

Mr. Hudson: They are considering it in Victoria.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The State needs as much money as it can get and I have no compunction in taking as much as I can get from that agency. That, however, is not the object of the Bill.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: This Bill does not affect the opening hours of the hotels.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Even there I will have no objection to an amendment. The only difficulty in connection with the increasing of the number of hours is that we might possibly create some confusion. We shall have a fair number of candidates, so to speak, to vote for. At all events, I feel justified in submitting this Bill as a Bill for war time. The measure provides that the Act, if it becomes such dies of itself in December, 1916, unless it is given further vitality by a resolution of both Houses, and so from time to time the duration of the measure may be extended, and if at any stage during its operation, it may be deemed advisable that the public shall again be consulted, we make provision for again referring the matter to the people. That will be done at the instance of a resolution of this Chamber and of the other Chamber. I think the Bill is commendable as a democratic measure. It is commendable, further, as one of the means we have for trying to keep a hand upon our resources during this troublesome period. It is a measure intended to prevent the waste of wealth, and to protect physical health and mental vigour. It is a measure that asks the people to come to their own rescue in a case like this, and to say voluntarily, and of their own free will, that the indulgence in intoxicants is a luxury in times of national disaster, and that we can well do without them, and that, therefore, they will vote for the closing of hotels at six o'clock. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Mr. Robinson: Before you resume your seat, will you tell the House the English hours for the closing of hotels?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not quite sure what they are. I know there are local differences.

Mr. Hudson: They are different in various localities.

Mr. Robinson: I only wondered whether you had them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I tried to get them but unfortunately I was not able to secure them in time to bring them to the House.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Does the Act of 1914 stand?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

On motion by Mr. Robinson debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Wednesday, 25th August, 1915.*

	PAGE
Papers presented .. .. .	390
Questions: Mining receipts and expenditure .. .. .	391
Artesian bore at Rottnest .. .. .	391
Government Electric Works .. .. .	391
Questions and replies .. .. .	391
Bills: Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 3E. .. .. .	391
Land and Income Tax, 2E., Com., 3E. .. .. .	391
Enemy Contracts Annulment, 2E., Com. .. .. .	395
Bread Act Amendment, 2E., Com. .. .. .	396
Government Electric Works Amendment, 1E. .. .. .	399
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, returned .. .. .	399
Adjournment, Special .. .. .	399

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

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912, amendment of regulations. 2, Prisons Act, 1903, amendment of regulation 25. 3, Health Act, 1911-12—(a) Cue-Day Dawn road board by-law, (b) Weston local board of health by-law.

### QUESTION—MINING RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What are the total receipts from the State battery system? 2, What is the total amount received for rent from all gold-mining leases? Also the amount received in fines? 3, What is the total amount received from prospecting areas? 4, What is the total amount received in dividend taxes? 5, What is the expenditure in connection with the State battery system, including all wages? 6, What are the salaries and expenses of the superintendent and inspector of State batteries (if any)? 7, What is the cost of administering the Mines Department on the goldfields, including wardens and registrars' salaries? 8, What is the cost of administering the Mines Department in Perth?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: I must ask the hon. member to move for a return and give reasons, as the preparation of this information will involve a considerable period of time.

### QUESTION—ARTESIAN BORE AT ROTTNEST.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What is the depth and diameter of the bore at Rottnest Island? 2, Has the work been abandoned? 3, If so, why? 4, If abandoned has the casing been removed from the bore? 5, What is the cost to date?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Depth, 2,586 feet. Diameter of the casing at bottom of bore—4 inches. 2, Yes. 3, Improbability of obtaining a supply of potable water and the excessive cost of further boring. 4, The 6in., 5in., and 4in. casings have been removed. The casing that remains in the bore is not worth the cost of removal. 5, £4,800.

### QUESTION — GOVERNMENT ELECTRIC WORKS.

Hon. R. J. LYNN asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What is the estimated cost of the new electric power house? 2, What is the capitalised amount of the

present tramway power house? 3, What rate is debited in respect of the under-mentioned charges:—(a.) interest; (b) sinking fund; (c) plant renewals; (d) obsolescence. 4, What is the estimated number of units to be supplied per annum to:—(a) Perth City Council; (b) Perth Tramways. 5, Has any agreement or arrangement been made with the Commonwealth authorities to supply the naval base with electricity? (a) If so, what are the terms and conditions?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, £295,000. 2, £37,596. 3, If this refers to the present power house, the replies are as follows:—(a) 4½ per cent.; (b) *nil* at present, as sinking fund is not debited until four years after raising of loan; (c) plant, renewals, and maintenance are charged to working expenses; (d) *nil*. 4, (a) 4,000,000 units; (b) 3,300,000 units. 5, No.

### QUESTIONS AND REPLIES.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.36]: I would like to call attention to the necessity for members giving something like reasonable time for the answering of questions. Sometimes very involved questions, giving a lot of trouble to the department and creating expense, are asked by hon. members, who expect to be replied to next day. In many cases it is an utter impossibility.

### BILL—FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and *passed*.

### BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX.

*Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This is an exact copy of the Bill which passed this House last session. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. H. CARSON (Central) [4.41]: I do not wish to raise any objection to the Bill, because it would be fruitless, but I would like to call attention to a clause in the assessment measure which was passed in conjunction with this Bill in the first instance. We have in that measure a clause giving exemption to a selector taking up land for five years after his contract is made. Hon. members will recognise that if this Bill and the assessment measure are carried into effect it will be a very serious matter to many selectors who are in great difficulties to-day. I hope the Government will consider this question, and afford some relief by an amendment. Probably it is an oversight on the part of the Government; because they recognise that the selectors are entitled to a reduction in land rents, which has not yet been secured. Yet we now propose to place a further imposition on them under this Bill.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: This is not doing away with the five years' exemption.

Hon. H. CARSON: But the five years is up to-day in respect to most of those settlers, and they are in great difficulties. Yet here we are imposing further burdens on them.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: You mean there have been practically no new settlers during the last five years? It is about right, too.

Hon. H. CARSON: That is not the position. We have had those settlers outback for five years now, and they have been exempt thus far, yet they are in no better position to-day to pay this tax. I hope the Government will give us an assurance that some relief will be afforded.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [4.43]: In connection with the re-enactment of the land and income tax measure, I wish to ask the Colonial Secretary a question, and if he is not in a position to reply I would commend it to him in the form of a suggestion. The Commonwealth is about to impose an income tax, and I would like to know whether anything has been done with a view to

securing the same set of officials to administer the Commonwealth and the State income taxes. It would be manifestly a good thing for the State Government and the Commonwealth Government, if the one set of officials could administer both Acts. It would mean a saving of expense. It would unquestionably be more economical to have one set of officials than to have two. Another suggestion to be advanced is that if the same form could be used for both the Commonwealth and State tax, it would mean a great convenience to the taxpayers. It would be a convenience to those who have to pay the income tax and also be a saving of expense both to the Commonwealth and the State Governments. I assume that the State Government, probably at the Premiers' conference, discussed this matter and that something has been done in regard to it. If not, something I think should be done. Whilst I am on my feet referring to the income tax, there is another matter I have already alluded to two or three times before in this House. I think it is appropriate that I should refer to again in the hope that the Government may see its way, not this session but perhaps next session, to introduce a Bill with a view to effecting a remedy, and that is in regard to introducing a system that would be more just in the incidence of taxation. Take the incomes derived from dividends. The dividend tax is 1s. in the pound. There is no exemption whatsoever in the case of this form of taxation. In the case of a person who draws his income from dividends, no matter whether it be £100 or £200 a year or a much larger sum, that person is taxed to the extent of 1s. in the pound. I know of two or three cases wherein the sole support of a man has been the dividend which is paid from the trading company in which his interests are. The consequence is that these people have to pay 1s. in the pound and a person whose sole income is derived from dividends, perhaps from a trading company operating in Western Australia and who gets say £200 a year, is taxed to the extent of £10 a year. Suppose

that an income is drawn from a concern of an exactly similar character but is not a company, the person drawing that income would be exempt altogether under the exemption of £200 a year. The person, therefore, who draws an income from a company dividend is taxed to the extent to which a person is taxed under the income tax if he receives over £5,000 a year. The tax under the Dividend Duties measure is 1s. in the pound in the case of an income in excess of £5,000 a year. A person who draws an income from dividends, and it may be from a trading concern which is engaged in Western Australia purely and simply, has to pay a tax exactly identical with the tax that the individual has to pay whose income is over £5,000 a year. I am quite certain there is no member of this House, or of the Government, who will not say that this position is quite unjust to persons with moderate incomes. It is manifestly unfair, and the suggestion I would make to remedy this position of affairs is the remedy which has been instituted by the Commonwealth under their income tax. The Commonwealth income tax, in a case of this sort, falls upon the individual shareholders. It is not placed upon the company as a company, but upon the individual shareholders. What the Government could do would be to abolish the existing dividend taxation and all the dividends would then come in the ordinary way under income tax, and a provision might be made—it is already made—in the income tax for absentee shareholders. In order to understand the position one has to remember the history of the dividend duties. The Dividend Duties Act was originally introduced in order to tax mining companies. Mining companies made immense sums out of Western Australia, and they were companies whose shareholders practically all lived abroad. The Government of the day accordingly brought in the Dividend Duties Bill and imposed this taxation of 1s. in the pound. Since then a number of local companies have grown up. At that time local companies were very few and far

between. There was scarcely one in the State paying any dividends. Now, however, there is a large number in Western Australia of local concerns which are paying dividends, and they are all taxed at exactly the same rate as the big mining companies. I cannot see why it is reasonable or just that an individual who has shares in a company should be taxed more than the individual who draws his income from another concern. I could quote dozens of cases of this sort. Take the case of say, two businesses. Both may be in the same street and both carrying on the same business and both have the same amount of capital. One happens to be a company perhaps with a few shareholders, and the other may be a business which is a partnership concern. The partnership concern comes under the income tax and the individual person is taxed under that provision. In the case of the company, however, it is the dividends which are taxed, and each individual shareholder has to pay to the extent of 1s. in the pound. There are certainly advantages attached to a limited liability company, but not sufficient to account for the greatly increased taxation. I suggest that the Government might take this matter into consideration. The Commonwealth Government have evidently recognised the injustices of the incidences of taxation, and if this Government would follow on somewhat the same lines as the Commonwealth Government I think it would be an improvement on the existing system.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [4.52]: The second suggestion made by the hon. member has been several times brought forward here. Of course, it can only be dealt with when our own Parliament comes to the matter in due course again. His first suggestion I think is one which the Government can do a great deal with by representation to the Commonwealth Government. In the State Commissioner's office are all the facts and data that the Commonwealth Authorities would need for imposing their war tax. The records are there. Someone may say that is a simple matter for peo-

ple to send in new returns. It is anything but a simple matter. Book-keeping is a very backward art in the majority of instances, and it is still more backward in families where there are no businesses. The filling up of income tax returns is often a far greater cost to the individual than the tax itself. If this Government would strongly urge upon the Commonwealth Government to save the people that waste—and it is a pure waste to send in a return that need not be sent in—they will do a great deal. When the proper time comes to deal with our dividend taxes I do hope that the Government will follow the advice now given again by the hon. member who has just spoken, and simplify the finances and make them just and equitable. The Colonial Secretary will understand that these criticisms are in no way dealing with or objecting to the land and income tax under the Bill before the House, which of course must be continued.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.55]: Before the Bill passes its second reading I want to strike a note. It may be a discordant note to the Minister and to other members of this House. I regret in view of the very strenuous circumstances which now prevail, that the Government have not availed themselves of the unanimous resolution which was carried by this House last session. That is to say, they have not fallen into line with the other States where income taxes are in operation, and put a greater tax on incomes not the product of personal exertion than they put upon incomes which are the product of personal exertion.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: There is hardly an instance of that in this State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That does not alter the principle. In almost all the other States where an income tax is in operation the tax is greater on incomes not the product of personal exertion, and the Commonwealth have gone further in their war tax and have so framed their proposed legislation as not to make the exemptions apply to incomes not the product of personal exertion. I very

much regret that that vital principle, however small the income may be, has not been embodied in this Bill. I also desire to state, off my own bat, that I think the income tax should have been raised. It is said that now is not the time for raising further revenue in view of the financial stress and the Commonwealth taxation. There is a system of taxation in force in this State which I venture to assert is unjust in its incidence and in its application. I refer to the present income tax which is now placed on Government workers of this State. It is by way of a reduction in hours and a corresponding reduction in salary. I opposed it right through the piece. It may be said that they get less wages for working less hours. The fact remains that the earning and the spending capacity of those individuals has been reduced.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is a reduction in wages purely and simply.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It must also be borne in mind that a small section of the community is asked to make sacrifices to tide the State over these abnormal times, and that the larger section of the community is allowed to go scot-free. I venture to say that a vast majority of the employees have got to suffer, and they will also come under the purview of the Commonwealth war tax. If this condition of affairs is necessary, if this revenue that has been saved is necessary to keep the State afloat, I say that some legislation ought to have been brought down, and Parliament asked to pass it, so that the community in proportion to its ability to pay should fall into line. These are my opinions. I very much regret that this idea has not been carried out. I have no desire to enter into either the technicalities or conditions in connection with the shorter hours and lesser wages. I do desire, however, to enter my protest that this condition of affairs has been allowed to continue, and that Parliament has not been asked to alleviate the position.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY  
(Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply)

5.0]: I am not in a position to give any assurance in regard to suggestions made by Messrs. Carson, Kirwan, Cullen, and Cornell, but I will promise to place the matter before the Government at as early a date as possible. I can assure hon. members there is no likelihood of any amending legislation being brought down this session, but at any rate it is desirable that the views expressed by hon. members should be placed on record, and when amendments are contemplated they should be given consideration. I shall promise to do that.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

#### *Standing Orders Suspension.*

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY so much of the Standing Orders were suspended as to allow the Bill to pass through its remaining stages at the one sitting.

#### *Third Reading.*

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

### BILL — ENEMY CONTRACTS ANNULMENT.

#### *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.6] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced pursuant to a promise made by us to the Federal Government. The measure has been rendered necessary by development which have occurred during the progress of the war. It has been found out, rather late in the day, that Germany has had a great indirect control over many of our resources. Its control over the metal supplies has been especially marked. This control has been secured by means which excited no suspicion. Firms and companies have

been brought into existence with British titles and, in some cases, with British managers or directors, which, upon investigation, have been found to be offshoots of large German corporations. They have been registered in Australia; they pretend to be devoted to the expansion of Australian interests, but they are German, root and branch, and, until prevented from doing so, they have been building up trade with Germany. To show the necessity for the Bill I shall refer to what has occurred elsewhere, and what has occurred elsewhere may have occurred here to a limited extent. At Broken Hill before the war, some of these Germanised firms had made contracts for the supply of metal extending to 1921. But that is not all. There was a special provision that those contracts should be suspended during the currency of war. More than that: it was provided that the interrupted period between the declaration of war and the proclamation of peace should be added to the term originally specified as the duration of the contract. For instance, if the present war lasted for three years and legislation of this character were not introduced and passed by New South Wales, the contracts would remain binding until 1924. Similar contracts may have been signed here; I do not know. If they have not, the Bill will do no harm. If they have, the Bill is necessary. But hon. members will realise the wisdom of steps being now taken to prevent the revivification of contracts which are at present inert owing to the existence of a state of war between Great Britain and Germany. It will be seen that if steps be not taken to furnish the means of ridding our producers of mineral ores, and perhaps our business houses, of the cords which bind them in a business sense to our enemy, we may continue after the war to pour our wealth into Germany to again build up that country instead of sending it to the Mother country and our allies.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Were these contracts made before the war broke out?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. And the particular clause to which I have referred was inserted in the agreements. That is to say, if war broke out in the meantime the period of the war would be added to the contract.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: It looks as if they knew something.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: It was good foresight.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill proposes to do something to avert such a possibility. It provides that any party to a contract with an enemy subject may apply to the Federal Attorney General for its cancellation, and if the Federal Attorney General be satisfied that it is an enemy contract, it becomes null and void. It is giving a great power to the Federal Attorney General, and some may think that the matter should be referred to the courts; but the Bill is exactly the same as the Federal Act, and all the other States have promised Mr. Hughes that they will introduce legislation on exactly similar lines. We were anxious to ascertain whether it would be wise to introduce any alteration to the measure, and we wired the Federal Attorney General to find out whether such could be safely done. He replied as follows:—

State legislation is necessary to supplement the Federal Act because of the limited powers of the Commonwealth in regard to trade and commerce. Many of those contracts may be outside the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth, but within that of the State. In any case it is necessary to make assurance doubly sure. It is essential that the State Act should follow the Federal Act literally. The functions of the Attorney General under Clause 3 will be exercised by the Federal Attorney General, otherwise there would be no uniformity of treatment of contracts.

I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

## BILL—BREAD ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.10] in moving the second reading said: The object of this amending Bill is to remove an avenue which the Government have reason to believe has been availed of more or less widely for the purpose of evading the spirit, whilst observing the letter, of the Bread Act, 1903. A reference to the principal Act will show that its primary object is to ensure that when a person buys bread of standard weight he shall be supplied with a loaf of the weight specified. It is a trite saying that it is possible to drive a coach and four through an Act of Parliament—

Hon. W. Kingsmill: In this case a baker's cart.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And the principal Act now proposed for amendment supplies a case in point in strong support of that saying. Hon. members will notice that in the existing Act it is specified that fancy bread may be of less weight in the standard loaf than the plain every day loaf of every day use. Ordinarily fancy bread would be more high-priced than the other, but in the exemption in regard to weight already referred to, bakers—I do not say all bakers, but some of them—have discovered a means for, so to speak, circumventing the Act. It is done in this way: a baker, by putting a few twists in the dough, produces an article which, while to all intents and purposes is the bread of everyday consumption, is still such as to entitle it to be listed as fancy bread, with the result that the penalties for selling underweight do not apply. The main purpose of this amendment is to remove that possibility in the future. One or two other minor amendments are also proposed. For instance, the power hitherto wanting is given to roads boards to ap-

point inspectors under the Act. That authority has been given only in the case of municipalities, and it is felt that with the expansion of several country centres which have not yet reached the status of municipal districts there is still sufficient necessity for a provision safeguarding the interests of consumers in the important matter of weight and wholesomeness of bread. Again, the Act as it stands makes no provision for the seizure of bread which does not conform to the requirements of the Act in those cases in which the quantity exposed for sale is less than six loaves. If a man who is delivering bread has only five loaves in his basket, the inspector has no right to interfere and certainly cannot insist on weighing the bread. He can only weigh the bread if there are six loaves or more, but under the amending clause the inspector will be able to weigh the bread if there be only one loaf. This explains the amendments we propose to the existing legislation.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The trade is in favour of it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There has been no objection so far as I know. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.15]: When speaking on the Address-in-reply, I intimated that if the amending Bread Bill referred to was similar to the measure placed before us last session, I would advise the leader of the House to drop it straight away because I thought there would be no hope of carrying it. That Bill proposed to create a monopoly between master bakers and journeymen bakers to the exclusion of all others. I find that the measure before us, however, is in an altogether different form, and I would record the fact that for once the Government have adopted my suggestion. With the amendments on the lines indicated by the leader of the House, I entirely agree. It was possible under the Act to evade the letter of the law. The leader of the House said a coach and four could be driven through an Act of Parliament, but in this case he might have said

a baker's cart could be driven through the Bread Act. I hope the amendments will prevent even that being done. I support the second reading.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.17]: There is one point which might not be clearly before the minds of members. The old provision compelling the weighing of half a dozen loaves was intended to safeguard the baker against a mere accidental fault in one loaf. The present Bill goes on the old saying that the weakest link determines the strength of the chain. The Bill says that if a baker has a million loaves of full weight and one of light weight, he is open to prosecution.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: It does not say that.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Bill does not say that if there is more than one loaf in the basket, the inspector must weigh the lot. If the Bill is passed in its present form, an inspector will be able to go over the whole of the bread in a baker's cart and if he finds one loaf of light weight, prosecute the baker.

The Colonial Secretary: No.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: That is how it appears to me.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: You are wrong.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Read Clause 3.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: After reading Clause 3 I am not quite sure that it will not be possible to prosecute a baker on the strength of one light loaf.

The Colonial Secretary: If there be only one loaf he may be prosecuted.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I want members to appreciate the point. A baker's whole batch may have only one faulty loaf, and he will be open to prosecution on that account. A baker would need to be very skilful to be sure that every loaf was of full weight. Mr. Colebatch shakes his head, but I hope he fully appreciates the danger. I am as strongly against dishonesty as anyone, but I would not like to think that a baker who, 999 times out of 1,000, gave full weight could be condemned for one light loaf. It would require exceedingly skilful work to make all the loaves alike. In our anxiety to do



justice to customers, I would not like to do an injustice to the bakers.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [5.21]: If the hon. member had read the original Act which this Bill proposes to amend, he would not have made the remarks to which we have just listened. Under the original Act, it is necessary for the inspector to take six loaves if there be that number, or such larger number as may be found convenient. Under this Bill it will still be necessary to take six loaves, if there are six loaves. If there are not six loaves the inspector will have to take all there are. If any baker is foolish enough to save light weight loaves until the last, and if he has only a few light loaves left, he deserves to run the risk of being prosecuted. I see no objection to the Bill in that particular.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [5.22]: Mr. Colebatch has given a correct explanation of the position. Subsection 2 of Section 12 of the principal Act, passed in 1903, reads—

Any justice of the peace, or police constable authorised by him, and any inspector may stop any person carrying bread for delivery, and search any basket, cart, or other means used by such person for the transit or delivery of bread, and, in connection therewith, do all or any of the matters aforesaid.

Section 13 states—

Where bread is weighed under the preceding section the weight shall be taken as to not less than six loaves if there be that number of the same description or size, or as to such larger number as may be found convenient. That will still operate. The words we object to are, "or as to such larger number as may be found convenient." Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to delete those words and insert in lieu, "and if not, then as to as many as there may be." If there are six loaves the six must be weighed, but if there are five the five must be weighed, and if there is only one loaf the fate of the baker must be determined on that one loaf.

Hon. J. Duffell rose.

The PRESIDENT: The leader of the House having replied, there can be no further debate.

Hon. J. Duffell: I understood the leader of the House was merely replying to a question, and was not closing the debate. There is one point I would like to raise.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be permitted to speak?

Members: Aye.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.24]: It seems clear that the framers of the original Act were desirous that a purchaser should receive the full weight for which he was paying, and with that object the Act provided that the bread should be put up in 1-lb., 2-lb., and 4-lb. loaves. The Act further stipulates that the bread carrier shall have on his delivery cart scales and weights. There must have been an object in making this compulsory, and the object, I take it, was for the protection of the man delivering the bread, so that he might avoid any danger of an accusation of selling short-weight bread by weighing it before delivering it to the customer.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is never done.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: That was evidently in the minds of legislators when they passed the original measure. The Act vests certain powers in inspectors, and I think the Government might make it known that it is absolutely necessary to give effect to the provisions of the Act which are as important to-day as ever they were. In the event of a carter weighing a so-called 2-lb. loaf and finding it 4-ozs. short, the idea would be to cut a slice from another loaf to make up the deficiency. As the Act has been evaded in this respect, it is well that its real intention should be emphasised. If the Act means anything, it is that the householder shall be protected to the extent of receiving full weight in return for what he pays. My object was to call attention to provisions of the Act which are not

being carried out in their entirety, but which should be enforced quite as much to-day as when they were passed.

The Colonial Secretary: That is due to municipalities.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Then let the attention of the municipalities be directed to the fact. If it so happens that members succeed in doing that, we shall have accomplished something.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

#### **BILL — GOVERNMENT ELECTRIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.**

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

#### **BILL—ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.**

Returned from the Assembly without amendment.

#### **ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.**

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.29]: I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 7th September.*

Question passed.

*House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.*

## **Legislative Assembly,**

*Wednesday, 25th August, 1915.*

	PAGE
Questions: Red Cross Funds and unemployment	399
Bills: Newcastle-Bolgart Railway Further Extension, 1R.	399
Roads Act Amendment Continuance, 1R.	399
Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, 1R.	399
Paper presented	400
Ministerial Statement, Handling the Harvest	400
Bills: Government Electric Works Act Amendment, 3R.	405
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, 3R.	405
Land and Income Tax, returned	414
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, returned	414
Motions: Immigration Department, to continue	405
Wyndham Freezing Works, to inquire	415
Money Bills Procedure, Joint Standing Orders	414
Return: Railway Freight and Hauling costs, Gosnells—Midland.	430

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

#### **QUESTION—RED CROSS FUNDS AND UNEMPLOYMENT.**

Mr. B. J. STUBBS asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government considered the advisability of exercising some control over the expenditure of the money collected in this State for the Red Cross Fund? 2, As it is reported that considerable unemployment exists among women, will the Government use their influence with the committee controlling that fund in the direction of inducing them to employ these women making clothing for wounded soldiers?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Funds raised by the Red Cross Society are subscribed voluntarily. The Government, therefore, can exercise no control over the expenditure of these. 2, The local Secretary of the Red Cross Fund is Mr. A. D. Rankin, and doubtless representations made to him in this regard would receive the consideration of those responsible for the expenditure of the money collected.

#### **BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.**

1, Newcastle-Bolgart Railway Further Extension.

2, Roads Act Continuance.

Introduced by the Minister for Works.

3, Licensing Act Continuance.

Introduced by the Attorney General.