

the efficient man must be helped to turn over to other commodities

Mr. Seward: Probably that includes some Great Southern returns. Down the Great Southern the average is only 8 bushels or 9 bushels, the country being unsuited to wheat.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But in the northern areas, where there are 4,730 farmers, over 1,000 of them are producing less than nine bushels per acre.

Mr. Seward: But they would be mixed farming.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not altogether. Even if they were, it would not alter the situation.

Mr. Latham: They ought to be growing oats and sheep.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. And we may have to amalgamate properties in order that they might have sufficient acreage to carry stock. That is evidence that a great many farmers in this country could not have made wheat-growing pay, even at 6s. per bushel. Numbers of farmers in good times, when they were getting an average of 5s. for their wheat, got further into debt. If we have to face a policy of reconstruction in this country, we shall have to take steps in Parliament to put people on a sound basis, helping the men of capacity and industry; but we cannot help the man who has not capacity and industry. I do not propose to say any more on the subject. I will be prepared to discuss the operations of the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Board when the amending Bill is introduced, in a few weeks' time. I will then give details of the administration of that board.

Progress reported.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

- 1, Yuna-Dartmoor Railway.
 - 2, Southern Cross Southwards Railway.
- Without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 7th November, 1933.

	PAGE
Bills: Entertainments Tax Act Amendment, 2R.,	1673
Com. report	1673
Geraldton Sailors and Soldiers' Memorial Institute	
Lands Vesting, 1R.	1679
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2R.	1679
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 2R.	1685
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, re-	
com.	1689

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

BILL—ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd November.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [4.34]: Previous speakers seem to have been more concerned about the promoters of picture shows than about those who will be most affected, namely the people who will have to pay the tax. It is my intention to oppose the Bill principally on the ground that the tax will operate against those people who, under the emergency legislation, have recently had their taxation doubled. Having some knowledge also of the country, I am opposing the Bill on behalf of the country people who, for a reasonably good entertainment, have often to pay an admission charge of at least 2s. 6d. to 3s. In my opinion it would be most unfair if the people of the country did not reap the benefit of this tax remission by the Federal authorities. I cannot agree with the Chief Secretary that it would be likely to have any effect on the future policy of the Federal Government if this State failed to impose the tax said to have been dropped for our benefit. I understand on good authority that there is no intention on the part of any of the other States to re-impose similar taxation. If the Federal Government are sincere in their professions about wishing to release taxation for the benefit of the States, why do not they forego something worth while, instead of a tax that will return a paltry sum of £11,000 a year? For those reasons I shall oppose the second reading.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.37]: As a representative of an industrial province, I feel it will be in the interests of the people not to impose this tax. An amount of only £11,500 is likely to be raised from it, and it must be acknowledged that the imposition of the tax by the State will cause the risk of throwing on to the unemployed market a considerable number of employees. I am satisfied that a number of the amusement companies have been losing heavily. Admittedly they have expensive plants to maintain and their revenue has fallen considerably. The remission of this tax and its non-reimposition by the State would undoubtedly be appreciated by patrons of picture shows particularly, and would help the shows to secure a return of some prosperity. No hardship would be inflicted if the tax were not imposed. The increase in the entertainments tax a couple of years ago has hit the companies hard, and we would do well not to impose this additional burden. Its non-imposition would be productive of more good to the amusement companies and the people than would its collection do good to the Government. Therefore I oppose the second reading.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.39]: I support the Bill. Were it a measure to enact fresh taxation against the people one might reconsider one's attitude, but this is a proposal merely to re-impose on behalf of the State a tax that the people have been paying to the Federal Government for some years. Were it proposed to increase the taxation on the lower-priced seats, again one might reconsider one's attitude, but this tax will affect people who pay more than half-a-crown for their entertainments, and if a person can afford to pay that amount or more for an entertainment, an extra 3d. or 4d. for tax will not make very much difference. I cannot follow the argument that if the tax be imposed by the State, certain employees might be thrown on the unemployment market. We must remember that the tax has been in operation for some years, and merely to transfer the collection of it from the Federal to the State authority is not likely to throw anyone out of work. The people have become accustomed to paying it, and therefore it cannot interfere with employment. Most of the entertainments in the metropolitan area can be

witnessed on the payment of 2s. or less. Consequently, the great majority of people who are paying the existing tax will not be affected. If a patron requires extra comfort when witnessing amusements, he should be prepared to pay for it. The suggestion that a tax of 3d. or so imposed on anybody who is prepared to pay the best part of 3s. for admission to an entertainment does not carry weight with me. I think one of the faults of the picture concerns particularly is that they have attempted to provide too much in the way of comfort for patrons. That is why a large number of the companies find themselves in financial difficulty. The vast majority of people are satisfied with average comfort which is available at an average price, but the additional comforts provided have been the cause of the financial difficulty experienced by picture companies. The greater proportion of the proposed tax would be provided by the people who look for the extra comfort—I except the people who go to the races and to whom the extra tax would not make much difference. When they can pay 10s. or 11s. for admission to the racecourse, I do not think the imposition of a tax of 3d. would keep them away from the races. As I have pointed out, the bulk of the money collected by way of entertainments tax is provided by the people who pay less than half-a-crown for admission, and the comfort provided for those people should be sufficient to satisfy the needs of anyone. I fail to see that the re-imposition of the tax by the State will materially alter the proceeds from the entertainments. When we realise the good that will be done by the proceeds of the tax, we should admit that that will more than counterbalance any disadvantages that may be inflicted by the re-imposition of the tax.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.43]: I oppose the second reading. Apparently we have reached a stage when, immediately the Federal Government release some portion of their taxation, it is fashionable for the State to seize upon that source of revenue. I do not agree with Mr. Fraser's statement that those people who desire to pay more than the average price of admission can well afford to do so. Many people are forced to pay the higher charges simply because they cannot get accommodation in

the cheaper seats. I am quite cosmopolitan, and invariably endeavour to get accommodation in the cheap seats, but frequently I have noticed that three or four rows have been reserved, allegedly for the benefit of people paying the cheaper rates, while I have been compelled to pay a little more.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: If a man is taking his best girl to the pictures he does not mind paying the extra amount.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is only natural. He would feel compelled to take her to the best seats. When they get married, however, they go to the cheaper seats because they cannot afford to pay for the dearer ones. It seems to me that the whole trend of Governments—not only this Government—is to impose as much taxation as possible. We are taxed when we come into the world. We are taxed right through our lives, and when we die, a tax is levied on our estate and cash taken away from it which should go to our dependants.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought you got a bonus when you came into the world.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The parent gets the bonus. The amount which will be collected if this tax is imposed is, comparatively speaking, a small one. When the Federal Government operated in this field of taxation, the tax amounted to 15½ per cent. If the taxation now imposed continues it will be equal to about 7½ per cent., which I consider fairly reasonable. Mr. Bolton has pointed out that those who can afford to pay for the dearer class of accommodation have had their financial emergency tax doubled. It has been increased from 4½d. to 9d. Therefore, with him, I think they are entitled to this small measure of relief. I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [4.49]: Usually I am not in the habit of encouraging taxation; I am rather averse to it. I propose, however, to support this measure, because I think it would be anomalous, now that the Federal Government are no longer imposing this tax, if the State Government did not re-impose it. I remember well when the Federal Government first imposed the tax. At that time the State Government were seeking a new avenue of taxation and they hit upon the idea of taxing the pleasures of the people. Their idea was applauded, because it was considered reasonable that the pleasures of the people should

be taxed in the same way that heavy duty was imposed upon tobacco and also upon spirituous liquor. As I say, the proposal to tax the amusements of the people was, I think, applauded by the whole community; but before the State was able to pass the necessary legislation, the Federal Government got in first.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Which State are you referring to?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: This State. When the Federal Government imposed their tax, they did so on amounts from 2s. 6d. upwards. It was left to the State to collect taxation on amounts below 2s. 6d. If we do not re-impose this tax, then it will be an incentive to the companies providing entertainment for the people to increase their charges for admission.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What about the country people, who are suffering most? Are you considering them at all?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am considering them.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: All their amusements are taxed, not only picture shows.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In my opinion, it would be an anomaly for us to say we should only continue to collect the entertainments tax on amounts up to 2s. 6d. If the caterers of amusement would only be kind enough to increase their charges to 2s. 6d., not only the country people, but also the people in the larger towns would be free of entertainments tax altogether. Those who can afford to pay 2s. 6d., 3s. or 4s. for an entertainment will not object to finding the little extra they will have to pay if this tax is re-imposed. The State should benefit by the imposition of this additional taxation. I shall certainly support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. SIR CHARLES NATHAN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.52]: I desire very briefly to express my views on this proposed tax and to say it is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill. If a person feels he cannot afford to pay 3s. 6d. to attend a picture show, he can buy a ticket for a cheaper seat. I would point out to members who are so solicitous for their country constituents and who object so strongly to the re-imposition of this tax, that the country people would be well advised to stick to the cheaper seats. I have two very definite reasons for supporting the Government in this measure. In the

first place, State Governments have for a long time been crying out that the Federal Government have absorbed too many avenues of taxation. The Federal Government have now vacated this particular field of taxation and therefore, to be consistent, the State Government should step in and take advantage of this means of collecting revenue. Secondly, so long as the financial emergency tax is in force, reducing the salaries of men to the extent that it has done, and so long as the sales tax imposes further obligations on the people, I shall not be a party to the lessening of taxation upon amusements, especially as it is not compulsory for people to purchase tickets for the higher-priced seats.

HON. E. ROSE (South-West) [4.53] It is my intention to support the second reading of the Bill. If any taxation is justified, I consider it is taxation on pleasure. I cannot see how this proposed tax can affect the man on the bread line or the man who cannot afford to pay for the dearer seats. A person who wants the better class of accommodation and can afford it, certainly should not object to the little extra he will have to pay if this tax is imposed. My contention has always been that pleasure and luxury should be taxed; but when it comes to the man on the land or to the necessities of life we should reduce taxation in every way we possibly can. People are taxed heavily in a great many other ways and we hear of few complaints from them about the entertainments tax. Now that the Federal Government have given up this taxation, I think the Government should re-impose it for the benefit of the State, especially in these times of depression, when the Government are called upon to provide money to assist the unfortunate unemployed to keep body and soul together.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [4.54]: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill for the reasons that have been advanced by Sir Charles Nathan. The Government should take advantage of this tax, even if it is a matter of collecting only £10,000 or £11,000 per annum. We are continually asking the Government of the day to carry out works in the country and they must have the revenue to enable them to do so. The

tax is a fair one, because it will be paid by those desiring greater comfort when visiting places of amusement. I always like a good seat myself, and I have no hesitation in saying that those persons taking the dearer seats can afford to pay the tax. If not, they can always get the cheaper seats.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.56]: I do not agree with hon. members who think the Government are doing quite the proper thing in re-imposing this taxation. Reference has been made to the position of country people. I know of entertainments in the country where the charge is above 2s. 6d. I live in the country and have some firsthand knowledge of this matter. In the town where I live I think the lowest charge for admittance to the pictures is 2s.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: It must be a prosperous town.

Hon. W. J. MANN: In many other places the charges are higher. In addition to the cost of the ticket, there is another expense which my colleague, Mr. Rose, has overlooked, and that is that very many of the people who attend country shows have to travel from 15 to 20 miles in a motor car.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If they can afford to do that, they can afford to pay the tax.

Hon. W. J. MANN: This is a different sort of argument from that put up a few weeks ago when the financial emergency tax was under consideration. At that time it was stated that the people were being mercilessly exploited. It was stated that they would be unable to pay the financial emergency tax of 9d. in the pound. Yet the same members to-day say that those same people can afford to pay this entertainments tax. I am surprised the Government have bothered to attempt to reimpose the tax, when the estimated yield will be only the small amount of £11,000 per annum. Had it been the sales tax, or some other tax of that description, it might have been worth while, but I certainly cannot agree that it is worth while imposing the tax for a comparatively paltry amount of this description.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [5.0]: On the whole the Bill has been well received, but there has been some wild criticism of it that will not stand the test of examination. Mr.

Baxter spoke of the disastrous effects of the tax. He said, "Already two substantial companies in the Commonwealth, who were engaged in providing amusement for the people, have gone into liquidation." He added, "If this proposed increased taxation will have the same effect, a very unpleasant position will arise, because the theatre buildings, if closed, will be of very little use for anything else."

Mr. Nicholson expressed himself in a similar vein. "I am wondering," he stated, "whether it would be wise to impose the additional taxation. The imposition of this tax," he continued, "may mean the closing down of houses of entertainment." There are two allegations here launched by Mr. Baxter and supported by Mr. Nicholson. They require dealing with. The first is that this is an additional burden on those who conduct entertainments, and the second is that these people have been having a very bad time and, in effect, this Bill will be the last straw in the back-breaking process. With regard to the statements of both hon. members that this is additional taxation, which may mean the closing down of houses of entertainment, it is clear that neither hon. member has read the repealed Commonwealth Act in conjunction with our Bill. When introducing the Bill I told the House it meant no increased taxation on the people, and I gave figures, supplied me by the Commissioner of taxation, showing, "Commonwealth Tax Repealed," "Present State Tax," and "Tax in this State if Bill passed." The hon. members ignore those figures and persist in saying there is an increase of taxation, despite the assurances to the contrary from Mr. Holmes, Mr. Miles and Mr. Yelland who are not easily deceived.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Increase in the State tax, I referred to.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Such reckless utterances are unpardonable. They are unfair and must mislead many people outside who will conclude that a fresh burden is being placed upon them apart from what has been borne by them in the past.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is a fresh State burden.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Touching the losses of companies who run entertainments, Mr. Baxter quoted two instances in the Commonwealth, of entertainment companies going into liquidation. I should not have been at all surprised if he had been able to quote considerably more. Business generally has

been affected by the great fall in the national income. In the boom times, caterers for amusement of every kind could be counted by the thousands in all the cities. Here in Perth the thing was manifestly overdone, and some would have to go out even if there had been no depression. Any who did go out left a better field for those who survived. The closing down, however, of only two theatres in the Commonwealth is not a matter that should cause astonishment or alarm.

But figures prove that, despite the tax, the picture shows have been doing very well indeed, and there is no indication of any decline in business. For instance, in 1931-2 there were 3,318,131 admissions to picture shows, while in 1932-3 there were 3,474,043. There were 155,000 more admissions to picture shows in 1932-3 than there were in the year before. Is that an indication that the provision of amusements and patronage at the theatres has declined? And this despite the fact that the Mitchell Government doubled the tax in 1930. How does this fit in with Mr. Baxter's and Mr. Nicholson's contention that the business has been declining, and has only taken an upward move during the few days which have elapsed since the Federal tax was lifted. £3,796 are the latest figures available in respect of the contributions to the Federal entertainment tax by those attending pictures, and last year 3,227,788 admissions escaped the Federal tax, out of 3,474,043. Ninety-three per cent. paid no Federal tax because the charge was under half a crown.

Mr. Nicholson tells us that "when the Commonwealth vacated this form of taxation, it was found that there was an appreciably improved attendance at entertainments. And Mr. Baxter goes further and informs us that, during the last few days, with relief from Federal taxation, there has been a wonderful increase of patronage in the better class seats." Where did the hon. members get this information? It could be only from the interested parties, who do not wish to see any tax at all. If 1d. in a shilling—that is what the Federal tax was—is going to influence anyone who has the money to spare and who wants a reserved seat either at a picture show or at a theatre, my ideas of human nature call for revision. And if he has not the cash to spare he should do as Mr. Holmes wisely suggested—"take a lower priced seat, getting the entertainment and economising from a monetary standpoint." But Mr. Baxter's and Mr. Nicholson's information is un-

sound. There has been no increase since the Federal tax lapsed; on the contrary there has been a decrease as the following figures will show. Take the three principal picture theatres.

For the week ended 19th October, the total high-priced admissions to the three picture theatres was 2,308. For the week ended 26th October—the last week of the Federal tax—the number was 3,126 and for the week ended 3rd November, when the Federal tax had expired the figures dropped to 2,456. I understand that some of those who conduct entertainments have been charging the tax and putting it into a Trust Fund in anticipation of the Bill being given a retrospective effect in its passing through Parliament. But that fact does not justify or help the contention that there has been a wonderful increase in the patronage of the better class seats. If the saving of 1d. in a shilling did bring about a wonderful increase, would it not be good business for the companies concerned to sell their high-priced admission tickets free of the late Federal tax and so increase their takings.

Mr. Baxter, in his reference to theatres said, "There is not one house of amusement in Perth that has not shown a loss during the past three years." Again, it would be interesting to know where the hon. member gets his information from.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: From the shareholders.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am informed that the returns furnished to the Taxation Department do not in all cases disclose what he states. At the same time, it is well-known that many of the theatres are over-capitalised, and that the general public are over-catered for in respect of amusements.

It is true there has been a great falling off in the patronage the old time theatres received during recent years, and, while there were 260,000 admissions in 1932 the total reached only 229,000 in 1933. The talkies are responsible. They are strangling theatricals. The Australian actors and actresses and orchestras threaten to become a back-number soon. And more is the pity! An important branch of Australian talent cannot hold its own against the attractions of the gunman and the illicit lover. But 130,000 of those who attended theatres last year—or much more than half—paid no

Federal tax at all, while the total tax realised was only £1,793. Mr. Baxter mentioned the stadiums, but they should be able to struggle along. They paid only £277. At dancing and skating halls there were 634,280 admissions—and only £691 was paid in tax; 577,641 of them paid no Federal tax. Regarding horse-racing, there has been no voice lifted on behalf of the Turf. Yet, it carries the biggest load of all—nearly half of the whole. The turf-frequenter weighed in at £5,103. And he seems none the worse for it. Anyhow he is a good sport. He is silent now.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: He is too weak to speak.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Baxter told us that he was more concerned with the country residents who had very little in the way of amusement, and that many different forms of amusement had to be abandoned in country districts simply because, owing to the tax, it would not pay to hold them. In reply to this, I will quote the statement of the Commissioner of Taxation. He says—

Only in about half a dozen towns, namely, Geraldton, Wiluna, Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Mt. Magnet, Broome and Gwalia are entertainments held with a charge of 2s. 6d. and over for admission. Nearly all the admissions, with the exception of balls are under 2s. 6d.

He further informs me that at all these places seats were available at less than half a crown and so did not carry the Federal tax. Mr. Bolton opposed the Bill on the ground that it would operate against those who have had their taxation doubled under the Financial Emergency Act. Of course that will be so. The Federal Act was in force when the Financial Emergency Act was accepted by members of this House. Mr. Macfarlane says the Bill is not in the interests of the people in his Province. It cannot affect any but those who are well-to-do. I cannot help thinking he is fighting their cause in this House. Mr. Hamersley expressed the view that I hold, that if this tax is released, the price of entertainments, picture shows, theatres and the like, will inevitably go up.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: This is the first taxation measure he has ever approved of.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Mann says there are very few entertainments costing less than 2s. 6d. He holds a view different from that held by the Commissioner of Taxation, who is dealing with such matters every day.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about the other States?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is no concern of ours what the other States do. If they do not choose to amend their law, they may suffer in consequence before long. The Commonwealth relinquished this field of taxation to enable the States to take it up. The Federal Treasurer said so in his Budget speech. If we do not accept such an invitation, we shall be regarded as being flush of money. If we are flush of money, however, why are we submitting a case to the Disabilities Commission for relief? We should only stultify ourselves before that commission if we refused this concession, small though it be. Is it wise that members should reject this measure, and in a month's time demand, through the Disabilities Commission, an increase in the annual grant to Western Australia?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: If the Federal Government reduced the Federal land tax, would the State Government increase it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This Government has always indicated that it is opposed to placing any additional burden upon industry. Other Governments have done so, but we have reduced income tax with a view to stimulating industry. When introducing this Bill, I pointed out the glaring anomalies that would obtain unless we passed it. Admission tickets of 2s. 6d. and over would carry a tax of only 1d. in every 1s., while tickets for less than 2s. 6d. would carry a tax of 2d. in every 1s. The alternative to the Bill is a loss to the State of £25,000 a year. It would be an act of folly to make that sacrifice. I feel sure that the majority of members will support my view and will pass the Bill.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	10
				—
Majority for	6	—

AYES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. V. Picse
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL — GERALDTON SAILORS AND SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL INSTITUTE LANDS VESTING.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.27] in moving the second reading said: Prior to the passing of the Lotteries Act last session, art unions and consultations of all kinds had developed in such a way that there was a demand on the part of many people for a more strict control over them. Eventually Parliament agreed that it was essential there should be some form of control, with the result that the Lotteries Act was passed. At that time many sweeps and art unions were being conducted by unauthorised persons, and in some cases there was a suspicion that the money raised by this means was not reaching the people for whom it was intended, at any rate, to the extent that it should have gone to them. When the legislation was being dealt with it was agreed that a commission should be appointed to take absolute control of all matters of this kind. Under the administration of that commission, control over these funds has been exercised, and the commission themselves have been very successful, judging by the progressive results of the various consultations they have been the means of promoting. Through their efforts, the money which has been contributed to the consultations has been used in the direction intended, namely in assisting various charitable organisations and those in need and in distress. We at least have a guarantee that

the money raised by this means does, to the full extent possible, reach the people for whom a particular appeal may be made. Another point is that prior to the passing of the principal Act, a considerable sum of money was sent out of the State almost every week in support of the art unions or lotteries conducted in the Eastern States. To-day that position has been reversed. While we may not have stopped in its entirety the sending of money from Western Australia to the Eastern States for that purpose, we can claim that the practice has been reduced to a minimum and that, on the other hand, the lotteries in this State have received a considerable amount of money from the other States. Therefore, the Lotteries Commission have answered their purposes to that extent. It may be advisable for me to give members some details to indicate what the work of the commission has actually meant with regard to the money contributed, the way it has been distributed, the costs incurred, and so forth. When the first lottery was held, the members of the commission decided that until they had had more experience as to how the consultations would be received by the public, they would limit the number of subscribers at the outset to 50,000. It was hoped that that number of tickets, at 2s. 6d. each, would be applied for within one month. The first consultation was very successful and £6,918 10s. was subscribed, but not in one month. Of that amount, £3,000, or 43.3 per cent., was paid away in prize money. The expenses in connection with the lottery amounted to £1,276 13s. 4d., representing 18.4 per cent., while the amount available for distribution was £2,641 16s. 8d., or 38.1 per cent. of the amount subscribed. Since that consultation was held, the commission have conducted six others, for five of which I have the figures relating to the amounts subscribed, the prize money, expenses and particulars of the amounts distributed for charitable purposes. I shall not give the whole of the details but it is perhaps desirable that I should place before members the results of No. 6 sweep, which closed a few weeks ago. In view of the success of the first sweep, the commission decided to increase the number of tickets to 100,000 at 2s. 6d. each, and on every occasion since, the consultation has been filled to that number at least. The filling of the consultation has been accomplished each time within four weeks. No. 6 consultation

resulted as follows:—Amount subscribed, £14,347 10s.; prize money paid out, £5,900, or 41.4 per cent. of the total amount received; cost of conducting the sweep, £2,065 7s. 10d., or 14.4 per cent.; amount for distribution to charitable organisations, £6,382 2s. 2d., or 44.5 per cent. of the total amount subscribed. For the whole of the consultations that have been held to the conclusion of No. 6 sweep, the corresponding details are: Total amount subscribed, £77,527 5s.; amount paid away in prize money, £32,100, or 41.4 per cent. of the total subscribed; cost of running the sweeps, £12,627 4s. 4d., equal to 16.3 per cent.; amount for distribution to charitable organisations and others, £32,800, or 42.3 per cent. of the total subscribed. Since then, another consultation has been held. It closed during the week and was drawn to-day. The latest appears to have been the most successful yet conducted by the commission. I understand it is not yet possible to give the actual financial results, nor will they be available for a few days. The consultation was for 100,000 tickets at 2s. 6d. each, but it was over-subscribed to the extent of 32,000 tickets. The prize money was increased by £1,760, making a total of £7,260 available for that purpose. The administrative expenses, which have been gradually reduced during the time the commission have been conducting the other lotteries, were brought down to less than 4½ per cent., which is apart from the usual 10 per cent. that is paid to ticket sellers. When the final figures are available, I shall place them before members. I mention the details of the latest consultation to show that the members of the Lotteries Commission have obtained, and are retaining, the confidence of the general public. That is essential in connection with such an undertaking. Prior to the introduction of the principal Act, a large number of people were more than suspicious that many art unions were not being conducted in the best possible manner, and that an undue proportion of the money subscribed was eaten up in the form of expenses. As a result, the impression gained was that the money made available as a result of those lotteries, was not as much as it should have been. Experience shows that we have altered that position and now the general public are satisfied that the methods adopted are in the interests of the organisations for whose particular benefit the consultations are con-

ducted. When I am dealing with the question of expense incurred in the running of lotteries, I would remind the House that it was usually considered that the cost of conducting an art union or lottery would represent at least 25 per cent. of the amount subscribed. In consequence, provision was made in the original Act to permit the members of the commission to deduct 25 per cent. for the purpose of meeting expenses, that percentage to include the 10 per cent. allowed to those who sell the tickets. Bearing that in mind, and considering that the cost of conducting the first consultation by the Lotteries Commission represented 18.4 per cent., I think the particulars I have given members regarding the reduced cost of the later sweeps, should speak well for the organisation that has been established by the commission. The latest consultation cost a little over four per cent. to run, apart from the 10 per cent. payable to the sellers of tickets. As the organisation becomes a little more perfect, it may be possible to reduce the margin of expense still further. Any reduction effected in that direction must necessarily be to the advantage of either the public or the charity organisations, which have received so much money from the lotteries to enable them to carry on their work satisfactorily. Before dealing with the provisions of the Bill itself, I shall indicate to the House how the amounts for distribution have been allocated by the Lotteries Commission. The hospitals have benefited to a great extent, more particularly those in distant parts of the State. X-ray plants have been provided for institutions whereas, although required for a number of years, the department concerned has not been able to provide the money necessary for the purchases to be made. Not only have the hospitals in the country districts benefited, but a large number of other organisations as well. They have received amounts varying from a few pounds to £2,000. It may be advisable for me to read a list of donations that have been made by the Lotteries Commission since they were first appointed. Here are some of the allocations to date:— School for the Blind, £2,000; Children's Hospital, £1,500; St. John's Ambulance, £1,450; Metropolitan Council Unemployment, £1,200; Parkerville Home £1,200; Blankets for unemployed, £900; Foundling Home, £700; Returned Maimed and Limbless Men's Association,

£650; Chandler Boys' Farm School, £600; South-West Unemployed Relief, Wokalup Boys' Farm School, Tardun Boys' Farm School, Model Homes, Ron Doig Memorial. Clontarf Orphanage and Anglican Boys' and Girls' Orphanage, £500 each; Silver Chain Nursing League, £450; St. Joseph's Orphanage, Unemployed Single Girls' Sewing Centre, and the Braille Society, £400 each; Infant Health Centres, £325; St. Vincent de Paul, £270; Castledare Home, £250; Mental Hospital After Care Committee £225; Fremantle Charities, Salvation Army Boys and Girls' Home, W. A. Deaf and Dumb School, St. John of God Hospital Free Ward, Jewish Orphanage Committee, Children's Protection Society, and Perth Hospital Out-patients Department, £200 each; Cunderdin Hospital (X-Ray plant) and Dwellingup Hospital (X-Ray plant) £175 each; Harvey Hospital Nurses' Quarters, £155; R.S.P.C.A., £117; Yarloop Hospital, £110; Hospital for the Insane, £110; Northampton Hospital (X-Ray plant), Pinjarra Hospital, Surf Life Saving Association, Merredin Hospital (X-Ray plant) and Railway and Tramway Hospital Fund, £100 each. And so it goes on. Those are donations already distributed by the commission. They have a certain amount in hand, the whole of which will be distributed in the near future in a similar way. Many of the organisations assisted by the commission were previously assisted by donations from the Government, and I should say that in some cases that has been effected as the result of the imposition of the hospitals tax. Consequently while it has not been possible for the Government to be as generous to some of those institutions as they were in years gone by, it has been possible for the commission to fill the breach. The commission have been doing excellent work in that direction, and I do not think anyone could cavil at the way they have distributed the funds available as the result of the lotteries. Getting down to the Bill, it is only a small measure, but the amendments it contains are rather important. The first is to increase the number of organisations that, under the heading of "charitable purposes" may benefit as the result of the lotteries.

Hon. E. H. Harris: By, roughly, what number?

The HONORARY MINISTER: By one. It is provided that any body which has for its object the relief of unemployed persons may participate.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Only one such body?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No; any organised body which has for its object the relief of the unemployed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That gives a very wide range.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Not wider than it should. Surely bodies organised to assist the unemployed are entitled to consideration. Prior to the establishment of the commission, many bodies were allowed to organise their own art unions, and so on. To-day many of them are not allowed to do that.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Quite right too.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Then if it be right that they should not do that, I do not see any reason why they should not participate in the funds distributed by the commission. Even at present it is possible for the commission to make an allocation to such a body.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It has been done already.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, but the limit provided in the Bill is £250 out of any one sweep. In the list I quoted a few minutes ago, blankets provided last winter cost £900, from this source alone. When we remember that the sustenance provided by the Government is sufficient only to meet the bare necessities of life, it will be seen that it does not allow for the purchase of blankets or clothing, and so it is necessary that there should be some supplementary avenue of relief. As the result of personal experience, I realise the necessity for having the relief given by the Government supplemented, and I suggest this as being as good a way as any. It would not require any particularly large sum, nor would the Lotteries Commission be expected to allocate a large portion of the money available: but I do suggest that such bodies should be bodies with charitable purposes within the meaning of the Act, and that the commission should have power to donate more than the £250 provided for in the existing Act.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do you contend that sustenance work is charity?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have said nothing whatever about sustenance work.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Yet the purpose of the Bill is to assist charity.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, and there can be no more worthy object. If the hon. member had to live and pay rent on 14s. a week, he would be looking for assistance from some other source. In the list I have referred to, there are one or two other items where the commission have provided money for this purpose, and it is desired to have this amendment in the Act in order that we might so validate what has already been done, and in addition make it legal that donations shall be given by the commission in future.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is the future, not the past that you are concerned about.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Still, it is just as well to make sure about the past. Then there is in the Bill an amendment dealing with the distribution of money by the commission. It provides that all such allocations shall be subject to the approval of the Minister.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Is that not already in the Act?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No, the Act provides that the Minister shall have power to authorise or prevent the holding of sweeps, but it does not give him any power over the distribution of the proceeds.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And a good thing too.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is a matter of opinion. If the Minister is to take the responsibility for the whole of the scheme, he should have some authority over the whole of the scheme. However, that is a point upon which members may differ, and I do not propose any further to elaborate it at present. A further amendment proposes to extend the period during which the commission shall operate. The Act will expire at the end of this year and it is desired to extend it for a further period of three years, making it expire on the 31st December, 1936. The experience of the last nine months, the popularity of the lotteries, and the fact that the public have confidence in the operations of the commission, lead me to believe that the House will concede the point that, instead of the operations of the commission being

limited to 12 months, they should be extended for a further three years in order that the commission might carry on their good work.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Eleven months ago you voted for the Bill being read that day six months.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Even if I did, if I have since come to the conclusion that the Act has made an improvement in the position of affairs, surely I am entitled to change my opinion.

Hon. J. Cornell: Is that the reason, or is it the change of seats?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The concluding amendment in the Bill is designed to provide protection to members of the commission who may happen to be members of Parliament. When the parent measure was introduced, it was generally understood that any member of Parliament who might be appointed to the commission would not be taking any risk of losing his seat in Parliament, the commission not being adjudged an office of profit under the Crown.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: It came as a surprise when some members of Parliament were appointed to the commission.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you now suggest that it is an office of profit?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know. Whether it was understood or not that members of Parliament would be appointed to the commission, we cannot escape the fact that members of Parliament were appointed.

Hon. J. Cornell: The man who said a month ago it was not an office of profit under the Crown now says it is.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not saying it is.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You want to make it an office of profit by giving the Minister control.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There may be some doubt in view of the fact that one person has taken proceedings against a member of the Lotteries Commission. I cannot conceive of that person taking such proceedings against a member of this House unless he had legal advice supporting his contention.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Two hundred pounds of easy money.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is not that person himself a legal adviser?

The HONORARY MINISTER: If there is any doubt at all regarding the position of the member concerned—Mr. Clydesdale, M.L.C.—it is only fair for Parliament to protect him. It should not be necessary for me to go into details. Mr. Clydesdale has been before the public for years. He has been associated with charitable efforts for many years, and has been responsible for raising a considerable sum of money. At no time has any doubt been cast upon his integrity. From personal experience I know that many calls have been made on his time in the interests of charity and seldom has he turned down such a call. Perhaps the success of the Lotteries Commission is due to the fact that he and other members of the commission have had wide experience of the duties. Apart from that, we have the fact that when the Government appointed him, they did not consider the position an office of profit under the Crown. If there is any risk of its being declared an office of profit under the Crown, we should take the necessary steps to protect that member.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If it is an office of profit under the Crown, will the provision in the Bill be sufficient to override the Constitution?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am advised that it will. If the person who has launched proceedings against Mr. Clydesdale goes on with his case, the court will determine the question, I presume, but I am advised that this provision will be sufficient.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is thought sufficient.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have been advised by the Crown Law authorities that it is sufficient, and I certainly hope it will prove sufficient. Summing up, I remind members of the success of the Lotteries Commission, which warrants a continuance of the legislation. I have dealt with the amendments found desirable as the result of nine months' experience. I think the House will agree that when the Government acted in good faith in appointing a member of Parliament to a position on the Lotteries Commission, there is no alternative to taking the necessary steps for his protection and ensuring that he shall not be a loser for having accepted a position under the previous Government. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. M. CLYDESDALE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.6]: For a number of years many people in this State have been subscribing to Tattersalls, the Queensland Casket and the New South Wales lottery. Realising the enormous amount of money that was leaving the State—an amount that was increasing yearly—and also the fact that there was no chance of a State lottery being authorised by this Chamber, I waited in 1931 on the then Minister for Police, Mr. Scaddan, impressed upon him the necessity for stopping the drift of money to the other States, and suggested the appointment of a committee to conduct Western Australian consultations. A considerable amount of opposition was experienced, but eventually an art union control committee of four were appointed by Mr. Scaddan. A large amount of preliminary work had to be done, suitable agents had to be appointed throughout the State, a staff had to be selected, and the public had to be satisfied of the committee's bona fides. The result of their first 21 months' operations exceeded anticipations, with the result that the committee were in a position to distribute the sum of £36,917, and also to pay for plant and furniture to the value of £1,440. The next development was the appointment by Parliament of the present commission. The first consultation was one of 50,000 tickets. Since commencing operations, the commission have conducted seven consultations. The latest one of 100,000 tickets closed to-day with 132,000 subscribers. It operated over a period of four weeks and the tickets were 32,000 oversubscribed. The total amount of money available for distribution since the commission have been in operation, covering a period of 29½ months, and including the payment for plant and furniture, is £72,000. The consultations are now on such a firm footing that next year it is expected there will be available for distribution a sum of approximately £70,000, which should be sufficient to place every genuine charitable organisation in the State on a sound financial footing. A suggestion has been made to alter the present arrangement and to appoint an honorary committee to distribute the money available. In that regard I might mention that when the first committee were about to be appointed, a gentleman well known in this State—well known to me, anyhow—secured the nomination of himself to be placed on the Board of no fewer than seven institutions under the promise of a guarantee of

liberal treatment to those institutions should he be elected as their representative. I discovered later that he intended to have himself elected as secretary to each organisation to look after its interests, and, of course, with considerable benefit to himself. If a new committee were appointed, the persons selected would not be able for a considerable time to gauge the merits of the enormous number of claims submitted, and I should imagine that a great deal of overlapping would take place. Further, their positions being honorary, they would be responsible to themselves only. Considering the large amount involved, such an arrangement would not be at all satisfactory. The members of the present commission have distributed over £70,000 and have received only two complaints, neither of which was genuine. There are two clauses in the Bill that no doubt will be keenly debated. Both those clauses were inserted at my request as chairman of the commission. Our auditor queried items for unemployment relief and required the sanction of the Minister for such transactions. I am satisfied that the auditor's reading of the Act was wrong, but to set my mind at rest, I requested the Minister to make the necessary provision in the Bill. I assure members there is no other motive behind the inclusion of those clauses. There are clauses dealing with retrospective legislation. I do not intend to discuss them beyond saying that, before accepting office, I was assured that my position was legally sound. Otherwise I should never have dreamed of accepting the office. The consultations have now developed into a big business which has to be run on commercial lines. It requires a big staff and strict supervision, as we have no fewer than 300 agents. We conducted the first sweep of 50,000 subscribers in 11 weeks. The sweep just closed has taken only four weeks and there are 132,000 subscribers. Members need not fear any danger of the sweeps being carried to excess, because the Act was wisely drafted and limited the number of consultations to 15 per annum. In this respect the position in Western Australia is better than that in either Queensland or New South Wales, where, apparently, much less restraint is being exercised. My experience is that, as time goes on, the tendency is for each sweep to occupy a shorter period than its predecessor, and some people would want a lottery every day. From all over the State we are receiving requests to conduct consulta-

tions more frequently. My contention is that what is a use to-day would, by holding consultations too frequently and taking from the people more money than they could afford, become an abuse. There have been constant attacks by a section of the Press on the Lotteries Commission and the consultations, but members of the commission had a duty to perform and they performed it. Had they adopted a different course, there is no doubt that the newspapers that now criticise and blame them would be singing their praises. Personally, I feel that my original objective has been achieved, and that with sound management the position can be maintained. Tens of thousands of pounds were leaving Western Australia every year for sweeps in other States and other countries before the committee, of which I have the honour to be chairman, took charge. We have stopped that heavy drift; on the contrary, we are now attracting to our sweeps money from outside sources. I may mention that for one sweep alone we received 4,000 letters from the Eastern States, and a considerable amount of money is being diverted to this State. In fact, we are advertising our lotteries on the screens in Brisbane in opposition to the Queensland lotteries. The deserving charities of the State are now assured of a regular income, and it must be a great relief to them to know that such is the position. I am proud of the fact that the costs of conducting the consultations are so low, being under 4½ per cent. of the moneys contributed. This result, I believe, is unequalled anywhere in Australia. I support the second reading.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [6.13]: I support the second reading, but in Committee I shall vote against several of the clauses. I propose to support the clause relating to the appointment of Mr. Clydesdale. The great support given to the commission by the country districts has been due, I believe, to the confidence reposed in Mr. Clydesdale and other members of the commission. Undoubtedly they are to be congratulated on the low percentage of cost to control the lotteries.

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

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd November.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [7.30]: When introducing the Bill, the Honorary Minister made out a case to justify some of the proposed amendments embodied in it. He described as cumbersome and slow the procedure necessary to gazette amended boundaries of fire brigades, municipalities and townships throughout the State, and explained how it could be simplified. To my mind, his reasons appeared very sound and they might command the support of members. Replying to an interjection by Mr. Hall, he said that the fire brigades unions have on several occasions requested the appointment of a representative on the board. I presume that request was made in pursuance of the platform of the Labour Party, Plank 8 of which reads—

Workers' representatives on management of State enterprises and public utilities.

I have here also an extract from "The Worker" newspaper of the 15th September reading—

With respect to the question of appointments on public boards being filled by members of the Labour Party, the Parliamentary Labour Party has notified the State executive that the Government may be relied on to give effect to this policy wherever possible, and pointing out further that instances might arise in which the principle could not be adhered to rigidly.

That shows the activity at present displayed by the Labour movement to secure representation on these boards. The newspaper also states—

The State Executive at its last meeting decided to support a request from the Metropolitan Council that the Premier should be approached by a deputation for the purpose of introducing legislation to create a State Gardens Board.

We have had an instance of the Government appointing representatives on various boards when we look at, say, the Licensing Bench, which comprises three ardent Labourites, and also when we consider the appointment to the Rottneest Board. I presume, therefore, that the Labour unions are really responsible for this Bill being brought before the House. The Honorary Minister said—

Much depends on those attributes of co-operation and goodwill, and it may mean that

the preservation of life and property might be affected if we do not have thorough efficiency, and if goodwill and co-operation are not obtainable.

I would like to know what that means. As I interpret it, it means that if the union do not get a member on the board, there will be no co-operation and no goodwill, and that might result in the loss of life or property. I would not like to say that is a threat, but I would like the Honorary Minister to explain what he means. He also mentioned that practical men should be on the board. I understand the volunteer fireman is the practical fireman, and the volunteer firemen have a member on the board. Then we come to the point, set out in the Bill, of appointing a representative to sit on the board. In my opinion, it is not advisable to have an even number on any board. At present the number is nine; under the Bill the number will be ten. The only reason that I can see for appointing a representative of the Labour union on the board is that he will sit with his employer to determine the conditions under which he shall work. I understand the employers and workers in this case have always worked amicably; and, if it is desirable that a representative of the union should sit on the board with the employers to direct the affairs of the board, then it is only logical that the employers should have a representative to sit on the committee of the industrial union. Another point made by the Minister was that by 25 votes to 15 the local authorities had agreed that when a member of the Fire Brigades Board ceased to be a member of a local authority, he should automatically cease to be a member of the Fire Brigades Board. That sounds all right, but if it is good in principle, why not apply it to the volunteer firemen or the proposed representative of the union? I have looked up the parent Act and find that each of the various bodies is entitled to elect its representative and there is no provision for his being a member of the body which appoints him. It is not necessary, in the first place, for the person to be elected to the board to be a member of a council or a road board. The road boards and municipalities throughout the State could elect one of the members of this Chamber, for example, and, under the amendment, he would not cease to be a member of the Fire Brigades Board if he ceased to be a member of this House. The parent Act I notice also makes provision for the defini-

tion of a volunteer fire brigade, of which there is a representative now on the board. The Bill provides that one member shall be elected by the Fire Brigades Employees' Industrial Union of Workers Coastal District, Western Australia. Who are they? There is a definition in the Act as it stands of "permanent fire brigade," which reads:-

"Permanent fire brigade" means any association formed for the purpose of extinguishing fire and assisting persons whose whole time shall be devoted to duties connected with that object, and who receive a fixed remuneration for their services.

Therefore, I submit that if a union is to be represented on the board, they should be termed "permanent fire brigades," and not as defined here, "the Coastal Districts Fire Brigades Industrial Union."

The Honorary Minister: That embraces all the permanent firemen in the State.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Why not provide that the permanent fire brigades shall have a representative?

The Honorary Minister: It is the same thing.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I submit it is not the same thing. This refers to coastal firemen. There are firemen in various parts of the State, permanent firemen not belonging to the coastal union, and it may be that at some later date unions in other parts of the State will desire to have a voice in the affairs of the board.

The Honorary Minister: The hon. member is raising a point that does not exist.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am raising a point which I submit does exist. The Bill definitely speaks of a certain industrial union, and the definition in the parent Act refers to a permanent fire brigade. I say there is a difference, and if fire brigade unions are formed in other parts of the State, they should be given the opportunity of having representation on the board. Mr. Baxter said that the union have 130 members. I shall quote from the "Industrial Gazette" of the 30th June, 1933—

Fire Brigades Employees' Union Coastal District of Western Australia.

That is the name of the union. The secretary is Charles Cross. The registered address of the union is 26 McMaster street, Victoria Park. On the 31st December, 1932, the union had 100 members.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They have 103 now, excluding 24 officers and 11 partially paid men who do not belong to the union.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: As I pointed out just now, local authorities are not compelled to elect one of their members to be a representative on the board. The same thing should apply with respect to the representative of the coastal industrial union. It may be in the mind of the union to appoint their secretary, Mr. Cross, as their representative: apparently, he could stay on the board for an unlimited period and not as prescribed by the Act.

Member: He might be holding an office of profit.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That would be an interesting point to raise when we get back to the Lotteries Bill, as to whether it would be an office of profit under the Crown, and whether a legislator could be a member of the board. Reference having been made to the representation on the board, I desire to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that representation is on the basis of taxation. We recently had an appeal made here to abolish plural voting, and it was pointed out that representation should be based on taxation. The same principle is involved here with the addition that the Chairman of the Board has two votes. We recently had a Bill before us which provided for single voting, and in amending the Fire Brigades Act, we may bring the position into line in regard to voting. Furthermore, if the Government are desirous that there should be a union representative on the board, when the Government are appointing their two representatives, which they are entitled to do, what is to prevent the Government appointing one directly as the Labour representative to hold office in accordance with the Act? The question arises as regards that representative as to whether we should alter the number "nine" and make it an even figure, say ten. The Chief Secretary pointed out to somebody this afternoon that we are in a parlous condition as far as the finances are concerned, and that we cannot relinquish any taxes. Then, are we not justified in refusing to pass a clause in the Bill before us which provides for an appointment at a remuneration of an additional £25? The duty of the union representative will be mainly to report to the permanent firemen the attitude adopted by the various mem-

bers of the board regarding labour interests. There is another matter that might be referred to, and it is an opportune time to mention it. When a district is populated, pipes are laid by the Water Supply Department. Later on the fire brigade authorities come along, open up the ground, and cut the pipes so as to insert hydrants wherever it is deemed desirable. If there were some co-operation and harmony about which the Minister spoke, between the Water Supply Department, and the local authorities, the hydrants could be put in when the pipes were being laid, and in that way money could be saved. I will support the second reading of the Bill, and trust it will be amended in Committee.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [7.48]: I oppose the second reading of the Bill, because, as far as I can judge, there is no necessity for it. The Minister referred to a lot of amendments that he considered were necessary, but I am credibly informed that the Board have got along very well under the existing Act, and that there is no need for the proposed alterations. True, they serve a useful purpose, that of covering up the nigger in the wood pile, which in this case, when you look for the nigger, you find him in the union representative on the Board.

The Honorary Minister: Would you call him the nigger in the wood pile?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is no necessity to look for the nigger in the wood pile. We see him at every turn; there are three on the Licensing Board, and several on the Rottnest Board. There is no need to look for them.

The Honorary Minister: The hon. member might look a little further.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The members of the board are to be paid, and I am advised—I stand open to correction—that this is the only State where members of a fire brigades board are paid. It is claimed that those who have seats on the board are there to represent their interests. Take the fire insurance companies. The managers of those companies go on the board, and they look upon that as part of their duty. But they are human like everyone else, and when £25 is being served up to the members of the board, they participate. The Government have representatives on the board,

and they are there, presumably, to protect Government interests. I do not know who the members are, but I imagine they are Government servants, who know what is required of them, when they attend the meetings of the board. Those officers would be in receipt of a salary in connection with the positions they hold in the service, and they might easily discharge their duties on the board without extra remuneration. The worst feature of the Bill is in connection with the under-mining of authority. It seems to me we are getting back to the navigation of the ship from the fore-castle instead of the bridge. The Bill provides that a union representative shall take a seat on the board with the right to vote, and it is claimed by the Minister who introduced the Bill that the necessity for this is to have a practical fireman on the board who knows all about fire-fighting etc., and who can be present to advise in that capacity. During the Minister's speech, he very properly paid a compliment to the services rendered by the late chief officer, but it came as a surprise to me to learn that that officer, qualified and all as he was, was not a member of the board. He attended the board meetings, but had no authority to vote. The Bill continues that practice. It is proposed to allow the chief fireman to attend the meetings, but we do not permit him to have a vote; at the same time, we allow a member of some union—not necessarily a member of the fire brigades union—to exercise a vote. If it is necessary to amend the Act for the purpose of having a qualified man on the job, why not make the chief officer a member of the board, and not a member of the community who may not be on the staff of a fire brigade? Further, I notice in the Bill that a local authority may nominate a representative to hold a seat on the board, but when that representative ceases to be a member of the local authority, he will automatically cease to be a member of the board. But when we come to the union representative it does not matter whether he is a member of the union or not, he still retains his seat on the board. Why the distinction between the representative of the local authority and the representative of the union? Mr. Harris raised the question of the salary being paid to a member of another place, and he also referred to the constitutional aspect which will probably crop up if the Bill is allowed to pass. As I

understand it, the insurance companies, the Government and others, provide the funds to carry on the board, and having provided those funds, they are entitled to representation on the board. I should like the Minister to tell us what quota is being provided by the union. There are nine members on the board and it is proposed that the number shall be ten. I am informed that in Queensland the amounts paid by the insurance companies is five per cent. of their premiums. In Western Australia the amount is seven and a half per cent. As we know, the insurance companies are not there for the good of their health. They have to pay seven and a half per cent. of their premiums into the fund to maintain the fire brigade, and we know that that comes out of the public pocket, plus a sum of money for the insurance company. One of the reasons given by the Minister for the introduction of the Bill, and the appointment of the additional member was that no member of the board had any practical experience in fire-fighting. Then why not appoint the chief officer?

Hon. A. Thomson: He is there to advise.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When it comes to voting, he will have no vote at all, though it is proposed that the union representative shall have one. Generally, as to the necessity for the introduction of the Bill I can answer that by quoting from the Minister's introductory speech, in which he said, "We have a most efficient service that we can still be proud of." If that is the position, why alter it; why not let it stand as it is? The Minister said further, that it was proposed, and rightly so, to appoint the chief officer, with all the qualifications and experience necessary. That being so, I can answer his arguments as to the necessity for having a practical man on the board, "What better man could you have on the board than the experienced chief officer?" I have raised the points as they appear to me. On the Minister's own showing there is no necessity for this Bill, for he says we have an efficient service of which we may well be proud. In view of that, there is no other course open to me but to vote against the second reading.

Personal Explanation.

HON. C. F. BAXTER: I desire to make a short personal explanation. When speaking on the second reading of the Bill I quoted figures showing the number of per-

manent firemen and volunteers, and those who were partially paid in each State of the Commonwealth. I also dealt with the number of firemen in this State and said there were 125 officers and firemen fully paid, and 11 partially paid. Mr. Macfarlane asked by interjection if they were all members of the union, and I replied that they must be so. I find that information is not quite correct, and desire to give the proper information to the House. The figures I gave with regard to the number of firemen in each State were substantially correct. The position in this State is that there are 103 permanent firemen who are members of the union eleven are partially paid. They receive a small monthly retainer and so much per hour for each fire but do not belong to the union, and there are 24 officers, who are not members of the union. The number of firemen belonging to the union is 103. The partially paid men do not belong to it, neither do the 24 officers.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.3]: It is my desire to move that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2. Before doing so, I wish to express my regret that I was not present when the Bill was going through the second reading, but ask for the privilege of making a few remarks upon it now. I thank the Honorary Minister for giving me the opportunity to study the Bill and ascertain if there were ways and means of improving it. Now that I have had that opportunity, I must express my dissatisfaction with it.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not want to interrupt Mr. Macfarlane, but would point out that according to the Notice Paper the Honorary Minister intends to recommit the Bill. Is it the Honorary Minister's intention to recommit the Bill? If so he will have lost his opportunity if he does not do so before Mr. Macfarlane speaks.

The Honorary Minister: I understood that Mr. Macfarlane was going to move for the recommittal of the Bill, for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought he was making a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT: I understood the hon. member was speaking to the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: With a view to moving for recommittal later.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may continue his remarks.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I desire to give reasons why I want this Bill recommitted. I anticipated that fairly drastic amendments would be made to the Act in order that it might be more workable. I was very disappointed when I found that the Government had only brought down minor amendments. The discontent that has continued throughout the year has been brought about by circumlocution, and by the expense to which the board is put in collecting the necessary fees. My object is to render it less costly to collect these fees. Parliament provided two compensation funds, one for the vendor and one for the purchaser. Administrative expenses have also to be found. It is necessary for the producer as well as the vendor to put in returns, and the licensee must also do so. These returns have to be rendered weekly and checked over. I understand when some of the licenses are issued they barely pay for the cost of the stamp in advising people what the fee is. I expected a better method than this. I have consulted with Dr. Stow with a view to drafting amendments so that the fees might be collected at the source and one return only put in. The Chairman of the board admitted that if this could be done, a saving of a thousand a year or more could be effected. I can see no reason why the fees should not be collected through the producer, and sufficient money provided by that means to cover all expenses. After putting in a day with Dr. Stow and coming to the conclusion that we had accomplished our desires, I learned from the Crown Law Department that I could not carry out this method, as it was an infringement of the Excise Act to collect anything on a gallon basis. What is the position with regard to the compensation fund that was collected last year on the gallon basis? The Crown Law Department say they will oppose an amendment along those lines, and so that I should not harrass the Minister I decided for the present to let that method drop. The Bill should, however, be recom-

mitted to deal with one of the definitions. I refer to Clause 2 which reads—

The term shall include the natural lacteal fluid product of an animal, notwithstanding that such product has been chilled, pasteurised, or concentrated, etc.

I have no objection to the term "chilled or pasteurised," but I do object to the word "concentrated." This is a trade name for an article which is manufactured from fresh milk, and has been a trade product in Australia for 40 years, and for 50 years elsewhere. It is an article manufactured in a vacuum. The same treatment is adopted as in the case of condensed milk, except that it is not preserved with sugar. It requires a fairly expensive plant to make, and a sound technical knowledge of the business. It must also be made from the very best milk. Cool storage is also required. It has been standardised in Australia since 1911. Here is a quotation from the health regulations of this State:—

Concentrated milk shall be milk which has been concentrated by the evaporation of portion of its water content, it shall contain not less than 37 parts per centum of total milk solids, and not less than 10 parts per centum shall be milk fat . . . for the purposes of this regulation "normal milk" shall be milk containing not less than three and five-tenths part per centum of milk fat, and eight and five-tenths per centum of milk solids not fat.

If this product is diluted back three times one gets normal milk again. This trade product is used by large manufacturers and on ships that have cold storage. It has lately been discontinued on the larger steamers which have a mulsifying plant, by the aid of which dry milk and butter are converted into milk. The condensed milk company which recently began manufacturing in this State supplies the State ships, and has found it a very successful line. The company desires to become an exporter, the same as companies are doing in other parts of Australia. The management cannot understand the opposition to this article except that perhaps vested interests may desire to put a sprag in their wheel. The Board's chairman states it is desired to prevent trickery. I cannot see that it is necessary to make a new definition in order to give control over this commodity, for both fresh and concentrated milk have enjoyed a standard since 1911. If people alter that standard they

are liable to prosecution. In Zeehan, Tasmania, concentrated milk played its part in the early days until developments brought a fresh milk supply. It was then dropped except in large places where it was still found useful. The same position occurred at Broken Hill, where there would have been a dearth of anything approaching fresh milk had it not been for the supplies available in concentrated form. In Western Australia, too, it has proved of advantage. I know of my own knowledge that at Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, when cool storage was obtained, the death rate in typhoid fever cases dropped 47 per cent. I am convinced that many opportunities will be available in the future for the use of concentrated milk under similar pioneering conditions. It has been the means of furnishing necessary supplies until such time as opportunities were presented for the provision of fresh milk. I, therefore, ask the House to support the recommittal of the Bill, with a view to deleting the word "concentrated" from the definition of "milk." I claim that should be done because the word has been coined for trade purposes and is understood as such. Clause 10 of the Bill seeks to amend Section 26 by altering the method of the collection of administration money. This provision will create much discontent and the chairman of the board is satisfied that it will not ease the position at all. If members look into the matter, they will appreciate the fact that the board now desire to collect 1½d. in every 5s. of the gross proceeds from licenses, which will affect both the producer and the vendor. It means that the same staff will have to be retained for checking and for the same purpose. It is surprising to discover that it takes 2½ per cent. of the gross turnover to provide the administrative costs of the board. The chairman of the board tells me that if the collections could be made at the source, it would save a tremendous amount per year.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is costing about £50 a week for salaries.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: And half that amount would be done away with if the checking staff were not required. I desired to amend the Bill along those lines, but I did not succeed. If all the demands had been incorporated, and made payable through the producers' returns

only, 3½d. per gallon would have covered the cost of administration and compensation would have been provided for both producers and vendors. The business is made a good deal more complicated than under the old system, and will certainly breed discontent while it lasts. Then there is the position regarding surplus milk. I think the reference to that class of milk should be deleted altogether. That milk should be dealt with on the farm by the producer himself. The only two forms necessary are contract and accommodation milk, the latter being required to make up extra milk over and above the ordinary daily contract quantity. The provision for surplus milk seems to leave it open for the person who receives it to be charged with the manipulation of it by disposal for purposes other than desired. My reason for asking the House to support the proposal to recommit the Bill is mainly to record an opportunity to move for the deletion of the word "concentrated," which is a coined word for the manufactured article. The board should be called upon to deal with liquid milk and not the manufactured article. I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

Question put and passed.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair: the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I agreed to the recommitment of the Bill for the purpose of further considering Clause 2 not only to give Mr. Macfarlane an opportunity to express his views regarding concentrated milk, but in order to alter the wording of the definition as agreed to originally by this Chamber. In the form we agreed to the definition contained redundant words. My amendment will substitute a definition that is more clear and concise. I move—

That all the words after "by" in line one be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"deleting the definition of 'Milk' and substituting the following:—

"Milk" means the natural lacteal fluid product of an animal, intended for human consumption as milk, notwithstanding that such product has been chilled, pasteurised, or concentrated, but shall not include such product when converted into condensed milk; the term

includes fresh cream, and cream which has been scalded or pasteurised, but does not include cream used in the manufacture of butter.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That in line four of the proposed new definition the word "concentrated" be struck out.

I have already stated my views and I trust the Committee will agree to my amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I oppose the amendment. Mr. Macfarlane's description of concentrated milk was perfectly correct and there is a description of it in the Health Act. I am advised that concentrated milk is milk from which the water only has been extracted and no other chemicals have been added other than .5 per cent. of boracic acid, which is used as a preservative. The constituents are specified in the food and drug regulations and are such that their addition makes an article not greatly differing from whole milk and it is, in fact, capable of being used for all purposes for which whole milk is suitable.

Hon. A. Thomson: So that people could buy concentrated milk instead of fresh milk?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Exactly. Mr. Macfarlane suggested that if concentrated milk were included in the definition and brought under the control of the board, people in outback districts would be prevented from securing supplies. The Bill deals with the metropolitan area. I have not criticised concentrated milk at all; it is a useful food and it would be difficult for some people in the outer districts if they were not able to get milk in concentrated form. The inclusion of concentrated milk in the definition will not debar those people from securing supplies. The object is to protect the producers in some instances and the consumers in others, which would not be possible if we did not include concentrated milk in the definition. I am advised that milk treated as I have indicated can be bought at a much lower price than is paid for whole milk. It may be bought at butter fat rates, 4d. or 5d. per gallon, as against 5½d., the usual price. And that milk may be concentrated and introduced into the metropolitan area, and because it has been prepared from milk for which a much lower price has been paid than would be paid for whole milk, it can be utilised in the larger establishments in the metropolitan area, such as hotels and

restaurants, and is supplied to them at a slightly lower rate than they would have to pay for whole milk. So in that way it would undermine the whole purpose of the Act. The producer would not be getting a fair return for milk which was being utilised in the same way as whole milk, and on the other hand the manufacturer would be receiving a much higher margin of profit than he was really entitled to. So, from the point of view of the Milk Board, it becomes necessary to have "concentrated" in this definition. There is no objection to concentrated milk as such, for it fills a very useful place, but, if the Act is to operate in the interests of the producers and others in the industry, it is necessary that the Milk Board should have control over concentrated milk in the metropolitan area. So, while there may be some value in Mr. Macfarlane's argument when applied to places where there is difficulty in getting any other milk, that argument does not apply to concentrated milk in the metropolitan area. I must oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: If what the Minister told the Committee were true, I would not be proposing the deletion of this word. The Minister has been misinformed, for concentrated milk can be bought only at the highest rate. Therefore his fear that it might come into competition with whole milk is groundless. For 40 years concentrated milk has been recognised as a trade product in all the cities of Australia. To-day it is being distributed in all those cities, yet is not in competition with whole milk, and so no voice is raised against it. I know more about it than do the board or any of the board's advisers. It will be of no benefit whatever to have the word "concentrated" in the definition.

Hon. E. ROSE: I cannot see what objection Mr. Macfarlane can have to the word being left in the definition. It is not as though it was proposed to prevent any concentrated milk being sold; the object is merely to have it under the control of the board. It should be under their control.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is under the control of the health authorities now.

Hon. E. ROSE: But it should be under the control of the Milk Board. I will oppose the amendment.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I followed Mr. Macfarlane closely, and I cannot understand what his real objection is. Concentrated milk has been on the market for many years.

It is milk, and nothing but milk, so why should it not be under the control of the Milk Board? I cannot understand Mr. Macfarlane's objections, and so I will support the Minister.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It seems to me that all these complications arise every time we come into conflict with the law of supply and demand. We set up the Milk Board as an experiment and I am in favour of giving it a fair trial. Mr. Macfarlane says that the highest rate has to be paid for concentrated milk. Even so, if it can be purchased outside the metropolitan area, concentrated, and brought into the metropolitan area and, by the addition of water, translated into milk again, the whole fabrication of the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act falls to the ground. Mr. Macfarlane says there is no legislation of this kind dealing with concentrated milk in any other part of Australia. But is there in any other part of Australia a Metropolitan Whole Milk Act such as ours? If not, Mr. Macfarlane's objection does not apply.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I can give Mr. Holmes the assurance that concentrated milk is bought at butter fat prices, always plus something per gallon.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But not an advance on the price paid in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It is not a cheap milk and so it cannot be sold in competition with fresh milk, as the Minister fears.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Macfarlane, I think, has indicated that the views of the board are fully warranted. He says that milk to be concentrated is bought at butter fat rates, plus something else. At present, the average price of milk at butter fat rates is 4½d., but the price of whole milk is 9d.; therefore, if milk intended for concentration is bought at 4½d. plus a little more, it would be quite easy for there to be unfair competition between the concentrated milk and the whole milk. That is exactly the fear of the board whose interests, primarily, are the producers who for long were not getting a satisfactory price for their product. Although, as Mr. Holmes has said, this is experimental legislation, the majority of those associated with the industry have already declared that it has been successful. Even Mr. Macfarlane has said that he desires to give the legislation a trial, and therefore I think we should not handicap the board by taking out of this definition something which can be and, I am advised,

already has been used in unfair competition with whole milk.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The price of butter fat varies, but the price of milk under the board will remain fairly constant. If the price of butter fat improves to about 1s. per lb., it will cost more for milk for concentrating than for whole milk for consumers.

Amendment on amendment put and negatived.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill again reported with a further amendment.

House adjourned at 8.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 7th November, 1933.

	PAGE
Questions: Midland Railway Co.	1693
Tramways, delays in service	1693
Bills: Public Works Act Amendment, 1R.	1693
Government Railways Act Amendment, 1R.	1693
Geraldton Sailors and Soldiers' Memorial Institute	
Lands Vesting, 3R.	1693
Augusta Allotments, 2R., Com.	1693
Forests Act Amendment, 2R.	1698
Purchasers' Protection, 2R.	1699
Annual Estimates: Votes discussed	1704
Lands and Surveys	1704
Agriculture	1719

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

QUESTION—MIDLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MARSHALL (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: Is the agreement with the Midland Railway Company, permitting them to haul merchandise at a flat rate of £2 10s. per ton from Fremantle to Geraldton, still in existence?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: So far as I know, the agreement is still in existence.

QUESTION—TRAMWAYS, DELAYS IN SERVICE.

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Railways: Is the Minister aware that there was delay in the Hay-street tramway service on Wednesday, 1st November, and if so, what the cause was?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1. Yes, owing to traffic exigencies it was necessary to cancel the 7.54 p.m. tram, but cars left the Town Hall at 7.49, 7.59, and 8.11 p.m. 2. Answered by No. 1.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1. Public Works Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Railways (for the Minister for Works).

2. Government Railways Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Railways.

BILL — GERALDTON SAILORS AND SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL INSTITUTE LANDS VESTING.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—AUGUSTA ALLOTMENTS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st October.

MR. LATHAM (York) [4.38]: From time to time there is sure to be some difficulty in tracing the owners of land so far as this affects the old titles. A little while ago a Bill was put through vesting in the Crown certain lands in the mining areas. This measure follows on somewhat similar lines. The areas with which this disability was associated are not only found at Augusta but at other places as well. In Albany, for instance, there is land similar to this area, the title for which the Minister is now seeking to provide for the present occupiers. It might be a good plan if the Titles Office were to provide machinery by which the necessary adjustments could be made. At present it is impossible for the Commissioner of Titles or the Minister for Lands to make any adjustments without