

Mr. CROSS: I move an amendment—

That the following further proviso be added:—"Provided also that the provisions of this section shall not apply to those assistant nurses under 21 years at present at Wooroloo T.B. Hospital."

Mr. ABBOTT: I am afraid the member for Canning does not appreciate the full meaning of his amendment. If carried, it would mean that the nurses to whom he refers could never get a certificate.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The member for Canning would bar them altogether from the provisions of the clause.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is so.

Mr. WATTS: The member for Canning could achieve his object by saying that the provisions of the last proviso shall not apply. His desire is that they should not have to attain the age of 21 years before they can commence training.

Mr. STYANTS: I give notice of a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move his proposed amendment unless the member for Canning withdraws his.

Mr. CROSS: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. STYANTS: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"The foregoing provision regarding age limit shall not apply to any person already serving at Wooroloo Sanatorium as an assistant tuberculosis nurse or trainee nurse."

Mr. ABBOTT: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out the word "provision" and inserting the word "proviso" in lieu.

The word "provision" covers the whole section, whereas the use of the word "proviso" carries with it the limitation desired.

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

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 7, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 9.34 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 17th September, 1946.

	PAGE
Questions: Typhoid fever, as to admissions to hospitals at Perth and Fremantle	843
Milk, as to compulsory pasteurisation	843
Bills: Friendly Societies Act Amendment, 3R.,	844
Marketing of Barley, (No. 2), 2R.,	844
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, (No. 1) 2R.,	847
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, 2R., Com., report	855
Road Districts Act, 1910-1942, Amendment, 2R., Com., report	856
Milk, 2R.,	857
Legislative Council Referendum, 2R.,	866
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2R.,	869
Business Names Act Amendment, 2R.,	869
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2R.,	869

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

QUESTIONS.

TYPHOID FEVER.

As to Admissions to Hospitals at Perth and Fremantle.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Chief Secretary: Will the Minister state the number of cases of typhoid fever admitted to the Fremantle, Children's and Royal Perth Hospitals in each of the last five years?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

Royal Perth Hospital, 1941, 3; 1942, 4; 1943, 10; 1944, 4; 1945, 3. Children's Hospital, 1941, 0; 1942, 0; 1943, 4; 1944, 0; 1945, 1. Fremantle Hospital, 1941, 4; 1942, 5; 1943, 12; 1944, 3; 1945, 10.

MILK.

As to Compulsory Pasteurisation.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT asked the Chief Secretary: Would the Minister ask the Minister for Agriculture to obtain and then lay upon the Table of this House, a report from the Commissioner of Public Health giving his views as to the advisability or otherwise of the introduction of compulsory pasteurisation to take effect at a date at which it is considered the machinery for such purpose would be available?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

Yes.

BILL—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY. (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [4.37]: The adjournment of the debate on the second reading enabled me to study the Bill carefully and to take particular notice of its aims. We know that for a considerable time the marketing of barley has been a matter of great concern to the growers in Western Australia. When the war was well under way the Commonwealth took control of that marketing. For many years the growers had their own arrangements for the provision of barley, of which there are two different kinds—one for feeding purposes and the other for brewing. The brewers who did their own malting and others who were well-equipped to undertake that work, took over the malting barley, particularly the two-row English barley. In their own interests the barley growers, by arrangement with the brewers, produced their barley from particular lands. The specially rich land that gave a very big crop, produced a barley that the growers naturally preferred because it provided them with a bigger cheque; but it was a barley that did not suit the brewers, who said that it was too steely, and not of the quality required by them.

It was found that the growing of barley on the lighter land, from which the farmer did not get such a big crop, was better for malting purposes. So the brewers guaranteed the growers a better price for that barley. The brewers preferred it to that which was imported from South Australia or Eastern Australia, and were prepared to give an increased price for the local barley because of the saving of freight which would be payable on the imported product. That scheme worked quite satisfactorily until the Commonwealth Government took over during the war. Although the growers protested to the Commonwealth Government and tried to get out of the general pool, they were forced to come into it. The price was reduced. The brewers had to pay the Commonwealth Government 5s. 6d. per bushel for barley, but the growers got very little by

way of advance because, being in the pool, they came into conflict with large growers in the Eastern States. I believe the actual loss to the growers of barley in Western Australia in the first season, due to the pooling, amounted to no less than £80,000. That represented a great blow to the growers, and no gain whatever to the brewers, because they had to pay the full price to the Commonwealth Government for the barley.

Again and again the barley growers of Western Australia urged that they be left out of the scheme and, after a considerable period and a lot of discussion, it was arranged that they should have their own organisation, under Government control within the State. We have now reached the position that the growers would like to have control of barley within the State instead of being embraced in the Commonwealth scheme. It seems to me the Government has accepted the suggestion to bring a barley Bill before the House, quite overlooking the claims of the growers. The growers want a Bill that will give them control, but by this measure the Government will take over the whole of the control, giving the growers the right to elect two of their own representatives. The other four members are to be practically Government appointees, with the Minister in charge.

At any time when it suits the Government it can bring the scheme suggested by this measure right back to link up with the Commonwealth scheme, which will still operate in the Eastern States. That is my impression after going through this measure. I cannot believe that it is what has been put up to the Government by the growers, and I am satisfied that when they get to know what is contained in this measure they will say it is not what they intended, and that it would be far better for them to be able to market their barley in the same way as they did previously, by private arrangement with the brewers or maltsters, because then they would at least be on the open market for all the extra barley that could be grown.

Hon. A. Thomson: What is the difference between the maltsters and the brewers?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: They are very much the same. The breweries have always done a lot of malting for themselves, but there are maltsters who have come into the trade and the brewers have given up the greater portion of that work. I do not know

the quantities dealt with respectively by the brewers and maltsters, but I think the breweries would prefer to retire altogether from the malting, leaving it entirely to the maltsters. There are not many maltsters in the business, though quite enough for the requirements of Western Australia up to the present time. They are all interested in the same business. The six-row barley was never in the same favour as the two-row barley, but the former comes into the picture when there is a big demand from outside the country by those who use it for making beer.

At one time we had a large export market for barley oversea, but we lost it owing to the action of the Commonwealth Government, which placed a heavy duty on glass. Our principal oversea market for barley was Belgium, and when the embargo was placed on Belgian glass the buyers of barley there said, "We have not any credits in Australia except in the case of Kimberley beef and barley." Belgium was the principal market for Kimberley beef and six-row barley, as well as for any surplus of two-row barley that was not required here.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Reciprocity in trade with Belgium was cut out owing to the high tariff.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: We have had to pay enormous prices for glass that we used to obtain from Belgium at a reasonable figure. We obtained no benefit from the embargo because we have had to pay such high prices for glass, owing to the duty.

The Chief Secretary: But we now have our Australian glass industry.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am glad to hear it. We have other industries, also, but we are paying dearly for them, and I am afraid that a lot of the money from wheat is being used to cover up their tracks. We have to pay through the nose for anything we want to buy, in the case of nearly every industry that Australia has tried to build up. If we pass this measure as it stands, we are shot. When we come to deal with a wheat stabilisation Bill, I believe it will be a counterpart of this Marketing of Barley Bill. If we pass this measure we must bear that in mind. I believe the Government has agreed with the Commonwealth Government that Western Australia shall come into line with the Commonwealth, and the cheapest method of handling wheat in Australia will be lost to us.

If this measure becomes law, we shall still be subject to control in the matter of the area we may plant, whether we grow barley, pigs, wheat or something else, and thus we shall have lost our independence. I know a large number of men who have abandoned wheatgrowing entirely because they object to being under control. This measure bristles with control. I have placed on the notice paper a series of amendments I propose to move in Committee, and I hope they will be adopted in order that some of the dangers inherent in the measure may be removed. The growers want an opportunity to form a board and have a greater say than it is proposed to give them under this Bill. We have our representatives in the matter of wheat, and they are familiar with quite a lot of the troubles that beset wheatgrowers. We have managed to pull the barley growers away from control by the Eastern States. They had a good innings while they themselves exercised control.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Whom do you mean by "we?"

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The barley growers.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You mean the barley executive of the P.P.A., not the board.

Hon. C. B. Williams: How does barley compare with wheat?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The barley growers have had control since they were pulled out of the Federal scheme. This Bill will deprive them of that control and place it practically in the hands of the Minister. I hope the Bill will be considerably amended. In my opinion, it is a measure for consideration in Committee rather than at the second reading stage, but I hope that amendments will be made which, while preserving the objects set out in the Bill, will prevent control by the Government or by anyone else. We do not want to be dictated to in the matter of handling our own product.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [4.53]: I am afraid I have to disagree with my colleague in some of the remarks he has offered. This measure is placed before us as the outcome of a deputation from the barley executive of the P.P.A., which I introduced to the Minister. This executive is the only body in Western Australia which in any way re-

presents the barley growers; there is no constituted authority or organisation representing the barley growers apart from that executive. We asked the Minister to introduce a Bill; in other words, the producers asked for a Bill.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They asked for this Bill?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: They asked for a Bill. Before I finish, I shall suggest a few amendments that I consider should be made, but in my opinion this is one of the best marketing Bills that has ever been placed before us. I may also assist Mr. Hamersley by supporting some of the amendments of which he has given notice, but I must say that the measure, while not perfect, does go a long way towards meeting our desires. The executive has been consulted on these matters and we are in accord with nearly every provision of the Bill.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Then Mr. Hamersley must be out of touch with his electors.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Mr. Hamersley represents producers of barley, but he is not on the executive. At the same time he has every right to speak on behalf of the people he represents.

Hon. C. B. Williams: But he should understand the position.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: One of the least desirable parts of the Bill is that dealing with the constitution of the board. The board is to consist of six members, three of whom shall be producers, but one of them is to be nominated by the Minister. The producers do not favour the Minister having the right to appoint one of the producers, and I cannot understand why he asks for that right. The Bill proposes to confer certain powers on the Minister and, even if the producers elected the three representatives, the Minister would still have sufficient power to over-ride some of the decisions of the board. The proposed board will be more of an advisory body than anything else, but I believe the Minister would support the board substantially in any advice it tendered to him. At the same time, I hope members will assist me to pass an amendment providing for the election of the three representatives of the producers.

The Minister is to have the right to nominate a representative of the maltsters

and a representative of the brewers. I am not greatly concerned about that. We have not received any communication from those people, so apparently they are satisfied. The Minister, however, will have quite a lot to do with the appointment of members of the board other than the producers, and I hope the House will approve of the three representatives of the producers being elected by them. While Mr. Hamersley was speaking, Mr. Thomson asked what was the difference between a maltster and a brewer. A maltster malts the barley with the object of selling it; a brewer malts the barley in order to make beer on his own premises. The maltster does not make beer.

Hon. C. B. Williams: A very good explanation.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is the point I wanted cleared up.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Some of the breweries do not have malting works. The Swan Brewery is a large buyer of barley, but whether that brewery malts all the barley it buys, I do not know. Some breweries buy from the Union Maltings Proprietary, Ltd., in Palmerston-street. Members need not fear authorising the appointment of a board of control subject to the amendment I have indicated. Much barley is produced in South Australia and, if the local board made the price too high, it would be an easy matter to import from the Eastern States. Consequently, that would be a safeguard. Subject to the amendment I have indicated, the board would meet with the approval of most of the producers.

A suggestion has been made that the consumers should be given a representative on the board. It was stated in another place that the people who drink beer should have representation. Such an argument has little real relation to the objects of the Bill. After the barley has been sold, the maltster puts it through certain processes, but the actual cost of the barley has very little influence on the cost of a jug of beer. I do not know how many grains of barley would be used to make a jug of beer, but the number would be very small. I cannot see why the consumers should be brought into the picture at all, and I hope their inclusion will not be suggested here. I commend the Bill and assure the House that

the producers will feel happy about it so long as it is amended as I have suggested.

On motion by Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch, debate adjourned.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban [5.0]: This Bill seeks to close all shops except those in the Fourth Schedule and small shops at 5.30 p.m. from Monday to Friday inclusive. This is to apply to all parts of the State, irrespective of the fact that in certain shop districts a half-holiday has been determined by a poll of the people of the shopping district to fall on some day other than Saturday. If, therefore, this Bill becomes an Act, it will totally disregard the wishes of the people in those shopping districts, and sweep aside the results of the poll that has been taken. The attempt to bring about the closing of all shops at 5.30 p.m., to my way of thinking, disregards the convenience of a great number of people. There are many workers who have domestic obligations and who have no opportunity to shop except after the ending of their working day. This compulsory closing at 5.30 p.m. would, in fact, be a real hardship to those people. As a result of closing at that hour, they would be compelled to do their shopping with shops specified in the Fourth Schedule.

Most shops of the Fourth Schedule sell confectionery, fruit and vegetables but in addition most of them keep a fair stock of groceries. Whilst this class of shop is permitted to remain open until 8 p.m., those establishments cannot sell groceries after 6 p.m. It is pretty well known that a good deal of after-hours trading takes place in these prohibited lines after the closing hour of 6 p.m.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: That is the only time when those shops sell them.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: If the Bill becomes law, this practice will be greatly encouraged but will still remain unlawful. It may be argued that shops can open earlier. That is true, but it would not be of any service to the average housewife

who is busily engaged in the morning preparing breakfast and getting the children off to school. She would not benefit by the earlier opening of shops. The net result of this compulsory closing would be that the big city shops would have lesser trading hours. Let it not be overlooked that the big city shops are the largest employers of labour. So much then for 5.30 p.m. closing.

Let us now look at Saturday afternoon closing, which this Bill seeks to make compulsory all over the State. Whilst Saturday afternoon closing is convenient and suitable for the metropolitan area, in many country districts it would represent a great inconvenience to rural workers and farmers, and to the wives of rural workers and farmers.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Who told you that?

Hon. L. Craig: That is quite true.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: In many shop districts polls have been taken and people have selected days other than Saturdays.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What about Kataning, Narrogin and Wagin?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I said it would represent an inconvenience to some shopping districts. They have said so by a plebiscite that has been taken.

Hon. G. Fraser: A pretty poor one.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: It was a good one. Section 105 of the Act makes provision for the taking of a poll. If 10 per cent. of the people of any shop district appeal to the Minister for a poll to be taken to decide on which half-day the shops in the town shall close, he is compelled to give them an opportunity to vote on that question. It seems to me that the alterations sought in the Bill will suit only the minority, and will totally disregard the wishes of the great majority of the people.

The Bill has some rather bad drafting features. Mr. Parker has from time to time strongly advocated that a Parliamentary Drafting Department should be attached to the Crown Law Department instead of the drafting being left, apparently, as a part-time job to some of the departmental officers.

Hon. G. Fraser: He would still find fault if that were done.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I would draw attention to two bad faults in the drafting

of this Bill. It leaves in the parent Act the Sixth Schedule. Perhaps Mr. Fraser does not know what the Sixth Schedule is. That schedule is a memorial to the Minister in charge of the Act for an alternative day to Saturday. The Bill arbitrarily fixes the half-day as on Saturday and the parent Act still makes provision for a memorial to the Minister for a poll to fix some other day than Saturday. The hon. member will agree that that is bad drafting.

There is another bad drafting feature in the Bill. An amendment leaves the Fifth Schedule in the Act. If this Bill becomes law, the Fifth Schedule will be absolutely superfluous and redundant. That drafting is a clear indication to me, and I think to the House, that Mr. Parker's advocacy needs a good deal of support from us. There are other inconvenient features in regard to 5.30 p.m. closing, namely, the compulsory closing of druggists and chemists' shops. I think the people will be greatly inconvenienced by that provision and also by the other provision relating to hairdressing establishments. My personal view is that the Government should not interfere with the present arrangement, and I will vote against the second reading.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.10]: I have had various letters from people in my province. Strangely enough, in one or two instances they seem to convey rather mixed views. One letter from a very important body says, "Do not let this Bill through whatever happens; we do not want the compulsory Saturday afternoon closing." From the same locality I have a letter from a number of people who state that they belong to an important sporting organisation. Sportsmen evidently do not consider the farming community who desire to have Saturday shopping, because these particular people are in favour of closing on Saturday. So that we have some who are in favour of the shops being kept open on Saturday afternoon and others in favour of closing them.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Let the local option poll decide the issue.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There was an instance where the local people worked under the poll system for many years. Everything seemed to work out well. In several other centres I know of that is not the posi-

tion. In one centre the shopkeepers agreed to close on Saturday. Within six months they came to me asking me to approach the Minister to see whether they could revert to the old order. They began by closing on Saturday and then found their business was slipping away to a neighbouring centre. They had the local option poll and they got the Saturday closing brought into being, but very speedily they found they were losing business. They then asked that the whole question be reconsidered. The Minister referred them to the Act, where it is laid down clearly that another local option poll cannot be taken for two years. Those people therefore had to wait two years and suffer a big loss of business. As soon as the community had an opportunity to vote again, it was decided to revert to the open shop on Saturday afternoon and evening.

Many years ago I had an experience at York. There was a sporting organisation there and I suppose its members were not concerned about the welfare of the district. They decided to close on Saturday. I had a number of employees, and said to the shopkeepers, "I am afraid you people are making a mistake in closing on Saturday afternoon, but as an employer it does not concern me." At that time people were all glad to go into the township where they could make their own purchases of what they required. As soon as Saturday closing came into full swing, my employees did not bother to come into the township on Saturday, because the shops were closed. They were unable to choose their own goods, and they therefore made their purchases direct from Perth. They sent their orders to Boan's or Foy's.

Hon. A. Thomson: You are not far wrong there; your argument is sound.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Those fellows were quite satisfied to pay whatever increased price might be demanded for their goods. They did not only have to do their own shopping but they had the pleasure of meeting one another. It did not matter two hoots to me so long as they were back at work on Monday morning. If they had too much liquor, or met too many friends on Saturday night, that would probably cost them a good deal of money, and they would very likely suffer for it in other ways, but so long as they made a recovery on Sunday and got back to work on Monday, it was all right with me. This is to try out the same

thing. When this House passed a measure for local option, by a poll, it provided something democratic. Let us keep this democratic principle going. I have been told, from many centres, that the shops are open to meet the convenience of the people as a result of the arrival of trains. At some towns there is no train or mail to collect on Saturdays. The people in those places would rather have the shops kept open on Fridays. They should be allowed to please themselves. Why should we put hobbles on them?

Hon. G. B. Wood: They do it in the metropolitan area.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: They have S.P. betting and other things in the metropolitan area. The people here want to see the country residents come into the city to spend their money, and they will. If they cannot make their purchases on a Saturday night much more country money will go into the city.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do you believe in late shopping on Saturday nights?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not mind. I am thinking of the employees. They usually want to do their shopping at the weekend. This Bill provides for compulsory closing all over the State so that no place will have the right to decide for itself.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.17]: Again I am at variance with Mr. Hamersley. I suppose there is not one member who has done more than I have to get the ideas of his electors on this subject. I was instrumental in getting the York Road Board, of which I am a member, to circularise all the other road boards. We found, as a result, that there was a difference of opinion. A little more than 60 per cent. was in favour of Saturday closing and just under 40 per cent. against any change. Some said, "Leave it to the people by way of local option." Much has been said about local option, but I do not agree with it. I think it is a farce entirely. We found some years ago, when the shops shut at Northam, that the people round about did their shopping at Tooday, Goomalling or York. The same thing happened when the shops at York were shut. In that instance the people went to Quairading, Beverley or Northam.

Hon. G. Fraser: Does not that indicate that the shops should all shut on Saturdays?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. That was no good to the individual storekeepers. They lost trade. Some years ago I was an advocate against closing on Saturdays. The Northam people had a poll and said that they did not want to close on Saturday afternoons. Today they have seen the light, perhaps because of the experience in the war years, and want to close on Saturday afternoons.

Hon. A. Thomson: Does not the Act give them the opportunity to close?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, but they do not want to be the only ones to close. It is unsatisfactory if one town decides to close and the others round about remain open. This is a case of one in, all in. I do not believe in the hogey of people going to Perth to do their shopping. I have spoken to many storekeepers on the matter, and not one is afraid of the trade going to Perth if they all close. People do not want to be bothered with shopping in Perth. We have been told that people will come to Perth for the races and do their shopping at the same time. Well, he is a poor country storekeeper who cannot compete with that sort of thing. I do not think a single storekeeper is afraid of it. I am in Perth as often as I am in my home town, and I have not spent 30s. in Perth on groceries. The difference in price is not worth bothering about.

There is nothing in the idea of not being able to get groceries because the shops are shut on Saturday afternoons. With telephones and motorcars only very little grocery shopping need be done on Saturday afternoons. In consultation with the largest storekeeper in York, I said, "How much shopping could be done quite easily by cutting out the Saturday afternoons?" He said that 85 per cent. could be easily done without any inconvenience. Many people go to the country towns on sale days, and they can do most of their shopping then. Today people will not do their shopping on sale days. There is only one big sale day at York and the people will not shop on that day. They do it the next day, Saturday. This storekeeper told me that he had implored people to put in their orders and get their goods away on the Friday, so as to ease the position on Saturday, but they would not do it. I said, "What about the farm hands?" He said they could shop at some time other than Saturday afternoons,

and are doing so. I mentioned one or two big farmers employing hands, and he said that the ordering was done by telephone and they picked up the goods when they come into the pictures.

Hon. A. Thomson: Does that apply to clothing?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: No, I have to admit that. I was speaking of groceries in particular. But a man does not come in to buy clothing every Saturday.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I suppose someone comes in every Saturday?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. Most of them come in on Saturdays for the pictures whether the shops are open or not. The shops at Corrigin have not been open on a Saturday afternoon for years, and no-one cares. The same thing applies at Narembeen, Nungarin and Wongan Hills.

Hon. A. Thomson: What about Kulin?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: It is not in my province. I understand, however, that a difference of opinion exists there. I am quoting places that I am particularly interested in. I inquired as to how the Katanning people were getting on and they said that they were quite all right and were not worried.

Hon. A. Thomson: They come in on Friday, which is always a sale day.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, like other places. From the investigations I have made I cannot see anything against closing on Saturdays. I was instrumental in having the York Road Board office closed on Saturdays. Someone said, "There will be a howl about this." There was no howl. People got used to it. They came in on other days to see the banker, the road board, the railways or the stock agents, who are all closed on Saturday afternoons. At 1 or 2 p.m. on Saturdays in the city the people are all going off to the races—

Hon. L. Craig: That is an exaggeration!

Hon. G. B. WOOD:—or to the football or the beaches.

Hon. G. Fraser: They go hiking.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: In the country towns they are working and have to play their football on Sundays.

Hon. A. Thomson: How many country towns work on Saturday afternoons?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am talking of shop hands and shopowners who have to work on Saturday afternoons. A storekeeper at Cunderdin said to me, "I have a good idea; I got it from the Post Office. People do not wait for the Post Office to open to get their letters, but get them from their box. I intend to put lockers for my customers on my side verandah."

Hon. A. L. Loton: You do not order your mail.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: No, but a person could order his groceries by telephone and pick them up later. My wife has seldom bought groceries for years without first ordering them by telephone. Many other people ring their orders through. I am only going on what the storekeepers have told me.

Hon. L. Craig: You seem to be the storekeepers' representative.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, but I am also the representative of the employees and everyone else concerned.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is for your district.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, and other districts too. I have not found any hardship in other districts where the Saturday closing prevails, and I made it my business to find out. I hope this measure will pass the second reading. If city members like to make it six o'clock, that is all right with me. If this measure were universal throughout Western Australia, those who object to it today would be perfectly happy about it in 12 months' time, or even less. I support the second reading.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [5.25]: I also represent a rural area, but in direct contrast to Mr. Wood, I believe in local option.

Hon. L. Craig: The trinity disagree.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Thank you. Mr. Wood has mentioned Katanning and Naregin. Those places have big sale days, and they occur mostly on the Friday of each week. Those towns are in my electorate. The people at Kulin recently tried the experiment of closing on Saturday afternoon and they turned it down flat. The train goes to that town on a Saturday afternoon, and the shops are shut. No-one

gets any benefit. No-one is there to get the vegetables which, together with the mail, come at the week-end.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is a point that city people overlook.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Local option satisfies the needs of the people. I do not care whether they shut at 6 o'clock or 8 o'clock in the metropolitan area, and if some measure is brought in to provide for compulsory closing there at 12 o'clock on Saturdays, I will support it.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.27]: It is quite refreshing to see a difference of opinion among the Country Party members. I congratulate Mr. Loton on his advocacy of local option for the outback places.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Why are you changing your tone?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am not changing my tone; I am supporting the hon. member. We are not ready for this uniformity throughout the State. I do not see why the people in the different localities cannot decide for themselves whether they will have their shops open or not. In the bigger towns such as Katanning and York the shop employees constitute quite a large proportion of the population. Also in those places the people have telephones and most have motorcars. But we have many small villages and towns throughout the group areas where the only day for the people is Saturday. The settlers there have no telephones. They come into town on Saturday to do their shopping and go to the pictures. If the people in the country want Saturday closing, they can vote for it. There is no harm in local option. If they do not want it they will vote against it. I see no harm in leaving the matter to the people to decide for themselves.

Reference has been made to sport. I do not know of any part of the South-West where sport is indulged in on Saturdays, so this will mean no hardship. If we are to have uniformity with regard to Saturday afternoon closing, why does the Government employ extra men on the trams in order to take people to football matches on Saturday afternoons?

Hon. G. B. Wood: They are paid extra for that.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The question of payment does not enter into this argument; the object is to secure uniformity. To say to the few people in some small country towns that they must not shop on Saturday afternoons because the shops must close and at the same time to require the poor old trammies to work until a late hour on Saturday nights in order to convey people from football matches or to and from the trots is not consistent. We must be reasonable. The lesser have to give way to the greater in all things. In some country towns the employees affected will number only three or four and it is no great hardship to require them to work on Saturday afternoons in order that a large number of farmers from the surrounding districts may be served. I do not know what the position would be in the group settlement areas and what the shop employees there would do if there were no business transacted on Saturday afternoons.

Hon. G. B. Wood: How many employees would there be in that position?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Many of them are married men with small farms and then again the single people want clothes and other things occasionally. The argument should not be based on what the towns require. People in the outer areas should receive some consideration. Members will realise that we must extend consideration to people living in the small centres such as those referred to by Mr. Loton. They have no voice in these matters like the towns that have their representatives to look after their interests. I am not concerned about the towns to the extent that I am regarding the rights of people in the smaller centres. We should not be adamant on this question. With the provision for local option, if people want Saturday afternoon closing they can vote for it.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.33]: This is a small matter, but it has many aspects. Personally, I cannot reconcile the actions of the Government which proposes to ask the people by way of referendum whether this Chamber is to be allowed to exist, when it can also introduce legislation enabling Parliament to direct people living in small centres like Walkaway and Wyal-katchem as to when they shall do their shopping and when the shop employees shall have

their half-holiday. It savours too much of the regimentation of which we have heard so much, if we are to say that everyone, irrespective of local conditions, shall be compelled to do the same thing in the same way at the same time. I am very much opposed to that attitude. I have business interests at Geraldton and to force Northampton, Walkaway and other places to submit to Saturday afternoon closing would suit me personally, but I do not propose to vote in favour of the Bill. If we are in earnest when we say we want people to go outback and open up this most inadequately developed State, we must extend to them greater consideration than is indicated in the Bill.

Last week I travelled from Carnamah in the south to Northampton in the north and out to Mullewa in the east, and everywhere I was asked to vote against the Bill which sought to impose Saturday closing on the shopkeepers outback. It is not a question of the shop employees or of the shopkeepers. Of paramount importance to my mind is the customer. In the parts of which I speak, the customer does not live next door to the store or in the next street nor is he a worker whose hours are safeguarded by Arbitration Court awards. That is the factor that influences me. Let us give the people themselves the right to say which afternoon suits them best for the closing of shops. If they decide that Saturday afternoon is best, well and good, but if they favour the half-holiday on Wednesday or Thursday, we should give the people the right to close on the day of their preference. If we are to act otherwise, why not say that the hotels must close on Saturday afternoons?

As to the suggestion that the shops shall close at 5.30 p.m., I have worked in a general store for many years and I can assure the House that, particularly during the winter months, very little business is done between 5.30 and 6 p.m. In my opinion, no hardship would be imposed upon the customers if the earlier shopping hour were fixed because people do not want to poke about in the dark when they are making their purchases and the extra half-hour would be of great benefit to the employees. On the other hand, the people in the outback areas should have the right to say when the shops should close.

Hon. A. Thomson: But they have that right.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: And I do not desire to deprive them of it.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.40]: I support the Bill. This question about Saturday afternoon closing has been argued time and again in years gone by, particularly with regard to the application of the principle in the country areas. On this occasion every member has made up his mind as to what his attitude will be. Listening to the debate, I could not help being amused at the inconsistency disclosed by some members regarding local option. What was their attitude in connection with local option when it applied to liquor licenses? They have postponed the holding of local option polls for ten or 15 years.

Hon. A. Thomson: Your Government postponed it.

Hon. G. FRASER: Members of this Chamber agreed to the postponement. What about their action in denying the people the right to conduct those local option polls?

Hon. L. Craig: Bring in another such proposal and see.

Hon. G. FRASER: The proposal has been brought up on many occasions and we have already seen what the attitude of members has been. They have no scruples about it at all. Yet they now talk about giving the right to the people to say, by means of a local option poll, whether the shops should, or should not, close on Saturday afternoons!

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I think you are wrong when you say that local option proposals have been before the House for many years.

Hon. G. FRASER: The matter has been before the House on many occasions and the local option polls on the liquor question have been postponed. That has been members' attitude although the law provides that local option polls shall be taken at the specified intervals.

Hon. A. Thomson: Why did you not see that that was done?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not discussing the question of local option, but rather the attitude of members who today are placing such stress on the application of local option in this instance. I am dealing with their inconsistency.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The circumstances were different, and you know it.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the suggestion that is always put forward when members are accused of inconsistency.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the hon. member is doing that, too.

Hon. G. FRASER: It can always be done by members who wish to explain their altered attitude on a question the basis of which is exactly the same as that concerning another matter respecting which their contention was in a contrary direction.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: You know that it applies in this instance.

Hon. G. FRASER: It does not! I have heard this type of argument ever since the abolition of the Friday night late shopping was first thought of. The same applied to the closing of shops on Saturday afternoons.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What are they doing in the Eastern States?

Hon. G. FRASER: So far as I know, the shops in the metropolitan areas all close on Saturday afternoons. In some odd places they still have Friday night shopping. Most of the business premises in the cities close on week-days at 5.30 p.m. There is very little 6 o'clock closing in the Eastern States.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That is entirely incorrect. I was there a fortnight ago.

Hon. G. FRASER: I was there a month or two ago, and most of the shops in Melbourne and Sydney closed at the hour I stated.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: But that applies to the cities.

Hon. G. FRASER: I referred to the cities, and said so specifically. I do not know what conditions apply in the country areas, but most of the premises in the cities close at 5.30 p.m.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That was not so a fortnight ago.

Hon. G. FRASER: Then conditions must have altered in the last month or so. I repeat that I have heard the same old arguments trotted out with regard to the shortening of trading hours. Reference was made to the employees on farms. Are they suffering any greater hardships through the closing of shops on Saturday afternoons than have been suffered by the workers in the towns? In these days we do not hear any complaints in the metropolitan area because

of the abolition of Saturday afternoon shopping. Since the change-over from the late shopping night on Fridays and the closing of shops on Saturday afternoons, the attitude of the people generally has entirely changed, and those who previously opposed the reforms would not now consider going back to the old order.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Because it spits them.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the Bill be agreed to and the country areas are placed on the same basis, the attitude of those who today oppose the measure will change and, as we have noted in the metropolitan area, they will not seek to revert to the old order.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.45]: If closing at one o'clock would suit the York district, I am sure it would not suit the province I represent. I agree with what Mr. Craig has said is the position generally in the South-West; but I would like to draw attention to the fact that we have a number of holiday resorts along the coastline and the week-end trade is what the storekeepers depend on. It is also a very great convenience for the holiday-makers to be able to get their requirements on a Saturday afternoon and thus avoid the necessity of buying them on the day they leave Perth. A number of these storekeepers would have to close down if they could not trade during the summer period. For that reason alone I am opposed to one o'clock closing. There are many of these stores and I know the great convenience it is for people to be able to do their shopping at them on Saturday afternoon. I also know the very great benefit it is to business people to take advantage of the holiday period in order to make up for the slack period during the winter months. A number of the outback towns also prefer that the law should remain as it is. If they desire a change, the machinery is available to effect it. I shall vote against the second reading.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.48]: I think there are some members in this Chamber who have entirely lost the viewpoint of the people residing in country districts. Mr. Wood said that the shops at Katanning, Narrogin and various other towns in my province right down to Albany all closed on Saturday. That is so. That

is done by the will of the people and they are perfectly satisfied. As a matter of fact, Friday is the big day in Katanning. It is the sale day and the country people make it their practice to come in from miles around to do their shopping on that day. There is nothing doing in Katanning on Saturday. That applies to all the big country towns. What better illustration could we have than that given by Mr. Loton? He mentioned a town which had a train at the week-end, on Saturday, and he said the people were waiting on that day for their fresh vegetables, groceries and other commodities. Are they to be denied the right—the privilege—of getting their necessities on the Saturday?

Hon. G. Fraser: Could not the train arrive on a Friday?

Hon. A. THOMSON: If the hon. member could arrange for the trains to arrive at all country towns on a Friday, of course the trading could be done on the Friday.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Very few trains arrive at country places on a Saturday.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The hon. member seemed to be most anxious about the shop assistants. There are just as many shop assistants in my district as there are in his and I am not afraid of them.

Hon. G. Fraser: He looks after them better.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am not contending that shops should not be closed on Saturday. I am not saying that we should not have the present system in all the big towns, but we have an Act which was framed to take into consideration the position of our outback people. It is all very fine for Mr. Wood and other members to say that the country shopkeeper is not affected. It would surprise Mr. Wood, if he made inquiries, to find out the number of mail orders sent by city shops to all the country sidings.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That has always been so.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The hon. member said that the business people in his district were perfectly satisfied that they would not lose any business at all if they closed on Saturday afternoon.

Hon. G. W. Miles: A good centralisation policy—drive all the trade into the city.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am not opposed to Saturday afternoon closing. I do not

think any person in my province wants to go back to the late shopping night. I am not advocating that at all, but I ask the Government this: Who is responsible for bringing in this Bill? Why was it brought in?

The Honorary Minister: To move with the times!

Hon. G. Fraser: Progress!

Hon. A. THOMSON: There we have the answer; it is that we are to move with the times.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Did you not initiate a movement to close petrol bowsters at a certain hour?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I did not.

Hon. G. B. Wood: There was no local option about that; no vote was taken.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, there was. We had requests from all over the country. For the information of the hon. member, I might say that I got in touch with all the bowster owners in my province and asked them whether they approved or disapproved of my proposed action. They were unanimous. Therefore, I did take a local option poll.

Hon. G. B. Wood: So did I.

The Chief Secretary: What about the customers of the bowsters? Did you consult them?

Hon. A. THOMSON: They were quite willing. There is a provision in the Act that if they require petrol they can get it. I am surprised that there should be any argument, particularly by some of the country members against the poll. I shall not enter into the argument adduced by Mr. Fraser. I feel that we shall, by an Act of Parliament, over-ride conditions that have been laid down by the Arbitration Court. Admittedly, of course, we can do so if we like. The Honorary Minister said this Bill was introduced in order to move with the times. Would I be unkind if I suggested that there was an election coming on and that it might be popular if a measure of this kind were passed? It will not affect any of the larger country districts, as these are today enjoying those privileges; what I am concerned about are the smaller towns where there is only one train a week. God knows the people in those places have enough to put up with already.

Hon. G. B. Wood: On what day does the train run?

Hon. A. THOMSON: On Saturday. Mr. Loton told the hon. member that.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Only one place!

Hon. A. THOMSON: There are other places as well.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! These dialogues must cease.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Act provides that any district can decide on which day the shops shall close. We are all aware that in country districts sports are held on Sundays, as the people have to travel considerable distances. I have no desire to deny men working on farms and men working in country stores any of the privileges enjoyed in the city; but as Mr. E. H. H. Hall has pointed out, many country people do not live adjacent to a store and probably they have to travel many miles to make their purchases. They do not enjoy the privilege, as does Mr. Wood, of a telephone to their house.

Hon. G. Fraser: They would have to travel on whatever day the shops were open.

Hon. A. THOMSON: They do. The hon. member has one view, I have another. I shall vote against the Bill because I believe the Act as it stands provides ample protection for all workers in the country districts.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [5.56]: I would like briefly to reply to Mr. Thomson's remarks on this Bill. He suggested the time had arrived when this measure might be amended in several directions and quoted a number of instances which he considered to be unfair as the result of the

parent Act. For that reason he said he intended to vote against the Bill. I desire to remind the hon. member that the parent Act expires on the 30th of this month. The National Security Regulations are expected to expire at the end of the year; and I suggest that if there is any period when control is lifted the repercussions will be exceedingly serious. They will be the same here as they have been elsewhere. The Government realises that the position is most serious. I informed the House, when introducing the Bill, that the matter had been the subject of some discussion at the recent Premiers' Conference, at which the Premiers of all the States of the Commonwealth were agreed that control should be continued. They were not in a position at that particular time, however, to reach a definite decision.

Hon. A. Thomson: I want control, but I want you to extend it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The matter was accordingly deferred until the next Premiers' Conference, which is expected to be held in January next. It is for that reason that no amendments have been included in this Bill. I hope that the sentiment expressed by Mr. Thomson will not be accepted by other members as being the attitude which should be adopted by this House. I should regret it very much indeed if control of rents were lifted by a vote of this Chamber. I hope the House will pass the second reading.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	3

Majority for 15

AYES.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. R. M. Forrester	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. G. Fraser

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. I. Loton	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. A. Thomson	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 15:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I want to emphasise the attitude I adopted on this Bill. For many years the measure has been introduced every year, and we have not been in a position to amend it any more than we are on this occasion. It seemed to me that the only way we could do something was to vote the Bill out, knowing that the Government could, if it so desired, within 24 hours introduce another measure which could, to a great extent, overcome the present black marketing that is taking place in regard to rents. We know that rents have been fixed. We also know that tenants are in the happy position of being able to appeal to the court and have them reduced. We know further—and I am sure the Government must know—of scores of cases where tenants are subletting rooms at rents higher than they themselves are paying for the premises.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will not make a second reading speech.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No, I am not doing that. I want to clarify my position. I am not opposed to rent control, but I do think it is time the Government faced the position and introduced a measure which would stop the pernicious system of black marketing which is in existence. I do not oppose the clause.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I, too, would like an opportunity to voice the hope that the Government will see its way clear to bring in a new Bill. I have a letter from an old friend of mine, resident in the metropolitan area, complaining very bitterly about the profiteering that has been taking place. We have an Act dealing with profiteering on the sale of ordinary commodities but we have no Act to compel people letting rooms to desist from the extreme profiteering that occurs. I am sure the Government realises the position. We have had the Chief Secretary's assurance that at the next Premiers' Conference something will be done. I hope that assurance will be honoured.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have also received urgent requests that this measure be drastically amended before being passed. Unfortunately, I have not any amendment to insert.

Hon. A. Thomson: We could not amend it; that is the tragedy.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Of course; and it is a great pity that it did not go out. Of all the ramps that have existed in this country, this is one of the greatest. There is an enormous number of houses that were let before the war at peppercorn rentals. The moment the war started, people subletting these premises charged treble the original rent and the owners have never had a look in.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Minister has given an assurance that the matter will be dealt with at the Premiers' Conference.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The point I want to raise is that many people cannot get into their own homes.

Hon. C. B. Williams: They sneaked away when they thought the Japs were going to raid Perth. Half of them are only curs, and would not face up to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please resume his seat? I hope members will not take advantage of the leniency I have shown. This clause is merely to amend Section 15 by changing the word "forty-six" to "forty-seven." The whole debate should be confined to the question of whether the word should be "forty-six" or "forty-seven." I allowed a little leniency, but I think members are taking advantage of it. I will now ask them to confine themselves to the subject-matter of the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT, 1919-1942, AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [7.30]: This is a very short Bill, and I commend it to the House, because in many country centres where infant health clinics are being established it is necessary to obtain some support from the local authority. Under the existing law no road board can vote any money from its ordinary revenue for such

purposes. While that applies in many centres there are, on the other hand, some districts where a few ratepayers ask their road boards for all kinds of assistance that cannot be granted. In some centres perhaps the people would rather be without this legislation, but, generally speaking, it would be of benefit to the local authorities. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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—MILK.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [7.35]: I consider that the main essential of a Bill to control milk in all the phases of its production and distribution is to ensure that the milk, when it reaches the consumer, is safe, clean and of a high food value. That seems to me the first essential. The second is to ensure that the milk, conforming to that first requirement, is delivered to the consumer at the lowest possible price compatible with justice and equity to all those engaged in the occupations of producing and supplying milk. Thirdly, we must ensure that, so far as is possible, the administration of the Act—an Act to control one of the most vital foods of the people—is divorced from political—as against parliamentary—control, and that those administering the Act shall be competent to do so and, what is more, that they will have the power to do it. It is from those three points of view that I desire to criticise this Bill.

I will deal first with the mixture of political control in this Bill, the powers of the board, and its personnel. Any member reading the Bill will see that the board is completely powerless. It exists as a board in name, and in name only, its functions being negligible. It cannot move hand or foot without the consent of the Minister. Let us look at how the board is to be controlled. One of the first clauses says that, subject to the Minister, the board shall administer the Act. Then it takes from the board any right to

divide the State into what will be declared dairy areas. It takes from the board any right even to divide an area once it has been declared. It takes from the board any practical control of the division of the State into dairy areas. Later on we find that the board cannot even appoint its own staff without first meeting the wishes of the Minister. It cannot issue directives to a vendor as to where he shall sell his milk, without the consent of the Minister, and when its powers are defined there is a clause which says that, subject to the approval of the Minister, it can do certain things.

The provision goes further, to make certain that the board can not do anything, by saying, "Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act the board cannot exercise any power without the consent of the Minister," and that any act of the board can be countermanded by a note in writing from the Minister. It says, further, that when the board has taken away the license of a dairyman or vendor he shall have the right of appeal to the Minister and then the Minister shall have the right to restore that license, and that the Minister will even have the power to decide finally what compensation the delicensed vendor or dairyman may obtain from the compensation fund. Towards the end of the Bill one finds that the board can prepare any scheme it likes for doing anything to improve the production, supply and distribution of milk, provided the Minister agrees to it. If he does not agree the board cannot go on with the scheme. Surely there can be only two explanations of that. One is that the Minister wants power and political control over milk. The other is that he is firmly convinced that the board which he contemplates will be incapable of carrying out the tasks that this Bill will allot to it. I do not think any other interpretation can be placed on a Bill of this character, which appoints a board and then takes from it every vestige of power.

I would have thought the best way to deal with the matter would be to appoint a board in which one had complete confidence and which therefore could be left to carry out its task. I think the public are entitled to see that the control of one of their principal sources of food is not left purely in the hands of the Minister to say yea or nay, but rather in the hands of a board competent to carry

out what Parliament says should be done under the Bill. One point that worries me considerably as to the powers of this board, or rather the absence of powers, is that the board does not appear to have any chance of controlling the dairies, the conditions in the dairies or the conditions under which milk is stored or kept. A lot is said in the Bill as to what the board can do, but the only penalty it can inflict is to revoke a license.

Let me remind the House that it is not many years since the Medical Board was limited to the revoking of licenses, if we may call them such, of medical practitioners, as a penalty for misdeeds, with the result that nothing was done, because the board never desired to take that extreme step. This board has to rely entirely on the Health Department carrying out its function of looking after dairies and other institutions connected with milk, while the board itself is completely powerless to do anything to improve existing conditions. Although I do not know how to put it into the Bill, I would sooner see the board given power to impose a fine or some lesser penalty than that of revoking the license.

In this morning's paper a correspondent, whose name I forget, agreed with my thoughts. He instanced that the British Milk Act would allow the board to say to a dairyman, "You have not done as you were told. We impose a fine of £5." I believe the board should have power to see that its instructions are carried out. In the past that has been one of the greatest difficulties. Whether that power can be placed in the Bill without inserting a totally new clause, I do not know. I have many amendments on the notice paper, as members will see, but this is a matter about which I have not been able to make up my mind. I suggest to members that they give the point consideration, because unless the board has authority to say to the proprietors of dairies, milk depots, milk bars, and so on, "You must make alterations to conform to our regulations," it will fail in carrying out the wishes of Parliament. I am certain that Parliament desires better conditions for our milk and a better class of milk than we are receiving at the moment. I propose to make this board a competent one. I have suggested that the Commissioner of Public Health and the Superintendent of Dairy-

ing be appointed to the board as ex-officio members. The officers holding those posts could attend each meeting or, if they chose, the meetings only when matters affecting the board and their own departments were on the agenda paper.

Hon. L. Craig: Would you give them a vote?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, otherwise they would be in the position of being told, "We know your wishes, but do not desire to carry them out." If the strength of the board were increased to seven by the addition of the Commissioner of Public Health and the Superintendent of Dairying—and I am suggesting one other technical officer—there would still not be a majority of technical officers on the board. There would still be the chairman, the two producer representatives and one consumer representative, none of whom would be a technical officer. The board as proposed in the Bill will be a nominated one, because the representatives will be nothing but political appointees, and the chairman will be a Government-appointed official, which would make the representation of the Government three as against two. I have endeavoured to take away from the Minister the power of veto and to make the board more representative and strengthened by technical officers. Government control would be eliminated.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And yet you would expect the Government to take full responsibility.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Government would still have considerable responsibility, because the Commissioner of Public Health and the Superintendent of Dairying are public servants, and the chairman will be the nominee of the Government, while one of the consumers' representatives will also be a Government appointee. If the Government indicated its views to the Commissioner of Public Health, the Superintendent of Dairying and the chairman of the board, the board could carry into effect the Government's wishes without having to run like schoolboys cap-in-hand to the Minister on every matter requiring a decision. What type of man would accept a position on a board such as is proposed? I certainly would not accept any post on a board on which, after having sat a considerable length of time and come to a de-

decision as a board, the whole of the decisions had to be submitted to the Minister to see whether he agreed with them. I cannot envisage anyone with real initiative undertaking the task of being a member of such a board. Members will realise that under this Bill the board will not be able to appoint its staff unless the Minister approves; it cannot even bank its money unless the Minister approves of the bank. Why not name the bank?

I have therefore suggested many amendments designed to make the board competent. I have gone a little further. Under the Bill it is proposed that the Minister shall be able to hand back a revoked license. While it may be a little more clumsy to appeal to a magistrate and while the magistrate may not always give the desired verdict, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that he is a man trained to weigh evidence, and what to me is the cardinal point is that the dairyman or vendor who has sinned against the public health would have to go before the public again and state his case in order to regain a license. I do not consider that a man who has offended against the public health should have the right to go to the Minister behind closed doors for his license or for his compensation. He has offended against the public health, and he should have to go before the public again if he is to be permitted to deal in food once more. The public has a right to expect that the board shall be competent. The public has a right to expect that the board shall be fully capable of carrying out its task.

The Chief Secretary: What makes you suggest that the proposed board would not be competent and capable?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I will deal with those aspects. The public has a right to expect that the milk supply will be supervised by a board to which it can look for guidance. The public has a right to know who is responsible for the conditions existing at present. Under the Bill, however, the board might shield behind the Minister or the Minister might shield behind the board. Let the board meet its responsibilities to the public and be capable of doing the job! I said that the board would not be competent for the simple reason that there would be no technical officers amongst its members. It is not right to expect that

five laymen would be hygiene-conscious. They cannot be. To become hygiene-conscious necessitates training both in technique and in science. The board should be guided by those who are trained technically and by the Commissioner of Public Health because in the past there has been a great gulf between the Milk Board and the Public Health Department, and the great gulf will continue unless the Health Department is associated with the work.

In other States there are varying boards, but so far as one can ascertain, they always have technical officers on them. Especially is this so in Victoria where they have a Milk Board and a Milk Supply Committee. Yet it is proposed that we put the matter of the milk supply entirely in the hands of lay members. These lay members should be guided by the advice tendered to them by the departmental officers and trained men sitting at their meetings as to what the standard of dairies should be and what the standard of milk as delivered to consumers should be. There are other directions, too, in which they should be guided in technique and hygiene. I have no idea of attacking the Milk Board as such. I am attacking the system that allows these people to deal with technical and professional matters without being guided by such officers.

I do not believe that the Milk Board today is hygiene-conscious. I do not believe that the Bill would make them hygiene-conscious. I do not think there can be any real attempt under the measure to provide the public with clean, safe milk. This Bill is one that deals with the economic side of milk rather than the health side. I would emphasise this point that if the board were hygiene-conscious, I do not think it would have given effect to some of the things it has already done. If members read the inter-departmental committee's report they will find that the pasteurised milk was examined for the Navy, Army and Air Force and the Americans by the phosphatase test. On page 24 of the report, we find this test mentioned for the milk supplied to the United States Navy and the Australian Army authorities. Out of 64 samples in one category, 31 were inefficiently pasteurised; out of 21 samples eight were not efficiently pasteurised; out of 70 samples 17 were not efficiently pasteurised.

Consequently the board was aware that pasteurising was not being carried out efficiently. Yet when I asked in the House how many examinations of milk involving the use of the phosphatase test had been carried out during the past 12 months, I was told "None." I hope that question was not confused by whoever gave the Minister the reply by the fact that the Department of Public Health was mentioned in the first paragraph of the question, whereas the second paragraph was intended as a considered question as to the number of instances in which the phosphatase test had been used in the 12 months. Without any idea of checking up on the Minister's reply, curiously enough, a letter came into my hands only this morning. An organisation with which I am connected is very interested in food problems, and some months ago discussed with me the question of various tests for food.

Allusion was made to the Milk Board, and I was asked about the phosphatase test. In a letter dated the 9th September from the Secretary of the Metropolitan Milk Board, the following appears:—

The phosphatase test has been used recently for pasteurised milk taken by this board for examination in the laboratory at the Department of Agriculture.

That statement would admit of certain interpretations—that the Milk Board is still doing it in an experimental way with the Department of Agriculture, that the statement is misleading, or that the question I asked in the House was misinterpreted. I hope the explanation is that the question was misinterpreted, but there is certainly a discrepancy somewhere. The Milk Board has carried out phosphatase tests, and knows that the pasteurisation is not being carried out effectively because, in answer to a question by Sir Hal Colebatch, the Minister stated that the apparatus was satisfactory if efficiently used. Even at this stage, 12 months after the conclusion of the war, some questions might reasonably have been asked of those carrying out pasteurisation to ensure that people who were paying for a properly pasteurised product were getting it.

Recently I asked whether Mr. Frank Petricevich had been re-licensed to sell milk and was told that he had not. Then I asked, in the event of his not having been re-licensed, where he was selling the milk he was pro-

ducing and for what purpose it was being used. The reply was that the board had been unable to obtain evidence that this man was selling milk. I could tell the board where some of the milk is going. I know where portion of it is being distributed, and if I could ascertain that, the Milk Board which has authority should not experience much difficulty in finding out. It did not take me long to learn the facts when once I had made up my mind to find out where some of the milk was going. I suggest that the Milk Board should find out. I believe that the board is more economically-minded than hygiene-minded. I do not think it is possible to make laymen thoroughly hygiene-minded. I therefore think there should be some trained officers on the board.

It is a fact rather horrible to mention, too, that a member of the board has been fined for selling milk that was below standard. I wonder if it is right that anyone who has been convicted of selling milk under standard should hold a post on the board. Heaven knows our standard of butter fat is low enough! That is a matter to which I shall refer later. I believe it is true—and I have quite an amount of information on the matter—that a dairy in the metropolitan area, which was the subject of a conviction, has been re-licensed by the Milk Board. Some members of this House have seen the conditions at various metropolitan dairies, and I do not think that those associated with the production or distribution of milk should re-license those places.

The time has come when we have to face the fact that the metropolitan area is not the place in which to produce milk. If the Milk Board had been hygiene-conscious it would have thought carefully before re-licensing any dairy in the metropolitan area that had become disused as such. The need for technical staff to advise the Milk Board is quite obvious when one realises the standards that have to be laid down for the dairy sheds, milking sheds, the storage of food in relation to the dairy, the depots, the standard of milk and the testing of milk, the basis of the phosphatase test for pasteurised milk, and whether the reductase test, or the methylene blue test, as it is sometimes called, should be used. I do not believe that the board should be totally reliant upon searching in other departments for its knowledge. That knowledge should come to it much better around the board table.

I am firmly of the opinion that neither the Minister who introduced the Bill nor the board believes that there is a real problem. Yet those of us who are trained in hygiene and public health are concerned because there is a problem. In the newspaper this morning the Commissioner of Public Health headed an article stating that the position is dangerous, so it is time one began to take some steps. The inter-departmental committee states in its report that it did not like many of the dairies it had visited, and that many of them were not up to standard. That committee stated in one paragraph that it visited quite a number of dairies, about 130 I think, and it went on to say—

On only 17 of the dairies visited could it be considered that the milk was strained properly. Twenty-six farmers were using gauze and/or cloth strainers; many of the latter were quite unfit for the purpose. They cannot be cleansed and sterilised satisfactorily, and quickly reach a condition in which they do more damage than good.

It further stated that only seven dairies were equipped with steam boilers, yet the depots state that they cannot be responsible for the sterilising of the cans that go back. Then the committee dealt with the difficulty of water supply for these dairies, and said that even in the irrigation areas they classed 10 of the 20 dairies as being bad to fair, or very bad. Those members who have seen the dairies in the metropolitan area will not be surprised to know that the inter-departmental committee stated that of the 14 visited in the metropolitan area, seven were bad to fair, three were very bad, two were good and two were fair to good.

Therefore it seems that a real problem exists, and it is further exemplified when we realise that the bacteriological reports laid on the Table of the House show that roughly 50 per cent. of the samples tested had been contaminated with manure at some stage or another. In other words, the bacillus coli was present. One has to remember that the colon bacillus and the typhoid bacillus are in the same group. They are the dangerous organisms in milk and can cause epidemics. Fortunately we have not had many cases of typhoid here, but there is a possibility of an epidemic when we realise that in 1941, in the three metropolitan hospitals there were seven cases of typhoid; in 1942 there were nine cases; in 1943 the figure had jumped to 26; in 1944 it

fell to seven and in 1945 it had risen to 14. Fortunately those are small figures compared with what occurred in the years gone by, but the danger always exists.

It is known by most of us that the Americans looked for an epidemic of typhoid in the Fremantle district in 1945 when the number of cases jumped to 14. The Americans had been inspecting the dairies. It was last year when Dr. Baker reported on the condition of the Fremantle dairies and it was suggested that the report was exaggerated. But if we read the inter-departmental committee's report on water supplies of the dairies we find that almost every word that he said is borne out. It will take a long time and large sums of money to clean up the dairies, and a much longer time than it would take to make the milk safe by pasteurisation. I agree that pasteurisation is not the total answer, but it is the total answer at first.

Let us introduce compulsory pasteurisation, and when we have our dairies in such a condition that we can safely liberate certain of them from control, we can say to the public, "If you prefer raw milk you can have it from those places because it is safe." But in the interests of public health I cannot see that at present we can say that the public can have milk from anywhere, especially when we remember that the Commissioner of Public Health reported in the Press this morning that one sample showed 32 million bacteria per cubic centimetre. There could not be much milk left in it.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: What is safe?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I can answer that later. It is desirable to get down to 30,000. I made it my business in recent weeks to go to Melbourne to ascertain the position there, for two reasons. Firstly, I wanted to see what was actually done in that city and, secondly, I wanted to see why such an amount of propaganda had been made of the fact that Victoria had not yet implemented its compulsory pasteurisation Act. In Victoria I met men who were idealists in the handling of milk. They were also realistic because they had businesses which paid reasonable dividends. They were paying those dividends because the milk supplied was quality milk. I saw at least four depots, each handling about 5,000 gallons a day. Those four could supply our wants. They

were bottling, pasteurising and sealing the bottles and, strangely enough, they were selling the milk at less than we pay here for milk that is inefficiently pasteurised and bottled.

That milk contained, on an average, 6,000 to 8,000 bacteria per cubic centimetre. Their aim was always to have less than 30,000, and they said they would be ashamed if the figure got near to 30,000. Those men were so idealistic in their realistic business that they employed bacteriologists in their depots, and they tested the bottles after coming from the washing machines. They tested their drums, of which they still use a few, before sending them out again, and they examined the milk every day to see that it kept to the required standard, and they looked to have on their files the reports of the departmental examinations stating that they had negative phosphatase tests after pasteurisation, and they never showed any bacillus coli in their milk. That is a realistic way of selling milk. When I showed some of these men the statements that had been appearing in our Press by the agents of the distributors and retailers in this State, they said it was lamentable that these men should allow such statements of Victorian, early Victorian, or even Georgian views to appear in the Press.

I asked what was the standard of their milk and they showed me the figures. They averaged, roughly, about 4.5 to 4.7 per cent. butterfat. They said they refused to sell milk of 3.5 per cent. standard. I said, "How do you do that?" The Victorian standard is 3.5 per cent. and I understand the Milk Board allows the depots to make a 4 per cent. contract with the producer, and the producer always takes care to see that it is above 4 per cent. in order to ensure that the depot will continue to take his milk. The result is that milk of a very high quality is distributed by firms in Melbourne.

Here we have not only unclean milk but milk of a low standard. I called on the Commissioner of Public Health some time ago and asked him if he would show me the figures of the butterfat content of our milk. I was amazed at the number under 4 per cent. I would say that 50 per cent. of the examinations of milk showed less than 4 per cent. We have here the same method

that is adopted in England and it is producing the same results. England has the standard of 3 per cent. butterfat and ours is 3.2 per cent., but with no safeguards. It is extraordinary how the cows produce milk to the minimum standard. We find now that we are beginning to pay higher prices for the animals that produce quantity and not quality.

Something should be included in the Bill to raise the standard of the product sold to the public. There are men in the trade who would not attempt to produce or sell milk of a low butterfat standard, but there are others who are governed by the quota or gallonage system and who attempt to produce milk of an inferior butterfat standard. We should get back to the stage of regarding milk as the nation's food. The people in Melbourne were generous enough to show me the whole problem—and the Department of Agriculture was very good to me—and even those in the trade kept nothing at all from me but showed me their books or other documents I wished to peruse. I toyed with the idea of suggesting an economic inquiry into the price of milk, and they told me that such economic cost inquiries had proved a failure. The only way by which we could bring about good results would be for the board itself to conduct a continuous survey of costs and to adjust them over a period of three years.

I mention that for the reason that I have been searching for the cause of the opposition to compulsory pasteurisation, especially in view of what has always been quoted to us regarding the defective condition of the milk supply. I cannot believe that the half-truths that have been published in the Press represent the real reason, and I cannot for the life of me believe that the views the Minister put forward when he introduced the Bill are the reasons for Press opposition to compulsory pasteurisation. I am wondering if it is all a question of cost. It is interesting to realise that in Melbourne to pasteurise, bottle and distribute costs exactly the same amount as is paid here for simply cooling and distribution. In Melbourne, 15d. is allowed for pasteurising, bottling and distribution, and 15d. is allowed here for the simple treatment and distribution.

Hon. L. Craig: Is that 15d. per gallon?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, for cooling, handling and distribution. As against that,

in Melbourne 15d. will pasteurise milk, bottle, seal and distribute it. Possibly there may be some difference owing to the altered conditions in the State, but surely it does not amount to all that much. I am wondering if objection to compulsory pasteurisation arises from the fact that some people who are paid well now think that the amount involved in the cost of pasteurisation will have to come out of their own pockets. It is interesting to realise that the retailer in Melbourne has agreed, even at that price, to commit himself to pasteurisation and to bear the burden of the added cost.

Let me now deal with the question of pasteurisation. There has been an awful lot of publicity and an awful lot of, if I may use the word, "hooy" published about the subject. A lot of it has been serious but much has been half-truth. I think that when we get to the stage of publishing such statements throughout the community as reached us here last week—for instance, the assertion that pasteurisation will lead to sterility in adults—we have got so low that it is time we did something about it. We are certainly not so stupid as to believe that sort of thing. It is evident that someone was being hurt when I asked for compulsory pasteurisation.

I hold in my hand a report which I sincerely trust has been read by the Minister and by those who are publishing their opposition to pasteurisation in the Press. It is the report, with recommendations on the pasteurisation and bottling of the Melbourne metropolitan milk supply, published with the compliments of the Milk Distributors' Association. When Victoria passed its Pasteurisation Bill, the milk distributors there realised they had a responsibility to the public. They did not like the legislation. They did not like the two large depots that were envisaged under the Act, and which were provided for on account of reasons that I shall touch upon in a few moments. It is certainly interesting to read from the president of the Retail Milk Distributors Association this statement—

It is intended to give these reports the widest possible circulation.

Earlier in the foreword he said—

The Association, therefore, decided to retain Mr. Edward Booth, a dairy technologist and executive with wide experience in many countries of the organisation and operation of the milk industry in all its aspects . . .

When Mr. Booth was retained to prepare a report on the Melbourne milk supply, he was instructed to ascertain the facts, and from those facts show the industry the logical steps to be taken to implement the policy of Parliament. In no way was Mr. Booth required to work to a brief. Had he recommended two pasteurisation depots for the whole of Melbourne, and given the facts on which such a case had been based, the association would have been prepared to accept such a scheme. His report and recommendations have just been completed.

One of Mr. Booth's early statements in his report is this—

I soon found that the present organisation, which has grown over the years, in most instances furnished two of these essentials, that is, a high quality of milk at low cost. The only remaining factor to be taken care of is the safety of the milk. It is agreed that this can only be achieved by a system which ensured that all milk is heat-treated to at least the standards accepted for pasteurisation.

Mr. Booth proceeds with his most comprehensive and lengthy report and concludes with this statement—

Action now is possible, and nothing less than action now will meet the urgent need for a "safe" milk. Immediate action, however, requires the use—not the scrapping—of existing facilities. Any other method must result in a long period of delay.

Here is a man whom the distributors asked to go into the question with a view to advising them in the matter. In the course of his report, Mr. Booth quoted Sir William Savage who, he says, presents a very practical point of view in the following remarks:—

Milk may be contaminated at all stages from the cow to the consumer. Undoubtedly, however, any contamination from the cow and during the milking and collection phases, i.e., at the place of production, is far more important in relation to disease causation than any liability to subsequent contamination. If we can ensure that the milk is effectively pasteurised, we have removed the main risk. Contamination subsequent to pasteurisation is usually with bacilli which are not pathogenic, and while it is important to prevent this contamination, its public health significance is comparatively slight.

This very important assessment of comparative risks is quite frequently unappreciated.

Another small paragraph from his report reads—

There is no case in 1944 for further delay. The sooner all milk is heat-treated to the standards laid down, the sooner will the dairy industry be able to stand behind the nutri-

tion experts who have advocated the consumption of milk on a far greater scale than in the past.

I have read these extracts from the report with pleasure for the reason that the Minister, when moving the second reading of the Bill in the House, rather inferred that this was something that the medical profession desired, and that with their limited knowledge of micro-biology that was the only conclusion they could come to. Here is a report from a man who is not only a dairy technologist but a man of experience whom the milk distributors of Victoria asked to make inquiries on their behalf. They also at the same time requested Mr. T. S. Bellair, who is a Bachelor of Agricultural Science, to look at the problem from a slightly different angle and it is interesting to note that in opening his report Mr. Bellair states—

In approaching the question of the pasteurisation of Melbourne's milk supply, there is no need to discuss the merits of pasteurisation for the Legislature wisely decreed by the Act No. 4972 "that all milk sold in Melbourne and Metropolis shall be pasteurised and bottled." Thus the issue is "How can this best be done" so that Melbourne will have a pure, safe milk supply at a reasonable price.

First let us analyse what factors make an ideal, pure, safe milk supply. These are:—

- (a) A raw milk with a low bacterial content, produced under hygienic conditions from healthy cows.
- (b) Efficient and prompt handling between farm and pasteurising plant.
- (c) Effective pasteurisation and subsequent cooling under hygienic conditions.
- (d) Immediate bottling into clean, sterilised bottles provided with an overall cap.
- (e) Storage between bottling and delivery under satisfactory conditions at a low temperature.

This gentleman was also asked to go into the question—this will be particularly interesting to some country members—of pasteurisation to ascertain whether it could be done satisfactorily in a small way as it could in a big way. His answer to that was—

To sum up my answer to Question 2, I have no hesitation in advising that pasteurisation can be thoroughly and efficiently carried out in smaller plants, as has been already demonstrated by many of the existing plants, despite the most difficult and discouraging conditions under which they have been operating.

Hon. A. L. Loton: What would be the output of one of those small plants?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: About 250 gallon a day.

Hon. A. L. Loton: At what cost?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That information is not included in the report, but that could be gone into at a later date because methods of pasteurisation differ. Mr. Bellair also made this statement—

There can be no disputing that an approved bottle washing machine could be operated just as efficiently in a small plant as in a plant dealing with 40,000 gallons a day.

I make mention of that phase because I know many country centres desire to undertake this work and some have approached the Minister with a request for power to pasteurise their own milk supplies in their respective areas. I think that inquiries should be made at a very early date as to whether that is possible, although I have not included that in my suggestions. I believe it is possible for the reason that there are various types of methods for pasteurisation. There is the Holder type which heats the milk from a low temperature over a long period. There is another system which heats the milk in a very short period to 160 degrees and then rapidly cools it. In that instance the machinery takes up a very small space. The most convenient type of plant is the A.P.V. machine, which letters stand for the name of the firm turning them out—the Aluminium Plant and Vessel Coy., Limited.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: Is that the flash method?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes. There is a third method which has only just come into vogue and which is being regarded as the most efficient of them all. There is a firm making the machinery at the present moment. That method of pasteurising actually bottles the milk and then pasteurises it. Speaking to Dr. Sutton some time ago, he was good enough to show me the method by which vinegar is bottled and then put into a pasteuriser, held for a time at a satisfactory temperature, and efficiently pasteurised. A small plant of that type could be quite easily set up. It is possible that, although this machine would cost more in big quantity work, it would cost less in a smaller type of operation. The machine is made by the Auto Dairying Engineers, of Thame, England.

Thus, although the methods of pasteurisation vary, the result is the same. It has been suggested that pasteurisation would destroy the milk. I might say this in reply to my newspaper correspondent who has been so energetic in replying to anything I have said in favour of pasteurisation. It is his statement that it destroyed the nutritive qualities of milk that is regarded by Victorian experts as early Victorian or Georgian. The report states—

Early research suggested that the methods of heat treatment used in the earlier years did cause changes in the food values of the heat-treated milk, and the comments of these earlier writers have been quoted over the years as a case against pasteurisation of milk. What is rejected by the defenders of raw milk is the fact that the process examined years ago bears but the slightest resemblance to the correct methods of pasteurisation as practised today under Department of Health control in most countries of the world.

It is today possible to examine milk and say whether it has been efficiently pasteurised. The phosphatase test has revolutionised the control of pasteurisation. Previously, plants had to be inspected by highly trained technical officers, but today the phosphatase test, done by approved laboratory attendants, can catch the offender. I admit that even since this report was issued there have been successful attempts to alter milk so that the phosphatase test could be misleading; but, provided the plant has an automatic recording thermometer—which under our food regulations is now necessary but has still not been enforced—the phosphatase test cannot be beaten. A negative phosphatase test with a proper temperature recording means efficient pasteurisation; a positive test means inefficient pasteurisation.

I have very little more to add, except to tell the House that whilst it has been said Victoria found it impossible to introduce compulsory pasteurisation, this is not the whole truth. The real truth is that when the typhoid epidemic scared the Melbourne public, they realised something had to be done to protect them against further possible outbreaks. A rise in cases of about four times the number in one year, although small, so stirred Melbourne that the Government decided something had to be done to protect the public, and it was decided to introduce a Bill for compulsory pasteurisation. This is what put me off proposing what I suggested last year, namely, a joint com-

mittee of both Houses to inquire into this subject. The Victorian Government appointed a committee which was even more technically minded than a Select Committee of either House would be. That committee found it had to spend so much time in making itself acquainted with the intricacies of the milk problem that it was about 18 months before it presented a report; and it was necessary, in view of the public controversy, to bring a Bill before the House.

From general comment among those in the milk trade in Melbourne and also by those associated with politics in Victoria, I learnt, or possibly reached a conclusion, that no Government in Victoria would dare today to oppose compulsory pasteurisation. The matter has been put off because of the difficulty in obtaining machinery, but the Government is receiving advices from time to time that if it will only give up the idea of municipal control of pasteurising plant and leave the work to private enterprise, under strict control, compulsory pasteurisation could be rapidly achieved. The committee's advice in its report to the Government is as follows:—

The Government should be asked to at once gazette regulations for the pasteurisation of milk, to take effect from the 1st January, 1945.

Do not forget this is from the distributors' angle.

Such regulations to define the licensing authority, and to permit of the issue of temporary permits to supply unpasteurised milk to dairymen at present not equipped for the pasteurisation of milk. The conditions under which a permit would be granted should be—

- (a) Where a dairyman has taken the necessary steps to obtain plant and equipment for pasteurisation of milk;
- (b) where a dairyman has made arrangements for the supply of milk from a dairy for which plant and machinery has been ordered;
- (c) where a dairyman has joined in co-operative association with other dairymen to establish and operate a plant for the pasteurisation of milk.

The Government should be asked to at once gazette regulations requiring that all milk shall be bottled, without any exceptions whatever. Such regulations to permit of the issue of temporary permits to dairymen who can prove that they have ordered the necessary bottles and ancillary equipment which have not yet been delivered.

In other words, if the trade can satisfy the board, or the Minister, that it has made honest and genuine attempts to obtain the equipment with which to pasteurise milk, it will be permitted to supply unpasteurised milk until such time as the plant arrives. From my investigations in Melbourne I have no doubt that something of this sort will be done, because permits are being granted to men now to obtain the material necessary to carry out pasteurisation.

My final word on the matter is that we have a glorious opportunity. We have none of the problems, which are facing Melbourne at the moment, involved in supplying milk to 1,000,000 people. We have one-fifth of Melbourne's problem. We have such a small quantity of milk to be used in the metropolitan area each day that the introduction of plant could be well left to private enterprise. I do not think the Government need be worried for one moment about having to find money for pasteurisation. There is one man whose plant has been ordered. Another man is waiting to see whether compulsory pasteurisation is regarded by the Government as being essential before he orders the plant. There are other men who have stated they are prepared to spend the necessary money to secure plant to enable them to pasteurise efficiently, bottle and seal to any regulations laid down by the board. I do not believe that we are presented with any real problem. I believe that if this House has the courage, as I trust it has, to accept the amendments which I have placed on the notice paper, in which I give the trade three years, approximately, from this date, within which to obtain the necessary machinery, it will be found that those in the trade will have arranged between themselves for the compulsory pasteurisation and bottling of Perth's milk supply. Then we shall have safe sound milk. I shall have no hesitation whatever in submitting my amendments to the House.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.40]: After listening to Dr. Hislop, I am convinced that the advice which he has tendered to the House is sound. He is a professional man and has set about his task in a practical manner. He has convinced me, at least, that the Government would be well advised to accept his suggestions. I have much pleasure in saying that I think the House

owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Hislop for having given it the result of his close investigations into this matter. It is up to the House to follow his advice. I intend to support his amendments.

On motion by Hon. F. E. Gibson, debate adjourned.

BILL—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL REFERENDUM.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 11th September.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [8.43]: It would appear that a small section of the community is again advocating and using every possible means to bring about the abolition of the Legislative Council. This is not a new move, as the abolition of this Chamber has been a plank in the Labour Party's platform for many years. We are now told however, that it is the people who are demanding that the activities of this House shall cease. I consider that the last Legislative Council elections demonstrated that the people were satisfied with their present parliamentary system, because Labour candidates pledged to the abolition of this House were not successful.

Perhaps one of the greatest advocates for this legislation is the president of the Trades Hall, who spoke a few nights ago in another place. He indulged in very undignified criticism of members of this Chamber, including some of his own colleagues. If ever I should require your support, Mr. President, I would not make the approach by telling you that you were not fit for your job. However, the same speaker said that the Government had tried to water down contentious legislation with a view to securing a chance of getting it through this Chamber. In my opinion, the industrial laws of Western Australia are equal to those of any other State, and all our industrial laws have been passed by this Chamber. I would refer to one of the recent contentious Bills agreed to by this House, that dealing with the provision of pensions for the Colliery miners. That measure provides for pensions to be paid to those miners on their attaining the age of 60 years. I think that a very generous act on our part, because the legislation was sectional and of a character enjoyed by no other workers of the State. I would like, to

ask to what extent the Government watered down that legislation.

Furthermore, it would be very interesting to know what legislation the Government would be asked to agree to and pass if this House did not exist. An effort is being made to justify the single Chamber in Queensland. A referendum was taken on a similar question in that State, and although there was a majority against the proposal, the Government took other steps to bring about its desire and eventually abolished the second Chamber. If that is not betraying trust or the electors, those words have no meaning! It appears to me there is a greater need for this House at the present time than ever before. The talk about obstructing progressive legislation is pure exaggeration. Of course, we have a right to amend Bills; otherwise this House would become a mere rubber stamp.

One would expect that before bringing down legislation of this kind the Government would have remedied the defects in the Legislative Assembly by introducing a Bill for a redistribution of seats. It has been shown on many occasions that the people are not properly represented in the Legislative Assembly because of the existing electoral boundaries, and one would expect those responsible for this measure to see to it that their own house was put in order before finding fault with this Chamber. There has been a good deal of criticism about the power of this House to deal with money Bills. During my term of office there has never been any disagreement of a serious nature. On every occasion when there has been a meeting of managers on contentious legislation, some reasonable arrangement has been arrived at.

It appears to me that this is a definite move on the part of a small section of the people—not necessarily the Government or even Labour members of this Parliament, but people outside—who are more or less forcing the issue. It seems a very convenient time, when elections are approaching, for this kind of propaganda to be put up. Considering the whole of the circumstances, I am inclined to the view that there is only one thing for me to do and that is to oppose the second reading.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.48]: It is not my intention to accuse the Government of window dressing or to pass

what might be construed as nasty remarks about the re-introduction of this Bill after the fate it received last session. I take it that the Government has a perfect right to introduce into Parliament Bills which represent the views of the people who are responsible for electing it. That is, to my way of thinking, only what we might reasonably expect. If a party is to be true to its platform, it will endeavour to give effect to the planks of that platform. Therefore, to indulge in lamentations or accusations against the Government for introducing measures which it is pledged to present is so much waste of time; but members who are not pledged to the political principles of whatever Government is in power, have a bounden duty to vote in accordance with the principles to which they are attached.

I am not going to take up the time of the House in accusing the Government of endeavouring to commit some diabolical act, or of attempting to do something from which the State will never recover, and that kind of thing. I am going to say, though, that if the Government is really sincere in this matter—and I do not mean to imply that it is not—and if it wants this State to follow the example of Queensland and desires to set about abolishing the Legislative Council here, there is only one right and proper way to do it or to attempt to do it. I intend to test the sincerity of the Government by moving an amendment, when this Bill gets into Committee—if it does get there. It will certainly pass the second reading if it depends on my vote.

When it is in Committee, I intend to move the alteration of one word. I propose to move the deletion from the definition of "elector" in Clause 2 of the word "Assembly" and the insertion of the word "Council." If the Government is really sincere about the abolition of the Legislative Council, it will agree to my amendment.

Hon. L. Craig: What does your amendment mean?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The hon. member can find out for himself. When the time comes, if he has not found out, I will take great pains to enlighten him.

Hon. L. Craig: Thank you, Mr. Hall!

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It is my firm opinion, that if the referendum goes to the country with that amendment, it will

be passed. There is an invitation to the Government, if it is really sincere in its attempt and desire to abolish this Chamber! There is an opportunity I do not think any reasonably-minded person could cavil at! Let the Government accept my amendment and test once and for all whether the people who are privileged to vote for members of this House really desire to maintain it or not. I shall support the second reading.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [8.53]: My remarks will be of the briefest. I do not want to give a silent vote on what is a rather important Bill, and I desire to give a few reasons why I shall vote against the second reading. I believe, in the first place, that the Government expects this Bill to be thrown out by the Legislative Council. In fact, the spokesman for the Trades Hall in another place said that it would be thrown out. He said that this House cares not one snap of the fingers for the opinion of the people. He also made some very disparaging remarks about the members of this House. The debate seemed to afford him an opportunity to refer to this place as an Old Men's Home. I heard him say that.

The Chief Secretary: He has a very high opinion of us.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: A very high opinion! Whatever his opinion of the House as a whole may be, I take strong exception to his passing reflections on the age of members. That does not refer to me, of course, but it refers to some of our respected members. There is no disgrace in being old, and I want to record my very strong protest at what that gentleman said.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! I want to draw the attention of members to a Standing Order that is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. It is not the first time that another place has maligned hon. members of this House. However, we can bear that. Standing Order 392 says--

No member shall allude to any debate of the current session in the Assembly, or to any measure impending therein.

I let Mr. Tuckey sail close to the wind, but I want to draw the attention of hon. members to that Standing Order.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am sorry I transgressed.

The **PRESIDENT**: That is all right!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I thought that it was merely that we were not allowed to quote from "Hansard."

Hon. G. W. Miles: It was quoted in the Press.

The **PRESIDENT**: This House always extends to another place generosity which is not reciprocated.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Generosity was extended to members in another place when they abused this House, and I take strong exception to that. The Honorary Minister in introducing this Bill spoke of the unpopularity of this House. Where is this unpopularity? I move about the country and have not heard disparaging remarks about this Chamber. I contacted a lot of people recently and do not remember anybody having brought up the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council or the extension of the franchise. One would expect from the remarks of the Honorary Minister that everybody was dying to get on the roll and to be entitled to vote. My experience is that it is the devil's own job to get them to go along and vote when they are on the roll. One has to have a car and take them to the polling place and use all sorts of persuasion. We are told how many people vote for another place and how few for this, but we are not informed that in the one instance voting is compulsory and in the other it is not. I cannot understand the Government falling for this sort of thing. I agree with Mr. E. H. H. Hall that it has a right to introduce Bills, but why not get on with something more important? The Government knows perfectly well that the Bill will go out. At least the Government thinks it will.

Hon. G. Fraser: You are fortune-telling now.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I said the Government thinks the Bill will be thrown out. Whether it will reach the Committee stage, as desired by Mr. E. H. H. Hall, I do not know. We have heard a lot about Queensland. We are not told about other places like America, Norway, and even other States of Australia which have two houses. It is my intention to vote against the second reading.

On motion by **Hon. G. Fraser**, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 11th September.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [8.58]: I am not going to support the second reading of this Bill, because I do not favour the Government setting up machinery to begin further trading concerns. We have private enterprise doing a very good job and I fail to see how if the State office is given authority to undertake all sections of insurance it will do any better job. The position may occur in which a monopoly is created by the State office cutting premiums to such an extent that private enterprise is put out of business. Premiums will then have to be increased, and the people who one hon. member said would derive most benefit from this measure will have to be taxed further to balance the ledger.

Mention was made of the Public Trustee's Office. I am not greatly concerned whether that office shows a small loss or not. It is doing a section of business that private enterprise could not undertake. Many of the estates that are administered are those of persons who have died in unfortunate circumstances or who are detained in institutions and are not able to administer their own affairs. During the war, many young men unfortunately did not return to Western Australia, and they left their estates somewhat tangled. It has fallen to the Public Trustee to administer those estates. Private enterprise is doing a good job in the sphere of insurance and I fail to see why the State should enter that field. I will not support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned.

brought down in another place was that three concerns at Balkuling, Dangin and Quairading desired to set up a group of service stations, one at each town, and a large engineering works at Quairading. They wanted to call this enterprise the B.D.Q. Co-operative Engineering Works, but when they went to have the name registered they found they were up against the provisions of the Act, which preclude anyone from using the word "co-operative" in that way. It was natural that they wished to use that word, in the circumstances, because the chain of works concerned were owned by three co-operative companies.

It seems extraordinary that the word "co-operative" should ever have been included in the Business Names Act. These people are setting out to give good service to the farmers in the districts concerned. We all know that most of the motor vehicles on the roads today are very old and require a tremendous lot of repairs to be carried out from time to time. It is almost impossible to get this work done today, either in the city or elsewhere. The directors of these co-operative works said they would set up their own engineering establishment to provide for the needs of the general public as well as those of their own members. I believe that no preference will be given to members of the co-operative concerns, and that the general public will be treated on an equal footing. If the word "co-operative" is removed from the Business Names Act it will be possible for these people to use that term in their business name. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

BILL—BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [9.2] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill which seeks to delete from the Business Names Act the word "co-operative." The reason why this Bill was

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [9.5] in moving the second reading said: This is another very small Bill, which seeks to give power to municipal authorities to make bricks and crush stone, both for their own use and for sale to other municipal authorities or statutory bodies or, with the consent of the Minister, to individuals and private firms. I

think it is desirable, because a municipal authority, in order to make bricks or crush stone, is faced with the necessity of installing a considerable amount of machinery. After it has fulfilled its own requirements it should be allowed to sell any surplus. At the present time I think they should be allowed to make bricks. We all know of the shortage of building materials, and I know of at least one municipal authority that has set out to make bricks for use in its own area.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Are bricks in short supply?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am told that they are, particularly in the country. In the district to which I have referred there are fine clay deposits and bricks were manufactured there nearly 100 years ago. Buildings made of those bricks are still standing. I refer to the York district, and also Northam and Beverley. It does not seem economic to cart bricks from Byford if they can be made locally.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Do you think a building made of those bricks will stand for 100 years?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, if it is properly erected, but not if it is built as some of the workers' homes are being constructed today. I know of buildings, built in York in 1850, being pulled down, and the bricks being used again. People would not use such bricks if there were not a shortage.

Hon. H. Tuckey: The shortage will not last long.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Another municipal authority has gone to the expense of installing a rock-crushing plant to supply metal for road making. That plant cost £1,800 and I think the authority concerned should be able to sell the surplus to other local authorities.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Is that not State trading?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: There is no State trading in that. I think it is desirable that this power should be granted. I would not suggest that a local authority should compete with private enterprise, but generally private enterprise will not instal rock-crushing plant.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Private enterprise is selling bricks.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: But they cannot be bought. I do not think the York Municipal Council would instal brick-making machinery if it could buy its requirements off the truck from Byford. There was a shortage of screenings, so it also installed rock-crushing plant at a cost of £1,800. With that plant the council will soon have enough metal for its own use and will wish to pass some on to others. That is all there is in the Bill. There are one or two consequential amendments, but that is the main purpose of the Bill; to give municipal authorities power to make bricks and crush metal, and to sell any surplus to those who want it. If a private individual wants to buy the surplus he will require the authority of the Minister. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [9.10]: I am not altogether in favour of the proposals outlined by Mr. Wood. If we do not agree with State trading in opposition to private enterprise, I cannot see how we can justify the granting of such powers to local authorities. I have no objection to a local authority setting up machinery to provide for its own requirements or to sell the surplus to a neighbouring authority, but I would object to it selling to private individuals. We cannot have it both ways. Although there has been an acute shortage of bricks and other materials such as road metal, that position will not last for very long. I understand that in a short time there will be plenty of bricks available. Furthermore, we know that road building material is now becoming available for various works in the country. I do not think the House should support the Bill. I hope that if it reaches the Committee stage an amendment to preclude local authorities from trading with private individuals will be passed.

On motion by Hon. J. A. Dimmitt, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.12 p.m.