that probably the union did not understand the Act. That is rather a reflection upon the union and certainly upon the secretary of the union, because it is his job to understand the Act. As a matter of fact, unions are very vigilant indeed in looking after their own interests, and rightly so.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Three opinions have been expressed in this House as to the meaning of the Act.

Member: Apparently the House made a mistake.

Hon. A. THOMSON: As Mr. Angelo has said, several opinions regarding the Act have been expressed. But for many years we have managed to exist without regulations stipulating that milk shall be delivered only once a day. Mr. Macfarlane and others have said that in many instances milk has been delivered only once a day. Mr. Angelo stated that only once or twice to his knowledge had milk purchased by his family turned sour; yet it had been delivered only once a day. All I can say is that Mr. Angelo's family has been very fortunate. Many people have told me they can manage very well with one delivery a day during the winter, but they prefer two deliveries in summer.

Hon. G. Fraser: Your friends must be amongst the 5 per cent. that have two deliveries.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Even 5 per cent. of the people are entitled to express their views. We were informed by the Minister that if certain customers required milk more than once a day, a permit could be granted covering delivery in such circumstances. My opinion is that too many restrictions are being imposed. Surely if only 5 per cent. of the population had been receiving an afternoon delivery, the then existing condition of affairs could have been allowed to continue.

Hon. G. Fraser: What about the additional cost?

Hon. L. Craig: The cost of distribution is an important matter.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am prepared to admit that. Whether the Milk Board will be able to prevent the delivery of milk in the one street by half-a-dozen milk carts is questionable.

Hon. L. Craig: It all takes time.

Hon. A. THOMSON: It does.

Hon. G. Fraser: It will cost a lot of money.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am looking at the matter from the producers' point of view and I am afraid that if the regulations are allowed to continue a reduced quantity of milk will be consumed in the metropolitan area. The milk bars in Perth are very popular, but I am informed that even now some of them use a considerable proportion of powdered milk.

Hon. L. Craig: It is milk, nevertheless.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, but it is not produced in Western Australia.

Hon. L. Craig: No, but that will come.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, I know. I am not aware whether the hon. member was in the House when I was speaking on the Address-in-reply. On that occasion I drew attention to the fact that this State is providing employment in Victoria for 6,500 men who are being paid £4 a week to produce goods exported to Western Australia. If we were producing those goods ourselves we should be able to absorb all the unemployed men in this State. In those circumstances the Government would be in a much happier position than at present. It is all right to say that production of powdered milk will be undertaken one of these days—

Hon. L. Craig: One of Nestle's factories in the Eastern States has closed down but the production by the company in this State has increased tremendously.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am prepared to say that Nestle's factory is performing a useful task in Western Australia and taking a large percentage of our milk off the market. Nevertheless I hesitate to support a regulation which must of necessity, in my opinion, reduce the consumption of milk. I do not intend to cast a vote in favour of the regulation until I am satisfied that the effect will not be in the direction I have indicated. Most of us have received a letter from the Metropolitan Retail Dairymen's Industrial Union of Employers. That organisation is asking why the importation of powdered milk into this State has increased so enormously since the Board came into being.

Hon. G. Fraser: Anybody could tell you that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The hon. member may be able to answer to his satisfaction but the question is being asked by the secretary of that union. He states.—

In 1933-34, when the Board came into being, 914,492 lbs. of powdered milk valued at £35,592 was imported into this State. This has increased to 1,837,245 lbs. valued at £114,862 in 1938-39, showing an increase of 922,753 lbs. valued at £79,270 during the Board's existence. The increase alone in one year (1938-39) was 427,952 lbs. valued at £45,495.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That is not on account of only one delivery being made.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No. I do not think one delivery has encouraged that development. The matter now is entirely in the hands of the Arbitration Court. What happens will depend upon the decision of the court when dealing with the application now before it. If the court stipulates that the hours the men are to work shall be from 1 a.m. to 9.30 a.m., that will mean that those are the hours during which milk will be delivered.

Hon. G. Fraser: You have it altogether wrong.

The Chief Secretary: You have it the reverse way.

Hon. A. THOMSON: What does the Chief Secretary mean?

The Chief Secretary: The Arbitration Court does not control the industry.

Hon. G. Fraser: It controls the employees.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Members representing the Government say that the Arbitration Court does not control the industry, but it certainly does do so to a great extent because conditions under which men work are

definitely laid down, and owing to the vigilance of the union officials, if there is any breach of an award the employer is immediately taken before the court and has to pay the penalty imposed for an evasion of the award.

Hon. G. Fraser: Do not you realise that many men engaged in this industry are employees themselves; that they do not employ anybody?

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is so.

Hon. G. Fraser: The Arbitration Court has nothing to do with them at all.

Hon. A. THOMSON: If that is so, why is the union approaching the court?

Hon. G. Fraser: Because there are some employees in the industry.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am not dealing with that phase at all. The hours will be fixed by the Arbitration Court.

Hon. L. Craig: Only the number of hours.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is so; the court will decide whether the men are to work two shifts or not.

Hon. G. Fraser: No.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask hon. members to allow Mr. Thomson to proceed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: My main reason for opposing these regulations is—

Hon. G. Fraser: Because you do not understand them.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Perhaps all the brains are not with the hon. member who interjected; we may be able to take a broader view than he is prepared to take. The regulations are not in the best interests of the producers, who for many years have been able to get along very well without such restrictions. Nothing has been advanced to indicate to us that these regulations will reduce the cost of distribution and increase the price to the producer.

Hon. L. Craig: They should lead to a reduction in distribution costs.

Hon. A. THOMSON: We have had no proof of that.

Hon. L. Craig: It can be assumed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: We have no evidence that the cost of distribution will be reduced.

Hon. J. Cornell: You may bet your life that people will still pay the same, if not a still greater price, for their milk.

Hon. A. THOMSON: There is every chance of the cost of milk being increased

Hon. L. Craig: On what do you base that assumption?

Hon. A. THOMSON: On the very argument the hon. member uses for a reduction in the cost. We have no evidence to show that a single delivery daily will increase the consumption of milk; on the other hand, there is every indication that it will lead to a decrease in the quantity consumed, at all events in the metropolitan area.

Hon. G. Fraser: There is every chance of the number of producers being decreased if the regulations are defeated.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That will depend upon the attitude towards the Bill that will be introduced later. Mr. Angelo said, "Let us pass these regulations and when the Bill comes before us, we can deal fully with the matter." When I am in doubt on any matter I prefer to leave things as they are to experimenting with questions of this kind. No member has yet been able to prove that these regulations will lead to an increased consumption of milk. I support the motion.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.35]: The issue is clear-cut. Regulations have been promulgated reducing the deliveries of milk from twice daily to once daily.

Hon. G. Fraser: In certain areas.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The only question we have to ask ourselves is whether this is a good thing or not a good thing. The people most entitled to consideration are the consumers.

Hon. A. Thomson: They do not appear to be receiving much consideration so far.

Hon. L. CRAIG: And the children who require milk must receive good milk. What proportion of consumers is having more than one delivery a day? I am told that the number represents between five and ten per cent. of the whole. Probably the figure is nearer five than ten. Very few people, therefore, require two deliveries daily, certainly not more than five, six or seven per cent. That in itself is evidence that two deliveries are not necessary. I have interviewed the Mayor of Fremantle. He is a member of the board, and a man of repute.

Hon. J. Cornell: He is all things to all men.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: And a chemist, besides.

Hon. L. CRAIG: We must take notice of his opinion. He said, "We have not had two deliveries in Fremantle for many years, and do not want that now."

Hon. A. Thomson: If that was done without these regulations, why not allow things to remain as they are?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Apparently the distributors themselves are not satisfied. I am keeping to the point, "Is it a good thing, or is it a bad thing?" I consulted one big distributor and said, "How will these regulations affect you and your customers?" No doubt his point of view is personal. Someone will get a profit out of this new system, and we must not delude ourselves by thinking that it is being instituted for the benefit of someone else. The distributors are probably keen about the change because they are going to save money. Let us agree upon that point. The distributor in question said, "Amongst my customers are nearly 100 babies. I consulted the mothers of the little ones, and told them that since the regulations were promulgated milk would be delivered only once daily. I also said that two deliveries could be made in special cases, on a permit being obtained for that purpose."

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: At the cost of the consumers.

Hon. L. CRAIG: He did not say anything about the cost. The distributor went on to say that not in one case had a mother applied for a second delivery. That is rather extraordinary. A great deal has been said about milk as an essential diet. In my opinion that is all bunkum. Milk is no more an essential commodity than is any other food. It is a good food, and in cases of mal-nutrition it is a complete food. In some instances it is a necessary food. I discussed this matter with one of the leading children's doctors in Australia. He has many patients, and attends several children's hospitals. He said, "I have treated many more cases of children suffering from the drinking of too much milk than I have attended cases of children suffering from an insufficiency thereof."

Hon. A. Thomson: He must have rich patients.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I have said that he attended children's hospitals as well as ordinary patients. When a campaign for the consumption of more milk is introduced, the people who first take notice of it are

those who can best afford to buy the extra quantity. Often they feed their children on milk when that is not really necessary. I have yet to be convinced that two deliveries a day are required. In Melbourne, it appears, the one delivery daily has been in force for many years. In another place, a member said that this was not arranged either by legislation or regulation; it was done by the milkmen themselves. The point is that the customers were satisfied. In this State there has been no outcry from the consumers. Has the Housewives' Association raised its hand in horror at the introduction of the new system? I have not heard a word from it. Has any other organisation of the kind written letters to the papers indicating that children are being starved?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: You may have to wait for an agitation until the summer comes.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The new system has been in operation for more than two months.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: For nearly three.

Hon. L. CRAIG: We have not heard a word from the people most concerned. All the opposition has come from the two Houses of Parliament. Let us agree that the consumers are being well treated. The distributors will supply all their milk by one delivery instead of two, and, I suppose, will make a profit.

Hon. A. Thomson: What about the other 5 per cent?

Hon. L. CRAIG: A man or two will have to be engaged to make those deliveries.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Several men will have to be told off to deal with the permits that are granted.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Very few men would be required to cover the whole of the metropolitan area. If the extra delivery does not pay the distributors, they will not make it. They are not bigger fools than are members of Parliament, and desire to conduct their business at a profit, just as other people do.

Hon. J. Cornell: The hon. member does not suggest that we in this House do things for profit?

Hon. L. CRAIG: If we get the chance, we do. Members must admit that the distribution costs will be reduced. One of the functions of the board is to control the distribution of milk.

Hon. J. Cornell: And some people want it abolished.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The milk supply system for the metropolitan area was in a chaotic condition when the board came into being. The producers received a low price for their commodity, and adopted all kinds of subterfuges in competition with one another. The industry to-day is in a much better condition than it was up to the time the board was appointed, though I admit that the supply and distribution are not what they ought to be. Until a system of zoning and probably bulk storage can be introduced, things will not be as they ought to be. All this takes time and money.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a municipal matter.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Probably municipalities should control the whole business, should purchase all the milk, and distribute it through two or three depots. That, however, is beside the point.

Hon. A. Thomson: That would be the only way to obtain efficient zoning.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Compensation would also come into the question. The third person to discuss is the producer. I have yet to meet a producer who does not want the system. At first, I was a little diffident about the matter, seeing that I represent the producers. I wanted to know how this would affect them. The first person I thought of was the producer, but, so far as I can gather, every producer is in agreement with the regulations. I thought to myself that there must be something in the opposition to the regulations. I asked one man, "Are you to get any more out of the arrangement?" He said, "No, I do not think so." One or two remarked that if the regulations were not agreed to, they might receive less. I do not know whether that assumption is correct. I take it all dairymen are honest and truthful people. They must be; I am one of their representatives and naturally believe all they tell me. They claim there is a danger of the returns they receive at present being reduced if the cost of distribution is not curtailed. We do not desire them to secure less, so long as those concerned—consumers, distributors and producers—are satisfied, and I have yet to learn that they are not. If any member can submit good arguments to me to support the proposal to disallow the regulations, I shall agree to that course, but I have yet to be convinced on the point.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They appear to have been satisfied for 5½ years before they moved.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Time is required, and one step is to secure reduced distribution costs. Until I am convinced that these provisions are harmful to the three sections I have mentioned, I must support the regulations and oppose their disallowance.

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

BILLS (6)—FIRST READING.

1, Geraldton Harbour Works Railway Extension.

2, Swan River Improvement Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

3, Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment.

Introduced by Hon. G. B. Wood.

4, Testator's Family Maintenance.

5, Guardianship of Infants Act Amendment.

Introduced by Hon. H. S. W. Parker.

6, Factories and Shops Act Amendment.

Introduced by Hon. J. A. Dimmitt.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.51]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 19th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 12th September, 1939.

	PAOR
Bills: Life Assurance Companies Act Amendment, Com.	570
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2d.	571
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, 2d., Com. report	571
Contraceptives, 2d., Com. report	585
Railway Level Crossings, 2d.,	587
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 2d., Com. report	589
Reserves (No. 1), 2d.,	591

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

BILL—LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 7th September. Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Labour in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 4—Insertion of new section 58A:

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) of the proposed new section be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

(a) (i) In the case of industrial life assurance policies notice stating the amount due or payable at the date of the notice and informing him that, in default of payment by him within a reasonable time, not being less than fourteen days from the date of service of the notice, and at a place to be specified in such notice, his policy will be forfeited, has been served upon him by or on behalf of the company, either personally or by leaving the same at his usual or last known place of abode or business, or by sending the same by post addressed to him by letter at such usual or last known place of abode or business;

(ii) in the case of policies other than industrial life assurance policies notice stating the amount which will become due or payable within seven days after the date of such notice and informing him that, in default of payment by him within a reasonable time, not being less than thirty days after the day upon which such amount becomes due, and at a place to be specified in such notice, his policy will be forfeited, has been served upon him by or on behalf of the company, either personally or by leaving the same at his usual or last known place of abode or business, or by sending the same by post addressed to him by letter at such usual or last known place of abode or business; and The clause purports to treat industrial life assurance policies and all other classes of