

AYES.

Mr. Fox	Mr. Seward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Keenan	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Warner
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Welsh
Mr. North	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Sampson	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Collier	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Cross	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Raphael	

(Teller.)

Clause 3—

Mr. SLEEMAN: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of subparagraph 3 of paragraph (a) after "certificate," the words "as a solicitor or solicitor and barrister combined" be inserted.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Question thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I move—

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the purpose of considering the Bill in Committee.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	15

Majority for 5

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cross	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Fox	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Wise
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Latham	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. McDonald	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Warner
Mr. North	Mr. Watts
Mr. Sampson	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Seward	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Sleeman	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

In Committee.

Mr. Withers in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3 of the principal Act:

Mr. SLEEMAN: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 21st November, 1935.

	PAGE
Papers: Land at Rocky Gully	1937
Motion: Health Act, to disallow meat inspection regulation	1938
Bills: Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1890,	
Amendment (No. 3), leave to introduce, 18.	1937
Lotteries (Control) Continuance, 28., Com. report	1938
St. George's Court, 18.	1942
Public Service Act Amendment, 18.	1942
Appropriation, 18.	1942
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, 28.	1942
Loan, £2,627,000, 28.	1946

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

PAPERS—LAND AT ROCKY GULLY.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.33]: I formally move—

That Correspondence File No. 932/32 and Classification File No. 283/31, dealing with land now thrown open for selection in the Hay district (at Rocky Gully), be laid on the Table of the House.

On motion by Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS
AMENDMENT.

Leave to introduce.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.34]: In moving for leave to introduce the Bill, I desire to say that its purpose is to insert in the Constitution Act that part of Clause 18 of the Electoral Bill dealing

with the Council's franchise, which has been excised by the House. That is the whole purpose of the Bill. I move—

That leave be given to introduce the Bill.

Question put and passed; leave granted.

First Reading.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, Bill read a first time.

MOTION—HEALTH ACT.

To disallow Meat Inspection Regulation.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter:—

That Regulation No. 4, made under the Health Act, 1911-33, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 1st November, 1935, and laid on the Table of the House on the 13th November, 1935, be and is hereby disallowed.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.37]: I moved the adjournment of the debate to enable the Honorary Minister, who was absent at the time, to reply to the motion. The Honorary Minister has only just received the information necessary to enable him to frame his speech, so consequently I will have to ask the House to grant a further adjournment of the debate till the next sitting.

On motion by Hon. J. T. Franklin, debate adjourned.

**BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL)
CONTINUANCE.**

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [4.38]: I will support the second reading. I am gratified at the way in which the measure has been received by the House. I cannot follow some of the arguments which have been used, especially that in which the lotteries were adversely compared with street betting. I think it was Mr. Cornell who suggested that it might be better to register shops for street betting and do away with the lotteries. I may be dense, but I cannot see why so many people should carry on that doubtful sport, if sport it may be called, of street betting. It is a weird kind of amusement, although all men and women have the right to do what they like with their money.

My observation is that the people who indulge in this recreation, if it can be called a recreation, are usually people living in rented houses and who are very often up against it economically and have no outlook on life. It must be that they receive some sort of stimulus from this recreation. It is a problem that has to be faced in this State as in other States and countries, and I do not think the registration of betting shops would cure the evil. I suggest there should be a counter attraction given to people who follow this street betting. If we could have a long-range house building policy which would give those people some occupation in attending to their own homes and gardens, it would be much better than having them hanging about street corners on Saturday afternoons.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: But a lot of them are single men.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Also unfortunately a lot of them are married people, and as I say, if we had a long-range building policy it would serve as a counter attraction to some of them, and so would provide an outlook for people who at present are down and out and have no future before them. By that means the position would be considerably relieved. Not by any stretch of the imagination can this street betting be compared with the beneficent work of the Lotteries Commission. It is a fact that the Lotteries Commission has not stopped the betting evil in Perth but it certainly has done away with the illicit lotteries, many of which were run properly, but all of which were expensive to run. Indeed the expenses had risen to such an extent that honorary organisers had to pay as much as 30 per cent. and 35 per cent. to ticket sellers before they could launch their tickets into the usual avenues. We all know what an evil it was in Perth. Now, happily, that has all been stopped. The work of the Commission has been very successful. The policy was laid down on solid foundations by the members of the first Lotteries Commission. They were fortunate in getting hold of good men to run the lotteries, and the secretary, Mr. Buscombe, who had previously spent a great many years of his life in raising funds for charitable institutions, is completing that laudable work by successfully running the lotteries to-day. The outside staff of the Commission inspire public confidence and they themselves take the utmost pride in

the success of the lotteries. Great credit is due to the leader of that outside staff, Colonel J. Denton. One thing that has not been mentioned during the debate is the great help rendered by the Lotteries Commission to unemployment relief. It is a pity, but it is true, that after the first year of the depression the public forgot the unemployed. The public are forgetting them to-day, and had it not been for the Lotteries Commission there would have been intense suffering amongst our people. As it is, there are now 20 voluntary committees in operation, and their funds are wholly derived from the Lotteries Commission. No matter how well the Government departments may carry out the policy laid down for them, there is always a gap between the time that a man becomes unemployed and the day when he is eligible for sustenance.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Government discourage that sort of thing.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It has nothing to do with the Government. I have always found the Government officials sympathetic and willing to offer every possible assistance. Many married people would suffer materially were it not for the funds that are made available to relief committees for temporary assistance. This class of work has always been supported by the Lotteries Commission and has done an immense amount of good. It is a reflection upon the people of the State that they have so easily forgotten the unemployed. Young people in full-time work forget the plight of the thousands who are below the bread-line. Every man engaged on relief work is below the bread line, and his wife and children suffer accordingly, but the people have forgotten them. It is a reflection upon all who are in employment and are receiving the basic wage or more, that they should so easily have forgotten those who are out of work. This applies particularly to young men and women who are in constant employment, and spend their pocket money without any thought of the plight of their old schoolmates.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Your Government exempted them from the emergency tax.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: They are not exempt.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes, they are.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If they receive only 15s. a week they are exempt, but they could hardly live upon that. They have forgotten the lost legion, as I would call them.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They should have cause to remember them by paying the emergency tax.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Thousands of these people have no regard for their fellows, who are just as capable as they are of carrying out many different kinds of work. Many of the unemployed are highly qualified, and they have been taught in public schools. Because they have not the necessary influence they cannot get any work. The Lotteries Commission have done good work in that direction. They spend hundreds of pounds annually in providing relief for both married and single people, and I commend them for their sympathetic consideration. In addition the Commission have built up a solid asset in Western Australia in the shape of increased accommodation at public hospitals, infant health centres, and other institutions.

Hon. A. Thomson: There has been a great improvement in the country.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The Infant Health movement was in a bad way a few years ago. We were expecting that as a result of the depression many of the centres would have to cease operations from lack of funds. Some six years ago all the money available was diverted to relief purposes. We were reconciled to the thought that the infant health movement would be sadly restricted in its operations. Thanks to the Lotteries Commission, however, not one infant health centre has ceased operations for lack of funds. No bona fide application to the Commission for funds to keep an infant health centre going has been refused. The Commission are to be commended for insisting that the committees in charge of various charitable organisations should raise money themselves. That is a wise provision. Committees should not be encouraged to rely too much upon the Commission. They should declare themselves both willing and competent to raise funds, and upon their doing that they receive assistance from the Commission. That has been the policy with regard to the infant health movement. Practically half of the money required, about £150 annually, has to be found from public sources in each centre. The committees have to raise some of the money, and the rest is found by the Commission. I am grateful to the Commission for the attitude they have taken up in respect to this movement, and for the sympathetic consideration

we have always received. Even in the case of the model infant health building in Perth, which cost about £2,000, half of the money came from the Lotteries Commission, and there was no difficulty about getting it. I hope to see many other such buildings in different parts of the State, half of the money being raised by public effort, and the remainder supplied by the Lotteries Commission. These are examples of what the Commission are doing. Gambling cannot be defended by anyone. If we cannot stop it, we can at least use the weakness of human nature for the raising of money for charitable purposes. The House would be wise to pass the Bill.

Hon. A. Thomson: You can see the spirit of gambling in the crowds gathered round a motor car in Hay-street.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am pleased to see them there. I know the money is going to be devoted to a good cause.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a case of people hoping to get something for nothing.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No one can defend gambling, but it can be controlled. Gambling is only an appeal to selfishness, and people hope to get something at the expense of others. If gambling is properly conducted we can extract a large sum of money from the public for good purposes. I support the suggestion that the Act should be extended for three years. This would give the Commission time in which to adopt a long-range policy, and carry into effect Mr. Clydesdale's suggestion. That hon. member wishes to have £20,000 a year set aside for the building of a big hospital in Perth. It is a splendid ideal to work for. That could easily be done if the Act were extended for three years, which would give the Commission time in which to make the necessary arrangements. I think Mr. Clydesdale's suggestion should be investigated. If possible a commencement should be made with that scheme at an early date. I see no reason why the Lotteries Commission should not do this, but it would be easier for them if they had three years in which to do it. I support the second reading of the Bill.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [4.55]: Whenever a measure dealing with what is commonly recognised as an evil comes before this House we can reasonably expect it will be the subject of controversy, whether

it be in connection with gambling, drink or any other evil of that kind. On occasions of that sort we shall always find differences of opinion. This Bill has been brought down solely with the object of extending the operations of the Lotteries Commission for one year. Almost every member has taken the opportunity to speak to the Bill. In so doing they have referred to matters not connected with the measure, but what they have said serves as an indication of how they view generally subjects of the kind. In view of the controversy that occurred when the first Bill was introduced, I think it speaks volumes for the Lotteries Commission that the legitimate criticism which has been levelled against their activities has been confined almost solely to the rate of commission paid to the various agents, who are essential for the successful conduct of the lotteries. The criticism had to do mainly with the fact that a mere handful of people have been particularly successful in disposing of large numbers of lottery tickets. I would point out that there is a large number of agents who obtain only a mere pittance of a few shillings a week as the result of their activities. Each of them, however, helps the Commission to make a success of the lotteries.

Hon. A. Thomson: For what sum do you think an agent, who makes a lot of money out of his activities, would be prepared to sell his lottery business?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Such an agent has no more right to the agency than any other person who is selling tickets on behalf of the Commission.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: That would be so in connection with any other business.

The HONORARY MINISTER: As the result of his business acumen one agent may have been more successful than others.

Hon. A. Thomson: I have been told that some agents would not sell their goodwill except for a large amount.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Would those agencies be transferable?

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: I do not think so. Those agents must have the approval of the Commission.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is not right that hearsay statements should be made in this Chamber. Some of them may be rather damaging. I understand what happens is that these agents are appointed by the Commission, and that the Commission may at any time effect a change.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I suppose it would be possible for an agent to negotiate the transfer of his agency to another man?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: With the approval of the Commission.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Commission have power to approve of any person who they think is fit to be appointed an agent. If they are not satisfied with an applicant, they do not give their approval, and that person cannot become an accredited agent. There must be channels through which the tickets are disposed of. Whilst a mere handful of people may make considerable sums of money out of the sale of tickets, the great proportion of agents receive only a few shillings a week from sales. It is only right I should say that as a result of the activities of the Commission during the last year or two various charitable organisations are in a more secure position to-day than they have ever been. In most cases they are not called upon to spend the time, energy and money they had to spend before in the interests of their charitable objective. The Commission have done this for them. I believe that in many cases charitable institutions are in a better position now than they ever were, because their activities have been recognised by the Commission to the extent that they have been provided with at least the equivalent, if not more than that, of what they were previously able to raise themselves.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not know where we would be in the country but for the Lotteries Commission.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It speaks volumes for the Commission that although practically every member of the House has spoken on this Bill not one has had any serious criticism to offer. There has been a suggestion made that those responsible for raising the money should not be responsible for the distribution of it. Let us analyse that as far as the present Commission are concerned. They have very little to do with the raising of the money, and I am advised that their main activity is in supervising the distribution of the moneys available. Certainly there is a secretary and a staff, all of whom are engaged in the distribution of tickets, and whatever arrangements are necessary for the successful conduct of the lotteries that are promoted. Their duties are confined to that particular aspect, but the members of the Commission have the responsibility of dis-

tributing the money when it is raised, and so I cannot see any logic in the suggestion that we should have two bodies, one charged with the running of the lotteries and another with the distribution of the money raised. There cannot be duplication in that event, which, to my way of thinking, is absolutely unnecessary, more particularly when we recognise the fact that prior to the establishment of the Commission there were evils in Perth in connection with the organising of sweeps which had become rampant in the metropolitan area, and which nobody could justify. At every street corner almost, and at every shop door, there were ticket sellers. One could not walk down the street without being pestered to buy a ticket in a lottery, either large or small, and this developed into such a nuisance that every section of the community complained. Since the Commission have operated, however, we have done away with that evil, and it can be said, as far as the selling of lottery tickets is concerned, it has been brought under control; and what is more, a far greater percentage of the money subscribed in this way does go into legitimate channels. That is something we should be well satisfied with, because most of us know that many of the sweeps were very successful from the promoters' standpoint, though not very successful from the point of view of the charities or people on whose behalf permission was granted to conduct them. That being the case, I feel that the continuance of the existing Commission is perfectly justified. I have no doubt the members of the Commission will take a note of the statements made by members of this House regarding the activities of the Commission. The question of advertising is a matter we must leave to the Commission. I do not think it can be said that they advertise too much.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is not the Commission I object to, but some of the agents.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Bill has nothing to do with that, and I do not see how we can deal with it.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Commission must note what has been said here about the publicity some of the agents indulge in.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have no doubt the Commission will take notice of what has been said, and, in view of what has been done in the past, we can rest assured that they will give the matter consideration. Insofar as the continuance of

the lotteries is concerned, I consider they are essential at present. Personally I regret very much that this is just an annual Bill, because I do feel that that has the effect of interfering with the work of the Commission to the extent that it is not possible for them to put into operation a long-range policy; but in view of the decision of Parliament on a previous occasion that it was desired to give permission for only 12 months, the present Bill has been framed accordingly. While I feel sure there will be no objection to the measure being continued for a further 12 months, I consider the time has arrived when we might seriously consider the extension of the period over which the Lotteries Commission shall operate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

- 1, St. George's Court.
- 2, Public Service Act Amendment.
- 3, Appropriation.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.15] in moving the second reading said: This is another Bill to continue an Act that has been in operation over a period, namely the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act of 1932. When first introduced it was a piece of experimental legislation, and like all experimental legislation a little experience has shown that there are certain weaknesses and anomalies which need to be corrected in order that the Act might be operated successfully from the point of view of the people affected. As I said, the Act has been in operation for a little over two years, and it has been found necessary to give consideration to quite a number of points which have arisen. The Minister for Agri-

culture has given consideration to those points and the result is the amending Bill before us. The board constituted by the Act were appointed to control the whole milk trade in the metropolitan area, to ensure a clean and wholesome supply to the consumers, and to endeavour to ensure the orderly marketing of milk in the metropolitan area. In addition, the board are charged with the duty of seeing that there is a regular and sufficient supply. From those points of view I think it can be said that the board have been successful. Certainly it must be admitted that the producer has reaped an advantage in that as a result of the board's activities he has been placed in a much better position than he occupied previous to the establishment of the board. I think it can also be said that the retailer in the metropolitan area has reaped an advantage, and the consumer has received the benefit of a better supply of milk than previously.

Hon. G. W. Miles: At the same price?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Generally speaking, I think so.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It might be a little less.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have been informed that in instances there has been a slight increase and there might be reason for it, but generally speaking there has been no material alteration in the price as a result of the operations of the board. The board have had a somewhat difficult task to co-ordinate the various interests concerned in the supply of milk to the metropolitan area, but regarding the position from the producers' point of view, I think I am correct in saying that those who supply the metropolitan area are in a more secure position than they were previously. This I believe arises mainly from the fact that, because of the operations of the board, they are able to enter into contracts for the supply of milk all the year round. To that extent they are in a better position than they were before when there was so much cut-throat business and unfair competition, and the producer did not receive a fair price for his commodity. Because of the improved financial position of the dairymen, they as a body have been able to effect various improvements to their herds and premises, all of which has helped them to consolidate their position. This

will have the effect of further improving the quality of milk supplied to the metropolitan area. From what I have read of the situation and the reports I have perused, I have come to the conclusion that one other good feature of the board's work is that bad debts, which for quite a long time were a menace to those engaged in the industry, have almost entirely disappeared. If that is so, it speaks well for the work of the board, and it certainly must have the effect of giving the producer and the retailer and all associated with the industry a better opportunity to carry on in the way we expect them to do in producing a pure milk supply for the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Were the bad debts contracted as between the producer and the retailer?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, and from the reports I have received, bad debts have almost been eliminated. There are one or two instances, but there may be circumstances to account for them. Generally speaking, however, bad debts have been eliminated.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do the board explain the reason for it?

The HONORARY MINISTER: There are two reasons which I have already mentioned. The producers are able to enter into contracts with reputable men licensed by the board, and the licensed retailer is in a far more secure position financially than before and is better able to meet his liability because cut-throat competition, which was so much in vogue a few years ago, has, to a great extent, been eliminated.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The producer can go to the board and be sure of getting sympathetic treatment and of having his account paid by the retailer.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Co-operation exists, which is helpful to all concerned. I mentioned that there had been an improvement in the quality of the milk supplied to the metropolitan area. The justification for that statement is that the board for two years have kept a graph of examination tests of the milk supplied. The graph discloses that the samples of milk taken included a much higher percentage of first-class milk than previously, while the number of samples which could be classed as bad has

been reduced considerably. That is a feature of the milk supply of the metropolitan area to which importance should be attached. If there is one thing of importance to the health of the community, it is to secure as pure a supply of milk as possible. The graph contains illuminating figures. Of 600 consecutive samples taken between the 16th May and the 31st August, 1935, compared with a similar number in the same period of the previous year, the number of first grade was 439 against 236. Members will agree that that represents a considerable and desirable increase. The number of samples graded as good to fair totalled 108 this year, compared with 231 last year, while the number graded as bad was 53 this year against 133 last year.

Hon. T. Moore: What happens to bad milk?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Made into butter.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Have you information how the grading is done?

The HONORARY MINISTER: At the moment I cannot answer the hon. member's question, but I will obtain further details later.

Hon. H. J. Velland: Who is responsible for testing the milk?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The board's inspectors take the samples, which are tested at the Government Laboratory. I have mentioned the main points regarding the activities of the board. Weaknesses have become apparent and need to be rectified. The Bill contains provisions to enable the board's activities to be carried on satisfactorily, but no radical changes to the Act are proposed. In the first place the definition of milk has been enlarged to include milk purchased for the manufacture of cream and for use in certain preparations such as milk blocks and flavoured drinks, which are now very popular and are being sold in milk bars established in various parts of the metropolitan area. The sale of such preparations is increasing rapidly and it is considered that the board should have control over that phase of the industry. In the definition of "quota milk" the words "under a written contract" are included. We desire that those words be struck out. There is a good reason for it, as for other amendments, but the proper place to explain them will be in Committee. The term "surplus milk" creates difficulty also because it appears to be in

conflict with the terms "quota milk" and "accommodation milk."

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It should not have been in the Act at all.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is proposed to strike out all the words after "milk" in the second line of the definition of "surplus milk" to make the definition clear and eliminate the conflict with other definitions. The Act contains provision relating to representation on the board. One of the representatives shall be elected by dairymen who are owners or occupiers of dairies within the Dairy Cattle Compensation Act area and have cattle registered under that Act. The other representative is to be elected by dairymen registered outside that area, but there is no provision that they shall be dairymen registered under the provisions of the Whole Milk Act. Consequently a number of unregistered dairymen have the right to vote, and exercise an influence, in the election of a representative on the board. The amendment proposes to restrict the election of representatives to dairymen registered under the Act. Another major amendment is designed to avoid the duplication of authoritative control. Certain sections of the present Act, such as Sections 2, 17, and 28, do not fit very well together. In order to simplify matters, it is proposed to re-model and simplify Section 2. This will remove the existing anomaly which requires a person to take out a registration for dairy premises with the local authority as well as with the board. There has been a good deal of—shall I say—trouble arising from the requirement of two registrations. Section 28 of the Act provides that the personal license necessary under local government legislation is not necessary where a license is obtained under the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act, but it does not go far enough. It should also contain a provision that registration of the premises with the local authority is likewise unnecessary. The fact that the board's inspectors have not been empowered to exercise the authority of health inspectors under the Health Act has stultified their usefulness on many occasions when action was necessary. The Bill therefore contains an amendment designed to clothe the board's inspectors with the powers of health inspectors, but subject to all such appointments being approved by the Minister for Health. The amendment is not designed to over-ride the provisions

of the Health Act. The desire is to have one central control for the purpose of smooth and efficient administration of the Act. The question of licenses has been the subject of review by the board and by the department. Present conditions are loose. I believe I am correct in saying that certain abuses have crept in as a consequence. For instance, the Act does not specify that either a dairyman's or a milk vendor's license shall be local or personal. Once granted, such licenses are not applicable to any particular shop, business, or dairy; and the result is that they are traded in. To that extent, it is considered, the Act should be amended so as to ensure that if a license is issued to a particular person, the premises he occupies or uses shall be perfectly in order.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That applies to shops principally, and not to dairies?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It applies pretty well all round.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It would be a hardship as regards dairies, but not as regard shops.

The HONORARY MINISTER: A license is issued to an individual occupying certain premises, but there is nothing to indicate that the license applies only to that particular person or those particular premises. Once a person has a license, he can go where he likes. While the premises in respect of which the license was granted might have been quite all right from a public health point of view, there was nothing to ensure that the premises to which the holder of the license removed were of a similar character. Privileges granted by the license ought not to be abused.

Hon. L. Craig: Presumably that applies also to farmers and milk producers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. Section 23 of the Act states that a dairyman's license has effect in the dairy area in which his dairy is situated. A vendor's license has effect throughout the district in which a milk vendor carries on business. To enable the board to exercise efficient control, such licenses should be restricted to particular places specified in the license. The board is set up as an authority not only to regulate prices, but also to ensure a clean and wholesome supply of milk to the community. The license is granted on the fact of the holder's having certain hygienic and well-conducted dairy premises. It is a futile position if the holder of the

license can shift on the following day to some other premises which are entirely unsuited for the purpose, and still retain his license, or alternatively, having once obtained his license, can allow some other person, who may not be physically suitable, to carry on the license. The dairyman's license also permits of too wide a scope. A person conducting a small suburban shop in which milk is sold, having been granted a dairyman's license, would be immediately entitled to start in business as a dairyman. Retailers of milk are divided into three classes. There is the retail vendor who sells from house to house; there is the person who sells milk in a shop in small quantities for house consumption or consumption in the shop; and there is the person who sells milk for consumption on the premises, such as milk bars. In order to exercise effective control, the board should have power to issue separate licenses for the various classes of milk vendors; and the Bill provides the necessary machinery to enable this to be done, and also to control the transfer of licenses. Again, the board are anxious to foster the sale of clean and wholesome supplies of cream; and this Bill contains the machinery to enable licenses to be granted for the vending of cream. One other matter dealt with in the Bill is of major importance. The existing Act contains no provision to prevent a person mixing milk that he has bought for treatment, with milk purchased for whole milk purposes, and thereby taking advantage of the cheap price at which the treatment milk has been obtained. That person can thus avoid his obligations and frustrate the intentions of the Act. Furthermore, there is no provision in the Act preventing an unlicensed dairyman from selling his milk to a licensed dairyman. The Bill contains a provision making it an offence to mix treatment milk with whole milk, and for the supplier, or person who is supplied, to take milk from unregistered premises. One other important matter arises in connection with the proposed amendment of Section 30 of the Act, in which provision is made limiting road transport charges to transport from dairy areas to milk stores to be paid by dairymen to milk vendors. The provision is not sufficient, owing to the fact that in many cases the dairyman and the milk vendor are the same person. It is still a vital matter that transport charges should be regulated in order to eliminate cut-throat

competition, to the detriment of other producers. The remaining provisions of this Bill are mainly for machinery purposes. One provision imposes a daily penalty to meet cases in which persons who fail to furnish the necessary returns have been penalised by the imposition of a small fine and have then maintained that they have been punished for the offence, and still refuse to furnish the returns. The Health Act contains a similar provision to meet similar circumstances. Certain provisions are included as regards the taking of action by the secretary or other authorised officer of the board. Such provisions are usually included in statutes of this nature, and they declare that the authority of the officer concerned shall be presumed without proof. In connection with the new provisions as to licenses, some adjustments for existing licenses are necessary. The present Act expires at the end of the year, but licenses under the terms of that Act run from the 1st July to the end of June following. When the board commenced operations at the beginning of this licensing year, they were faced with a difficulty in regard to the currency of the licenses to be issued. On the advice of the Crown Solicitor it was decided to issue the licenses until June, 1936, subject, however, to sooner determination if the Act lapsed. The Bill provides that all existing licenses shall be surrendered. It is particularly necessary that dairymen's and milk vendors' licenses should be surrendered on account of the provisions in this Bill for the issue of four classes of licenses in regard to milk vendors, and on account of the stipulation as to licensing of particular premises where the business of dairying is being carried on. That, I think, is a general explanation of the measure. There are numerous details in connection with the matters I have mentioned. This, like many other measures of the same nature, is really one which can be more conveniently considered and discussed in Committee. Therefore, I propose to content myself with the outline I have drawn. From the information in their possession, I think hon. members will agree that the amendments proposed in the Bill are essential in the interests of all parties associated with the milk industry. While there may be difference of opinion regarding particular amendments, I think it can be said that this is a genuine attempt to make the position more satisfactory not only from the aspect of the

Milk Board but also from that of the producer, the consumer, and all others concerned. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland, debate adjourned.

BILL—LOAN, £2,627,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 14th November.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.45]: The debate on the Bill has covered much ground, and in some respects has proved very interesting. Long before I was elected to this Chamber I read the criticism by members with regard to reckless borrowing. Although such criticism has not ceased, the authority to continue borrowing does not seem to be in any danger of refusal. During the past four or five years, any borrowing that has been resorted to has been justified on account of the effects of the world depression. During that period the Government have been saddled with the serious responsibility of keeping the wheels of industry moving, and that would have been utterly impossible without extensive loan authorisations. I trust that as soon as the State is more fully restored to normal conditions, the amounts provided for in Loan Bills will be considerably reduced. During the early days of the depression, many economists expressed their views regarding what should be done, but it was left to one practical man to save Australia from a financial crash. I refer to the late Sir Robert Gibson, who was then Governor of the Commonwealth Bank. If I am any judge, I feel sure, taking into consideration recent events, the time is not far distant when the powers that be will have to seek the advice of another strong man. For my part, I do not think it is necessary to use loan funds for dealing with our primary products. What the farmers require are payable markets, and anything the Government can do to assist in securing improved marketing will be helpful. The fat lamb industry is expanding rapidly, and very soon will be of considerable financial assistance to the State. Three or four years ago I approached a stock firm with the suggestion that, in order to encourage

stock raising in the district, they should provide saleyards at Pinjarra. I was told that the district did not warrant such an undertaking because there was not sufficient stock. On the other hand, I was informed that if I chose to build saleyards there, the firm would lease them and conduct sales from time to time. Only a little while ago the firm were induced to build the yards and the other day in one yarding they sold 2,500 fat lambs at an average price of £1 per head. Since then several hundred lambs have been marketed at that centre. That goes to show that in the course of three or four years the industry has expanded at that centre until now between 3,000 and 4,000 fat lambs are produced in one season. If a district like Pinjarra can develop to that extent and others expand similarly, it will not be long before we shall be exporting not 150,000 fat lambs, but double that number. The Government have effected good work in assisting prospectors through the Unemployment Relief Department and the prospecting scheme. The work of those men has proved of great benefit to the State. Personally I have great faith in our goldfields, and I am convinced that anything Parliament and the Government can do to encourage the industry should be readily forthcoming. Some people tell us that the goldfields are almost worked out. They advance that contention notwithstanding the fact that almost half the State is auriferous and the deepest shaft so far is down only a little over 3,000 feet. In Johannesburg the shaft of one mine is down 6,000 feet; that mine is still working and there is no croaking heard there. Mr. Angelo referred to the fishing industry and the excellent grounds near Broome. There are hundreds of square miles of similarly prolific fishing grounds between Geraldton and Broome. When we consider the export phase, however, we are confronted with the same old problem of the cost of production. There is a splendid market for salted and smoked fish in Java and the Far East, but it is available only at a price. It would be necessary to put smoked fish on the market in Java at 5d a lb., whereas it costs 10d. per lb. to produce that article in Western Australia.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: It should not cost that much.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: But it does, all the same. While the position is not hopeless,

there are many difficulties to be overcome. I was pleased that the Government were able to render certain help to the pearlers at Shark Bay. Those people experienced a very trying time, and although the pearling industry is lagging to-day, it has been of great value to the State in the past. I am sure that when world conditions return to normal, the industry will revive. The Government have spent large sums of money in connection with pearling. It is interesting to note that there are hundreds of thousands of acres of pearling grounds extending from the South Passage past Useless Inlet and Denham to many miles north of Monkey Mia. A number of blocks were surveyed there, and two pearlers alone had 25,000 acres over which they had the right to fish for pearls. If the pearling grounds are not properly worked, they become congested and deteriorate. It will be seen, therefore, that it is necessary to encourage the industry and assist it to be continued until conditions return to normal. I was rather surprised to hear that the Government had removed the inspector from that part of the coast some time ago. The Fisheries Department shows a profit each year. I know the Government experience difficulty in financing the different departments, but I hope they will be able to reconsider their decision regarding the inspector in the immediate future. I would like to know whether any provision has been made for rebuilding Cave House at Yallingup. The existing premises have been in a dilapidated condition for years, and I cannot understand why the rebuilding scheme has not been undertaken, because it would be reproductive from the outset.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They are concentrating on Yanchep.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: As a member of Parliament, I would hesitate to take any distinguished visitor to Cave House and have to admit that it was a State concern. That is what I think of the position as it stands to-day. There has been some talk about the Government building a hotel at Yanchep. Before they find any money for that purpose, I hope Cave House will receive adequate consideration.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Hear, hear!

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I do not think anyone will cavil at the expenditure in the South-West regarding water conservation schemes. In that category I include the

Canning Dam. The work is costly, but it is of tremendous importance to the State. While some losses must be experienced for the time being, ultimately those schemes will be regarded as eminently sound. In a minor sense, I compare the work with the Goldfields' Water Scheme. The Government deserve every credit for their activities in that regard, and that also applies to the engineers responsible for planning and carrying out the work. While on the subject of water supplies, I hope the Government will not hold up the Serpentine River for future metropolitan requirements. The former Minister for Works (Mr. A. McCallum) stated on one occasion that, in the course of many years, the Canning Dam would prove insufficient for metropolitan requirements, and when that time came it was intended to harness the Serpentine River. In my opinion, it is a wonderful catchment area, and the water would gravitate to Perth, but there is another phase to be considered. The Serpentine flows through a rural district. If additional supplies are required for the city, I believe other sources could be tapped, and I do not think the Serpentine should be touched. The settlers have spent much money in the area from North Dandalup to Byford, and if they are prevented from securing adequate supplies for irrigation purposes, their outlook will not be bright. We know the large amount of money that was expended on the Peel Estate.

Hon. L. Craig: Wasted there.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: That was on account of foolish management. The Peel Estate was purchased for 6s. an acre.

Hon. L. Craig: Which was 5s. 6d. an acre too much.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: That is beside the issue. There are hundreds of acres of first-class land on the Peel Estate. The unfortunate part is that the land is flooded in winter and is dry as a lime-burner's kiln in summer. What is necessary is a water supply for irrigation purposes from the Serpentine Falls. If the river could be reserved for its natural purpose, it would be a step in the right direction. I trust the Government will use every possible endeavour to supply the metropolitan area from some other source when it becomes necessary to do so. Some comment has been expressed regarding the Government sustenance operations interfering with farm labour. It has

been stated that many workers prefer to remain on sustenance rather than accept work on farms. The agricultural industry is not the only one to suffer in that respect. Men could have secured positions in the timber industry, but they were satisfied to remain in receipt of sustenance work, which enabled them to labour for two or three days in the week and spend the other days on holiday.

Hon. G. Fraser: Those men were easily pleased.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: While those conditions obtain, there is always sure to be trouble in that respect. I have no doubt that the Minister for Employment will use every effort to effect an improvement along those lines in due course.

Hon. T. Moore: There are no vacancies in the timber industry to-day.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I cannot say what the position is to-day, but a few weeks ago No. 2 State Mill was working two shifts, and almost every man that came along was given a job. I told two men that they would be able to get work there, but they refused to avail themselves of the opportunity, preferring to remain on sustenance. So Mr. T. Moore can see that I know what I am talking about. Reverting once more to the question of borrowing, as it takes half our revenue to meet our sinking fund and interest obligations, members should always keep that point in mind. I hope the time is not far distant when we shall be able to reduce our borrowing, and I shall do my part to assist in that direction. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [6.0]: I congratulate the Government on their loan programme, notwithstanding that during the course of the debate a member suggested that the Government had looked after their own supporters in the spending of money; that is to say, by spending it in districts represented by their own supporters. I should like to ask that hon. member just where the money coming under one item he mentioned, the provision of buildings, has been expended, and whether it was spent in districts represented by supporters of the Government. The Government have gone on with their loan programme quite irrespective of the political colour of the district in which they were spending money. That, of course, is the right thing to do; where works are most urgently needed, that is where the money should be spent. So

when one comes to examine the loan programme, he finds that there is very little indeed in the contention that the Government have looked after their own supporters.

Hon. J. Cornell: The people on the goldfields have not seen much of it.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not in a position to speak of the goldfields. I repeat that the Government have expended loan money quite irrespective of the political beliefs of the district where it has been spent. That is the correct procedure to follow. Take my own district, for instance: I am likely to have to meet serious complaints from my electors on the score of the non-expenditure of money, loan or otherwise, in my district.

Hon. L. Craig: You are not going to talk about the Fremantle bridge, are you?

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member would not expect a Fremantle member to refrain from any mention of the bridge.

Hon. A. Thomson: We all want to see that bridge built.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is not merely Fremantle that is interested in that bridge, for it is required from a State point of view.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is purely a State concern.

Hon. G. FRASER: Of course. The people of Fremantle probably would be the greatest gainers from the bridge, but still it is in the nature of a State requirement. I was going to remark that Fremantle members frequently have cause for complaint in respect of the loan programme regarding that bridge, and other works. If the Fremantle members protest long enough, probably they will see the bridge built ultimately. We have been protesting for a good many years now, yet we have not succeeded to any extent.

Hon. A. Thomson: Hope deferred maketh the heart sick.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You will have a new Government in time.

Hon. G. FRASER: We have appealed to all sorts of Governments, but without success.

Hon. L. Craig: Who was it started this bridge question?

Hon. G. FRASER: The one thing I am concerned about is that the Government, any Government, will not undertake the cost of the bridge until such time as they are compelled to do so. Another complaint, from the Fremantle point of view, is that we have

not had any assistance from either Federal or State Government in the provision of a dock at Fremantle. One could produce quite a lot of complaints if one wished to do so.

Hon. A. Thomson: You want to keep on hammering at that dock.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, the dock and the bridge, and quite a few other important matters.

Hon. J. Cornell: You are to have a new fort, and new guns.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, but we could do without them. These military preparations may, of course, come in some day, but certainly the bridge and the dock would come in from the very beginning.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: There are plenty of guns at Fremantle.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know that, but I often find them at a little place across the river. There are many items in the Bill which one could refer to, but my chief reason for speaking was to refute the criticisms that have been levelled at the Government for having repatriated to England certain people brought out here some years ago. The matter has been referred to on two or three occasions in this Chamber. I am alluding, of course, to the repatriation of certain migrants. I have had a lot to do with a number of those people, and my complaint against the Government is, not that they have sent some Home, but that they should have sent more.

Hon. J. Cornell: Those who went did not pay their private debts before they left.

Hon. G. FRASER: Nor their public debts, either. If any member here had been mixed up in these cases he would realise that those people had a most impossible chance of making good here, and that the only right thing to do was to repatriate them. I am not speaking of a person who came out here and was satisfied with the country, yet who wanted to go Home again, but of the migrants who are dissatisfied. I have a number of their cases in hand now, endeavouring to get the Government to repatriate more migrants. We have even found that where we have been able to prove a case to the satisfaction of the State that these people should be repatriated, we had then to run the gauntlet of the Federal people, and of the British representative. We have had all sorts of obstacles placed in our way by Mr. Crutchley, the British representative. We have been able to get over

most of those obstacles, but the latest one has proved exceptionally difficult. Mr. Crutchley laid it down that before he would approve of any migrants being repatriated, they would have to submit the names of people in England who would look after them on their return; he would then have inquiries made in England to ascertain the financial standing of those people before he would approve of repatriating the migrants.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is a pity he did not inquire into the financial standing of those people before the migrants came out here.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. A big majority of the migrants were brought here from industrial centres, where they and their people were earning but a poor living, and certainly their people are not in a position to maintain the migrants when they return. Mr. Crutchley did not want to have those migrants thrown on the hands of the British Government. He said the migrants had been carefully selected before coming out here.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Who made the selection?

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know, but certainly it was not well done. It is stated that because the Australian Government had entered into this agreement with the British Government and the migrants had been brought out here, the responsibility was thrown on to the Australian Government. If everything was fair and aboveboard, that might be correct; but unfortunately quite a large number of migrants should never have been sent out from England. In my opinion, the British Government broke whatever contract they made by sending such people here, people who were not physically fit, even when they left England. Not only the doctors who were supposed to examine these people but, I believe, the shipping companies and various other people were keenly interested in bringing these people to Australia, as were also the agents in England, who were getting £1 per head for every migrant they secured. Consequently the agents were not so much concerned about the type of person they were booking as they were with the fees they were receiving. The doctors should have refused to pass many of the migrants, but unfortunately they were sent out here. I do not think the Australian Government are breaking any contract in sending back a number of those people. I have known men who have been here for eight or nine years and

have had no difficulty in obtaining invalid pensions. Yet the invalidity of those people did not arise during the period they were in Australia, and some of them have confessed that they suffered from those disabilities before leaving England. So, as I say, it is not breaking any contract to send those people back Home. Many of the migrants who came out here went first to the group settlements, and thence made their way to the city, having either been put off the settlements or having walked off. Ever since the dole has been in existence they have lived on that. Even if they could secure jobs, it would be impossible for them to do the work, because they are physically unfit for work. When those people are in so weak a state of health, it is unreasonable not to give them an opportunity to get back amongst their friends in England, where presumably they can get some little extra help. Yet we find serious obstacles placed in the way of those people being sent back. I have good reason to know how difficult it is to establish that a person is suitable for repatriation. Even to reach that stage one has to be fortified with medical evidence to prove that those people are incapable of doing any useful work. Then, after reaching that stage, it becomes necessary to get over the barriers raised by the Federal Government, and by the British representative. One of the obstacles raised against the repatriation of those persons is that they still owe some of their outward passage money.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you supporting the Bill?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, and I want to see that special consideration is given to that question. I rose to refute the criticism that has been levelled at the Government for having sent back some of those migrants. I worked out a calculation to determine whether it would be cheaper for the Government to keep those migrants here or to send them Home, and I found that whereas it would cost the Government £1,100 to keep them here for the rest of their lives, it would cost only £150 to send them back.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Why not get them invalid pensions, and let the Federal Government maintain them?

Hon. G. FRASER: That would be quite a good idea. However, I will support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 21st November, 1935.

	Page
Annual Estimates, 1935-36, report of Committee of Ways and Means	1950
Annual Estimates, 1935-36, State Trading Concerns, report	1950
Bills: St. George's Court, 3R.	1950
Public Service Act Amendment, 3R.	1950
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), report	1950
Appropriation, Standing Orders Suspension, all stages	1950
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, Com. report	1951
Supreme Court, 2R., Com.	1951
Limitation, 2R.	1970
Adelphi Hotel, 2R.	1972

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

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, St. George's Court.
 - 2, Public Service Act Amendment.
- Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Report of Committee adopted.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1935-36.

Report of Committee of Ways and Means adopted.

STATE TRADING CONCERNS ESTIMATES, 1935-36.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.34]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Appropriation Bill to be introduced and passed through all stages at this sitting.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have satisfied myself that an absolute majority of members is present and in favour of the motion.

Question thus passed.