

right or wrong. It struck me as peculiar that the Minister should say that in spite of the opinion of medical men on pasteurisation, they might be wrong. He said that, by and large, the medical profession believe in pasteurisation, and we must acknowledge that scientific opinion, by and large, is right. As I said before, we must be guided by the experts. Therefore I consider that we should follow their advice unless we can conceive of some very good reason why we should do otherwise. Pasteurisation has been adopted by many communities throughout the world, and I should like to see it adopted here.

If we study the disadvantages of using non-pasteurised milk, we must realise that the milk, when taken from the cow, may not be infected with tuberculosis or some other disease, but it may very likely become infected after being taken from the cow. Comparatively few people are infected with bovine tuberculosis, but many are infected by diseases contracted after the milk has been taken from the cow. The purest form of milk seems to be that which is pasteurised and delivered in containers that ensure that it does not become contaminated after it has left the cow. There may be some support for the argument of the Minister that valuable constituents of milk are destroyed by pasteurisation, but, so far as I have been able to ascertain, these constituents may be supplied from fruit, vegetables and other sources that are not subject to the same disadvantages as is milk.

The proposal is to pay some £30,000 a year for the destruction of cows that react to the T.B. test, but are we approaching this problem from the most important aspect, namely, that of giving the consumer the purest possible milk? I agree that nobody would knowingly drink milk infected by bovine T.B. When we read the statistics relating to those who have contracted the disease, we find that they form only a small percentage as compared with those who might possibly have contracted some disease from milk that has become contaminated after leaving the cow. Would it not be better to subsidise the pasteurisation of milk and so ensure a germ-free supply to consumers? I suggest that the Minister might set a time from which pasteurised milk must be delivered or milk that has been certified as being free from T.B. or other

disease. This policy has been adopted by other communities. Either the milk must be delivered fresh in a condition free from T.B.—that is, bottled under hygienic conditions—or it must be delivered after being pasteurised. I should think that would be the proper approach to the problem; it appeals to me as being the proper view for the responsible authorities to take.

I would have liked to see provision made in the Bill that, after a given date—I do not care whether two or three years—only pasteurised milk might be supplied or fresh milk from herds tested and proved to be free from the diseases that have been mentioned. I hope the Minister will see fit to reconsider some of the provisions of the measure and at least set a date-line from which the consuming public may expect to get fresh milk that is absolutely free from contamination and infection at the source, or pasteurised milk which, though it may not contain all the attributes of wholemilk, will at least be free from all disease.

On motion by Hon. W. D. Johnson, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 27th August, 1946.*

	PAGE
Questions : Sewerage, Claremont, as to houses connected and sanitary depot .....	462
Electoral rolls, as to reprinting .....	462
Bills : Marketing of Barley (No. 1), Order discharged .....	462
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, Com. ....	462
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., Com. Report .....	465
Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment, 2R. ....	465
Milk, 2R., Com. ....	466

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

**QUESTIONS.****SEWERAGE, CLAREMONT.**

*As to Houses Connected and Sanitary Depot.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Health:

1, How many houses in the Claremont electorate are still served by the pan system?

2, Where is the sanitary depot situated for the reception of nighsoil from such houses?

3, How many of these houses are in sewerred portions of the electorate?

4, How many houses in the district are served by septic tanks?

The MINISTER replied:

1, 208.

2, For 15 pans from Mosman Park and 18 pans from Cottesloe on Reserve A1665, Rocky Bay. Others to the sewer at West Subiaco.

3, I am unable to obtain this information.

4, 918.

**ELECTORAL ROLLS.**

*As to Reprinting.*

Mr. WATTS asked the Premier:

1, How much longer before Legislative Assembly rolls are reprinted and available?

2, If all rolls will not be available at once, which rolls will be out first?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

1, Approval has been given for the staff of the Government Printing Office to work overtime in an endeavour to have all of the Legislative Assembly rolls reprinted and available by the end of September.

2, Ten (10) rolls are now available, viz.: Roebourne, Gascoyne, Mt. Magnet, Mt. Leonora, Yilgarn-Coolgardie, Boulder, Mt. Marshall, Greenough, Irwin-Moore and Forrest.

Five (5) more are expected this week, viz., Murchison, Brownhill-Ivanhoe, Nelson, Avon and York.

Priority will be given to the completion of the remainder of the rolls for the rural and outer areas.

**BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY**

(No. 1).

*Order Discharged.*

On motion by the Minister for Agriculture, Order discharged.

**BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

*In Committee.*

Mr. Rodoreda in the Chair; the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—New section:

Mr. DONEY: I take it this is the clause which permits of the part of the State to the north of parallel 26—that is, the North and the North-West—coming under the provisions of the Act. That being so, I welcome the measure, as will several thousands of people who live in comparative isolation in that part of the State, who pay very dearly for poor food and who, for that matter, have to move from place to place and pay heavily for the privilege. The North and the North-West cannot for quite a number of years yet have the population and enjoy the low prices and general conveniences of the South-West, but I think it is possible to iron out many of the disparities between that part of the State and ours. The Bill makes a start on that most desirable job, but it will not have that effect unless it is administered sympathetically. If we adhere to the punitive and restrictive provisions that apply in this part of the State under the parent Act, the Government will ruin the efficiency of the Bill.

I made some inquiries into transport matters when I was in the North recently and learnt then something of the extreme shortage of vegetables and fruit and the extremely high cost of transport and, what was perhaps worst of all, the uncertainties of the arrivals and departures of air, road and sea transport. Immediately following the enactment of this Bill there should be an intensive investigation of North-West transport and supply problems, of domestic and medical and other problems, with the object of cheapening and regularising daily needs and thus removing the principal obstacle to North-West progress. I was particularly glad to hear the Minister say

it was the Government's intention to subsidise road and air transport. That would enable vegetables and fruit and items affecting the health and other general welfare of mothers and babies and ordinary dental and educational services to be taken up there, principally by plane, regularly and at a reasonable cost. If that were done, the health and happiness of North-West men and women should materially improve and there should follow in due course the population and development so necessary to that part of the State.

Unless some action as is portrayed in the Bill takes place very soon, the North-West may be in a state from which it will be almost impossible to recover. In any case, the task of improving conditions there cannot be done very cheaply or at any great speed, because the North and the North-West comprise huge areas of country and we know that, apart from Marble Bar, there are no sizeable centres of population, except along the coast. All this means that there will be considerable difficulties in relating the low costs that are so essential to such stubborn factors as distance and isolation. It is plain that unless someone takes action of the kind set out in the Bill, it will not be long before some power other than that possessed by us will be put into force with the object of doing the job. I support the clause.

**Mr. McDONALD:** On this clause, which extends the provisions of the Bill to the whole of the State, I would make two observations. The first is that I think the Bill is justified in extending some transport control to the whole of the State. It has been somewhat of an anomaly in the past that we have directed our attention only to that portion of the State south of the 26th parallel. The Bill ensures that where regulation is necessary, it will extend to the whole State. The second point is that now we are providing that this type of legislation is to operate throughout the State, the time has come when we should have some clearer conception of the role to be played by road transport and air transport in relation to the railways. I gather from the remarks that have been made by the Minister for Transport that this subject has been receiving his attention. It has been mentioned in this Chamber in the past by me and by other members.

Quite recently in Queensland there has been something of a revolt against restrictions on road transport, a revolt which has been justified, if any breach of the law can be justified, by urgent circumstances. I gather that with the support of wide public opinion, road transport has been used to meet essential requirements of the people which would not have been met if the strict regulations as between railways and road transport in Queensland had been maintained. Therefore I do not want this clause to pass this Assembly without voicing the opinion very definitely that road transport and air transport cannot be restricted into the compartments in which we have placed them in the past. They are bound to extend; and the sooner we define our ideas and make provision for the necessary enlargement of road transport, bearing in mind the position of our railways, the sooner will we create conditions that will make for the progress of the State.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Amendment of Section 60:

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (a) of proposed new Subsection (3) after the word "roads" the words "(including the erection of shelter sheds or other amenities along such routes)" be inserted.

It will be appreciated that if those words are added there will be nothing mandatory. It will still be at the discretion of the local governing authority. Actually the amendment makes no great difference to the overall situation. Local governing authorities at present use the money collected in fees exclusively for the maintenance of roads, whereas when shelter sheds are erected, the cost comes from ordinary revenue. If some amount is taken out of that received from the traffic fees, there will be a lesser draw upon the ordinary revenues of the local authorities. At the same time the amendment may, and I hope will, have the effect of making the local authorities actually wish to take greater steps than they have done in the past. It might be said that those who actually use the bus services are indirectly paying the heavy license fees and are, therefore, entitled to some facilities and amenities.

It is generally recognised, too, that the days when patrons of transport services should have to stand on street corners for lengthy periods in all weathers should be terminated. I have used the term "other amenities," and I appreciate that it could loosely be construed to embrace practically anything. But I am certain that the brake would be applied by the local governing bodies themselves. They would do only those things pertinent to the transport services on the particular routes. I have in mind, when using that expression, such things as island platforms, protective rails, seating accommodation without a shelter-shed, and so on. They are facilities essential to conforming to the modern requirements of the travelling public. These things are probably the direct responsibility of the bus companies, but it has to be borne in mind that the companies operate on annual license and, because of that, I am loth to suggest that they should have to embark capital expenditure on a project which may not be theirs next year.

All I desire is to take certain steps to encourage the erection of the type of facilities that I have mentioned. The amendment will be an indication to the local governing bodies that this Parliament realises the need for such amenities and facilities and is giving the local authorities an opportunity to act accordingly. Over-all, the position, probably, will not be substantially altered. This matter may be largely psychological. The local authorities will be subject to a certain amount of pressure by patrons of the buses, and by the bus companies themselves because, either indirectly or directly, they have paid these moneys and are entitled to some additional benefits.

Mr. DONEY: I offer no opinion as to the desirability of the amendment, but suggest that the member for East Perth seeks to insert it in the wrong place. It would be far more suitable if the words came in after the word "operate" in line 39. The amendment at present gives the impression that we are referring to the road, and that the shelter-sheds and conveniences have some bearing on the road.

Mr. McDONALD: I support the amendment. The matter of shelter is one of some concern to the travelling public. The question has been raised many times in my district. The shelters and amenities of the

kinds described are a necessary adjunct to our road transport.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: As the amendment is not of a compulsory nature—it does not force a legal obligation on a local authority to expend money for the purpose of erecting shelter-sheds or other amenities—I agree with the member for East Perth that there can be no great harm done if the words are included. It is still left quite optional for any local authority to decide whether it will or will not do these things. Under the Act, and even under this amending Bill, it would be illegal for a local authority to use any funds from the pool, when distributed, for the purposes suggested in the amendment. If so desired, it could take money from its ordinary rate fund and erect these amenities with it.

The amendment might give some inspiration to the local authorities to do these things, and it would give omnibus proprietors, as well as the people who use the omnibus services in the city, some lever to bring about the installation of these urgent and necessary facilities. The member for Williams-Narrogin went a paragraph too low, because the funds from the source mentioned there come from the license fees of commercial goods vehicles and not from those of omnibuses. It would be slightly irregular to suggest that the erection of shelter-sheds should come from the funds provided by the licensees of goods vehicles. I have no objection to the amendment, for the reasons I have stated, but I point out that I feel a consequential amendment will become necessary if it is carried.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: The consequential amendment that I think is necessary is the addition of the words "shelter-sheds and other amenities" to the paragraph. If they are not added there could be some legal argument as to whether the paragraph covers the position as fully as the member for East Perth proposes. I suggest to him that he move that those words be added to line 33.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a matter on which a legal mind could best advise. There does not seem to me to be any necessity for the addition of these words. We have now given the local governing authorities power to utilise this money by expending it on

roads, shelter-sheds and other amenities, and the money will be divided amongst the authorities concerned in the improvement of these roads. I do not know that the addition of any words would make the definition clearer. We are still specifically applying the now amended clause to those authorities responsible for the maintenance of the roads. However, if it is felt that such a course would make the intention clearer—I would like to hear further discourse on it—I have no objection to it.

Mr. McDONALD: I think another aspect should receive consideration. In lines 2, 3 and 4 of paragraph (a) of the proposed new Subsection (3), the words "shall be applied in like manner towards the maintenance and improvement of the roads" appear, and the passage, as amended, would read, "towards the maintenance and improvement of the roads, shelters and amenities." I doubt whether those words would authorise a local authority to spend money on the construction of shelters and amenities. I think the intention of the Minister might be more safely implemented if some care were applied to the amendment and that point given consideration. I am not sure that the amendment as at present worded will apply to more than existing shelters and amenities.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 9, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

### **BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

#### *Second Reading.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 22nd August of the debate on the second reading.

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—ELECTORAL (WAR TIME) ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE** (Hon. E. Nulsen—Kanowna) [5.7] in moving the

second reading said: This is a small Bill, but one that is very important. The Act is being amended and continued, and it is desired to extend its provisions to members of the Forces who are serving with a unit in Japan or Borneo. It is anticipated that there will be approximately 1,000 Western Australians serving in Japan at the time of the elections, and there will also be a substantial number serving in Borneo. The Bill will give to those persons the privilege of voting—if it becomes an Act—and, without the amendment to the principal Act, the persons concerned in Borneo and Japan will have no right to vote. The Bill further provides that the commanding officer of each unit may designate one or more non-commissioned officers of the unit concerned, before whom the members of the Forces serving with that unit may record their votes. I believe that privilege was given in the case of the Legislative Council, under a wartime Act, and has acted satisfactorily. There power was given to appoint non-commissioned officers as well as commissioned officers for that purpose. The commanding officer was given that right.

Mr. Watts: A reliable lance-corporal might be better than a major-general.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is so, and it would give the commanding officer a wider choice. He might not have a sufficient number of commissioned officers to do the work that had to be done. There are certain consequential amendments made necessary by this amendment. The Bill further provides for the repeal of Sections 17 and 18. Section 17 refers to voting by discharged members of the Forces, and Section 18 to action by the Chief Electoral Officer. Those provisions are no longer required, and it is suggested that they be deleted. The Bill therefore provides for the repeal of these sections and also of Section 20 which is necessitated consequentially upon the deletion of Section 17. There is no provision for the repeal of Section 19 which refers to the voting by unenrolled discharged soldiers who are within Western Australia. Sections 23 and 24 are to be repealed. These sections relate to voting by persons employed by the Allied Works Council and the Civil Construction Corps. As members are aware, those bodies have been disbanded and there-

fore the sections I refer to need not be re-enacted.

Mr. Watts: Those two sections were a frost, anyhow.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: At any rate, they can go by the board. It is also proposed to repeal Section 25, which relates to objections to claims for enrolment. It will be remembered that shortly before the general election in 1943 action was taken by an elector under the provisions of Section 25 to object to the enrolment of a number of electors. The adjudicating magistrate ordered the removal of the names of 88 electors from the roll. The Chief Electoral Officer reports that of those 88 electors, 37 had previously been enrolled for other districts and they were immediately reinstated on the rolls for those districts; but the remaining 51 electors had not previously been enrolled for any district and were in consequence disfranchised.

The electors in question had resided in the district for more than one month prior to enrolment and were compelled under the Electoral Act to enrol. Sections 47 and 48 of the Electoral Act already sufficiently provide for objections to a claim for enrolment by an elector, the only difference between the provisions of the Electoral Act and the Electoral (War Time) Act being that, under the former, objections lapse on the issue of the writ. This is a much more workable and satisfactory system than that provided under Section 25 of the Electoral (War Time) Act, and there seems no good reason for the retention of that section. The Bill therefore provides for its repeal and also for the continuance of the Electoral (War Time) Act for a further period of 12 months.

As I remarked earlier this is a small measure but its passage is essential in the interests of persons who are serving Australia in various foreign countries and in order to give them an opportunity to record their votes. The men will be absent on service for two years but during that period there will be a general election, and it is but reasonable that those who are in Japan or Borneo should not be disfranchised. If the Bill becomes an Act they will be given an opportunity to vote at the general election. In a democracy such as ours we should do everything possible to

ensure that those entitled to vote are given an opportunity to exercise the franchise, whether those people should be here or elsewhere, so long as they are serving in the interests of the nation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McLarty, debate adjourned.

## BILL—MILK.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 22nd August.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [5.15]: For many years we have been promised the introduction of a comprehensive Milk Bill which would supervise the production of wholemilk intended for human consumption, and, I suppose, would control wholemilk supplies from producer to consumer. This is definitely the responsibility of the Government, and before I sit down I shall make it clear that this Bill falls far short of what I think is the Government's responsibility in the control of this food-stuff.

Mr. Watts: I think so, too.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We must realise that milk is the most potent and delicate of all foods. Its outstanding nourishing quality is, unfortunately for human beings, very subject to contamination. Because of that, the civilised world agrees that the control of its production, distribution and consumption should be the direct responsibility of the Government. It is from this angle that I am disappointed with the Bill. The measure is not strong but weak, and to that extent, from my point of view, will prove ineffective and do little in the way of reform with regard to the regular supply of whole-some milk to the metropolitan area compared with what that area is already receiving.

I recognise that the Bill anticipates going beyond the metropolitan area but, as far as I can see, little, if any, improvement will be effected by it in the metropolis. It does not control or in any sense attempt to regulate a wholesome milk supply, but simply provides for a board of five persons to intercept the milk at specified stages and impose upon processors and distributors the obligation to procure licenses; and the possession of such licenses will give the licensees cer-

tain rights to protection in competition and will impose penalties if they violate the conditions of their licenses. On the other hand those licensed persons must accept the milk supplied and thereafter they are responsible for its quality and standard.

A big feature is that the milk accepted by the processor or distributor is not quality milk but is just milk. The individual has to take what is supplied and then accept the responsibility for its quality. He obtains his supply by permission of the board, but he cannot reject it or get other milk because its acquisition is subject to the board's approval. In other words, he can get his milk only from the people the board authorises to supply. This raises a very important question and I think this is where the main issue lies. In commerce generally, if one purchases a commodity and finds that it is not up to standard, one immediately discontinues accepting the commodity from that person and looks around to obtain an article of better quality. Under this Bill, that cannot be done. The processor or licensed person must accept the milk that is presented. The board does not say that it is milk suitable for the purpose for which it is to be used by him, but simply says it is the milk that must be used. If he rejects the milk, then he is without milk. He has no alternative for getting other milk. He rejects it and his business, as a consequence, suffers the loss of that quantity of milk.

Again, it is only here that the board does control inferior milk. The board does not try to prevent milk going into consumption. It allows the milk to go to the people who distribute, and does not take any action to police that milk or to ensure that it is wholesome and fit for human consumption until a license has been issued to a person to handle the milk. Therefore, in that sense, the Bill is extremely weak, because the milk is not guaranteed by the board. It is left to others to discover any deficiency or any dangers that may exist in the milk.

Mr. McLarty: That is the job of the Health Department.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If the Health Department is to be relied upon, then we do not need a Milk Board. What we should do is to increase the functions of the Health Department so that it may carry the two responsibilities—that of watching the milk

supplied to the people and of policing it from the point of production until it goes into consumption under the health regulations. That is another weakness. It is questionable whether we should have two authorities functioning in one operation. The member for Murray-Wellington states that when we come to question the quality of milk—that is, milk at the source—it is left to the Health Department to decide whether it is fit for human consumption.

In Committee I think we shall have to devote a good deal of attention to that matter, because the question arises whether the board should not control the milk from the dairy to the kitchen table and not leave one part, and the most important part, to another department that may or may not function efficiently and cannot be brought to book under the provisions of the Act.

If we place responsibilities on a board, we should be able to ensure that the board carries out its full operations. But under this Bill, as pointed out by the member for Murray-Wellington, an important part of the responsibility for a wholesome milk supply to the people is divided and distributed between two departments. As I have already said, this Bill does not control milk. All that it does is to follow the milk around from licensed place to licensed place. It is intercepted at given stages and, when it gets so far, there shall be a license. But this is following the milk all the time without there being any guarantee that the milk being followed is wholesome milk. Therefore, in that sense, I say this is not the effective Bill I have been looking forward to or the sort of Bill I thought the Government intended to introduce.

One of the main operations in the supply of milk is its processing for the purpose of purification and the removal of objectionable matter. The board is to consist of five members, but while processing is a very important operation, and I should say the most important of all the operations associated with a wholesome milk supply, the processors are not to be represented on the board. The point of view of the processors will have to be gathered casually and will not be submitted regularly to the board as will the point of view of other interests represented on the board. If the processing is effective, if the processor is doing his job and pasteurisation is complete, then the danger to

consumers will be limited but, while the processor is responsible for that very vital operation, he will have no voice on the board. Yet those that consume the commodity he is supposed to put into wholesome condition will have representation. I do not object to the consumer being represented on the board; I have no objection to the producer being represented, but I do say that where the processing is so vital to a pure and wholesome milk supply, the board should have the benefit of a member qualified to speak from that angle and to assist the board in making a close examination of what is being done and determining where improvements may be made.

There is a good deal of working around the question of processing, but the Bill contains insufficient detail to give us a guarantee that the board, without a representative of the processors, will not have to scratch around through its inspectors to ascertain what is going on. Even the draftsman, in preparing the Bill, does not seem to have devoted much attention to the processing side. This question of processing is most interesting. I think members will be glad to know exactly how we in this State started to go into the question of the best means of giving to the people a wholesome milk supply, and the process by which that could best be accomplished.

Hon. N. Keenan: What part of the Bill deals with processing?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It comes in casually here and there. I have found it difficult to pick up the references. One has to go right through the Bill and analyse it carefully. The drafting is such that, in my view, the Bill is a complicated measure. I experienced a great deal of difficulty in finding the references, and have had to go backwards and forwards, time and again, to ascertain where they were.

Mr. Doney: You did find them eventually?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I found the references to processing, but I think there should be more detailed matter in the Bill concerning this all-important question.

Mr. Watts: The Minister had it drawn in that way especially to bamboozle you.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That may be! It was in 1925 that the Government of the day determined to go into the question of

giving a more wholesome supply and a greater guarantee of wholesomeness to the people in the distribution of milk. It decided to encourage the formation of a company sponsored by the producers and led largely by the South-West producers, of which Mr. Edmund Rose was the pioneer, a gentleman who, I am glad to say, is still a resident of the State, and who became chairman of the initial organisation. Mr. Rose was really the spokesman and driving force of the organisation of dairymen, who wanted to have whole milk distributed in a manner that would give a greater guarantee of healthfulness to the community. The initial effort was assisted by Westralian Farmers, Ltd., and, as a result of Government encouragement and Westralian Farmers, Ltd., collaboration and assistance, the Dairy Farmers Co-operative Company Limited was formed and registered. The funds were subscribed by means of shares taken up by dairymen and sympathisers who were interested in the supply of milk for the consumers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! What has that to do with the present Bill?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Bill deals with the question of distribution and processing of milk. I am trying to point out—I hope I shall be allowed to point out how we tried—how we started in 1925 to deal with modern methods of processing and the results we have obtained, and then the question arises whether, after going so far, we should neglect to give greater detailed attention in the Bill to processing and to representation on the board of those responsible for it. One cannot rise in one's place and just declare that processors should be represented on the board without explaining that processing has been in operation since 1925. Unless one is allowed to review what has been accomplished during that period and where we are today as a result of those experiments, of what use is it to discuss processing at all? Processing, however, as applied to milk under this Bill, is a vital necessity.

Mr. Watts: The absence of it!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The absence of it would be most dangerous to the welfare of the public. I think it is necessary for us to review how it was that we started.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be necessary but it is not very relevant, all the same.



Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is strange. I have been putting in most of the day reading up relevancy, and it is a most interesting study.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member has been reading all day does not come into the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know that. If you, Sir, say it is impossible for me to deal with the establishment of the processing of milk, how it came about and how it has operated, as well as the need for greater attention being given to the question of processing, I am not going to proceed further with a discussion on the Bill. With that limitation, it would make my remarks purely uninteresting, and from my point of view they would not be relevant to the real issue. I could well, therefore, leave the little that would be left to me to the Committee stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member proceed?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I was saying that the company was formed originally by dairymen and sympathisers, led by Mr. Edmund Rose. The Government encouraged that and agreed to guarantee the sum of £10,000 to the company in support of its ambition. The E.S. & A. Bank and Westralian Farmers Ltd. assisted with credits, and the latter co-operative assisted with advice. Pasteurisation of milk was the objective of the company, and the present pasteurisation that goes on in Perth is the outcome of the start that was made, or really was the start that was made in 1925. The then company sent to South Australia to see whether it could get advice, and ultimately an expert who was then, I suppose, first in pasteurisation was sent from that State to this one to supervise the installation of the original plant. The plant was erected on the present site in Stuart-street, Perth, and the building is largely the same one as then, but it has been added to and improved from time to time during the intervening 20 years.

The condition of the Government guarantee—this is important—was that the operations of the Dairy Farmers Co-op, Ltd. should be supervised and controlled by Westralian Farmers Ltd. until the advance was paid off. In other words, the Government guarantee stipulated that the actual

control and running of the concern, although it was a separate company, should be done under the supervision of Westralian Farmers Ltd. It was in 1929 that Westralian Farmers Ltd. assumed full liability for the Dairy Farmers Co-op Co., including the Government guarantee, so that in that year the Dairy Farmers Co-operative Co. ceased to exist and the processing of milk by means of pasteurisation was then transferred from that company to the Westralian Farmers, Ltd. That went on until 1936, when the latter company paid back to the Government the £10,000 which it had guaranteed and which the Dairy Farmers Co-op Co. had used, but not profitably.

The whole thing was then taken over by the Westralian Farmers. That company assumed responsibility and took over all the liabilities of the Dairy Farmers Co-op Co. By July, 1945, the Westralian Farmers had made a loss of £64,507, including all the accumulated loss of the Dairy Farmers Co-op Co. and the £10,000 which the Government had advanced. That meant a loss of £64,000 to the shareholders of Westralian Farmers, Ltd. In 1940 all the operations of the company were revised. It had discovered by that time the impossibility of running a processing plant on a balanced basis unless distribution was associated with the processing. In 1940 the company was forced into the position of purchasing the distributors' licenses and taking over their rounds, and it was at this period that the figure quoted by other speakers of £10 and £15 per gallon was claimed as goodwill by those who held the licenses. The company paid and is still paying for rounds that come on the market from £10 to £15 per gallon for goodwill.

Mr. Abbott: You do not approve of that?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. I am coming to the point that I wanted to make in giving this history. It is that the processing of milk must be associated with its distribution if one wishes to carry on the business on an economic basis. Therefore, the board should realise the importance of understanding the processing and its obligations, including the economic effect imposed by the board on the processing from a monetary point of view. The distribution of milk is now divided among various people. Pascomi has expanded beyond a processing operation and now undertakes distribution. I do not want

to go into the question of the merits of pasteurised and unpasteurised milk. I simply want to emphasise to the House that the processing of milk is of such importance that the Bill should take more notice of it and, above everything else, should provide for its representation.

I have here the report of the Metropolitan Milk Board, dated the 23rd of this month. The report sets out in detail the inspection made of and samples taken from milk delivered by Pascomi. I do not want to go into the details, because they are of a technical nature. It is interesting to note, however, that on a basic figure of 50,000 germs or impurities, the examination of the Westralian Farmers' plant disclosed 28,500. The maximum scientific basis is 50,000 for pasteurised milk, but on the 23rd August the plate count of impurities in the milk was down to 28,500.

Mr. Rodoreda: Is that a bacteria count?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. It is also interesting to note that in the case of whole-milk, that is, milk not processed, the count might reach 500,000. One can see the difference between the processed milk when it reaches a high consumption and wholemilk which is not subject to treatment. I think the Bill is deficient in that respect, and I hope the Minister will try to ascertain whether representation cannot be added to the board for this important side of the industry. I was going to explain exactly what other people think of processing as carried on in Western Australia, but I can leave that point until we reach the Committee stage, when one is not so circumscribed. After all, the Bill is essentially a Committee Bill. The Committee will have to accept a big responsibility in trying to secure full explanations from the Minister; and I venture the opinion that we shall experience some difficulty in thoroughly reconciling one clause of the Bill with another and one part with another.

For instance, take the milk vendor! He is allowed to sell milk to consumers and in that respect he is controlled under his license; but when milk is sold to wholesalers that does not apply, as the milk vendor is looked upon as a person distributing milk to consumers. The same clause that deals with the vending of milk

excludes the control of cream which is used for ice-cream. In the previous Bill that was introduced in this House and defeated in another place that exclusion did not apply; but the Minister has now made provision for the exclusion from supervision of cream that is made into ice-cream. That is a most dangerous provision. If it was necessary to include such cream in the Bill last year, surely it is necessary to include it in this Bill.

When we realise the enormous increase in the consumption of ice-cream, we should try to make it just as rigid that pure cream and pure milk must be provided for the production of ice-cream as is the case with wholemilk intended for consumption. It has happened in Perth, and may be happening today, that when a discovery is made that milk is not up to standard, that milk is taken from the particular centre involved to another centre where it might be useful for the production of ice-cream. Members can perceive the danger of having loose milk about when the Bill does not enable the board to exercise supervision over such milk in the same way as it does over wholemilk for human consumption. However, it is somewhat difficult to explain the matter without making reference to the clauses of the Bill. Therefore, I do not propose to attempt to do that now; but in the Committee stage, I will endeavour to get members interested in it.

There is another matter that will need a good deal of attention. I refer to the compensation fund. The member for Murray-Wellington devoted some attention to this subject. There is a very definite variation from the existing condition. To-day there are two funds. It is proposed that the new board under this Bill shall take over all the assets and funds in the hands of the existing board. But those compensation funds will be consolidated into a fund which will become the compensation fund. The extraordinary thing is that another clause says that the board at any time may introduce some scheme in regard to wholemilk and that the scheme can be financed from the compensation fund. It seems extraordinary to me that the board may experiment with anything it imagines would be of benefit; that it can try out a scheme; but that for this purpose it has to draw on the compensation fund.

There appears to be a weakness in that. I tried to discover where else money for such a purpose was to be obtained, but it does appear to me that the board is authorised fully to use the compensation fund.

There is another provision relating to the issue of licenses. The extraordinary position arises that a person who is denied a license is to have the right to appeal to the Minister against the board's decision. Then the provision goes on to say that during the period he is waiting he shall not be allowed to distribute milk. If he has been denied a license, I cannot understand how he can suffer as a result of being denied, inasmuch as he is not allowed to distribute milk unless he is licensed. However, those are features of draftsmanship. No doubt it is a bit too complicated for me, and the Minister may be able to explain it. But I would direct members' attention to the fact that it seems difficult to follow Clauses 30, 31, 32, 33—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member must not mention the clauses.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** I was not going to speak to them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. member must not refer to clauses by number during a second reading speech.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** It is a simple way of doing it. However, the point is that licenses are covered by five or six different clauses. If members will search through the Bill they will find them. I would direct attention to those clauses and would point out how complicated the whole position may become unless it is clarified to a great extent. I regret that my conception of relevancy is so wide of the mark, because I find myself limited on the second reading. However, the position provides one with plenty of scope to deal with the matter in Committee, though one may have to speak far longer than than one would have done on the second reading. The Bill calls for close Committee examination. I support the second reading although I am disappointed with the measure. I would have liked the Government to profit from the experience in New Zealand and New South Wales where the production and distribution of milk are controlled, and where there is a greater guarantee of wholesomeness than applies in Western Australia or than we will be able to ensure in the future.

This Bill is not capable of guaranteeing to the general public really wholesome milk. I know that throughout the world the great problem is how to remove impurities from milk. Gradually but surely, however, that is being mastered. The trouble in Western Australia is that we allow any milk to go into consumption, and under our licensing system the distributor has to be charged with supplying inferior milk before it is discovered that the product should never have reached the licensed premises. The idea of the member for Murray-Wellington that the policing of the production of milk should be left to the Health Board does not appeal to me. That should be a function of this particular Milk Board. It should take milk as it comes from the cow, process it, and see that it is not subject to any contamination and is kept as clean and pure as possible. It should see that those impurities that get into the milk after it leaves the udder are eradicated. The milk should be subject to processing to try to remove what, after all, human beings have put into it. I admit there are germs contained in the milk that even pasteurisation cannot completely eradicate. Nevertheless, the milk should be more closely examined and more closely policed than is possible under this Bill, and there should not be two authorities charged with the one responsibility.

**MR. OWEN (Swan) [5.59]:** This Bill provides for an Act to give better supervision over the production, transport, sale and distribution of wholemilk, and it should result in a better quality product being supplied to the consumers. I feel that the measure will receive the support of the majority of members. Like the member for Guildford-Midland, I am disappointed that the Bill does not seek to have all milk pasteurised, though perhaps our reasons may not lie on the same course. Without pasteurisation, there is still a danger that unclean and even dangerous milk may be distributed and that thereby the health of the community, and particularly of the younger generation, may be endangered. We all know that milk is a complete food. It is Nature's food for the young of all mammals. In our present state of civilisation large quantities of it are used both by our young folk and by the adults. In the natural state the infants of all animals receive their nutriment direct from the mother and, although there is a

possibility of germs being transmitted from the mother to her offspring, there is very little danger of contamination from outside sources.

Under our present system—even in the country where milk is used within a few hours of being taken from the cow—there is still ample opportunity for outside contamination. The delivery of milk to the large cities takes much more time. Sometimes as many as 48 hours elapse from the time of milking until the milk reaches the consumer. During the course of its transport to the various depots there are quite a number of opportunities for contamination to take place. I have already mentioned that milk is a complete food. Besides a considerable amount of water it contains carbohydrates, proteins, fats, minerals and some vitamins. Milk is also an ideal medium for the growth of organisms—those minute organisms that we refer to as germs or, better still, as bacteria. The Minister, when introducing the Bill, mentioned that there are harmful bacteria and useful or beneficial bacteria. I do not think, for the purposes of whole milk at least, we can consider any bacteria as being beneficial. They are harmful or harmless.

Of course there are bacteria which, in the process of cheese manufacture, or even in the ripening of butter, are useful, but we are not concerned with them in this Bill. Therefore I consider that they are either harmless or harmful bacteria. The ones referred to as harmful are those pathogenic types that can cause disease, particularly in human beings. Because bacteria are not as big as, say, blowflies, most people know very little about them or their life history. Although the average housewife would look with horror at any meat on which a blowfly had sat, she would not hesitate to use milk, or other foods, which might contain myriads of pathogenic bacteria. Of course we cannot blame her because she does not know what is present, and the old saying, "Where ignorance is bliss—"

Mr. J. Hegney: What the eye does not see the heart does not grieve for.

Mr. OWEN: Yes, we might put it that way. Bacteria, for the purpose of comparison, might be regarded more in the nature of a plant which, under favourable conditions of growth, thrives. Under conditions

that are not so good the bacteria form seeds which we refer to as spores. These spores, very much like the seeds of plants, can withstand considerably adverse conditions, and when conditions become suitable again they germinate and start off a fresh colony of bacteria. Now, bacteria can be destroyed by heat. Even comparatively low temperatures, provided they are maintained for some time, are quite effective in killing or destroying bacteria, but the spores can withstand quite a lot of heat. Many of them are not destroyed even by temperatures above boiling point.

Heat is used in many of our food preservation methods. In the canning of meats or vegetables the food is sealed in a container—usually a tin—and then subjected to a heat sufficient to kill the bacteria and most of the spores. But in that heating process certain vitamins are destroyed and perhaps some of the food content is also destroyed. So we cannot use this method to pasteurise or, shall we say, sterilise milk. Once milk is heated above 160 to 200 degrees we tend to break up its structure, and it alters so that the cream will not rise and usually the albumen is coagulated. We have, therefore, to make use of another process, that known as pasteurisation. This method consists of heating the product—in this case milk. It is either heated to 145 degrees, on the low temperature method, for about half-an-hour and then cooled very quickly, or it is heated to a higher temperature—about 162 degrees—for a matter of 15 seconds or so. The main thing is that it should be cooled immediately afterwards. This process kills most of the living bacteria, and the immediate cooling prevents the spores from germinating.

Provided the milk is kept cool there should be a low bacterial count, and it should keep for a considerable time. If properly carried out, pasteurisation does not destroy the food value of the milk, but only the bacteria, both harmful and harmless. The question is resolved into one of whether milk should need pasteurisation, and there are two main sources of contamination. The cow may be suffering from a disease, such as T.B., contagious abortion or mastitis, and the bacteria responsible for that condition may be present in the milk obtained. Whatever is done after that cannot destroy those bacteria or inhibit their multiplication except by pas-

teurisation, which makes the milk safe. For that reason alone I think all milk should be pasteurised. It is all very well to say that we should weed out the diseased cows, but we would need an army of trained scientists to test the herds at the frequent intervals necessary to ensure that no milk from diseased animals was sent to the depots. Even if milk direct from the cow did not contain harmful organisms, from that time onwards it would be open to contamination, either during the milking, owing to the milker having dirty hands or failing to wash the cow's udder, or through the cow swishing its tail about while being milked.

The Minister for Justice: Would not milk be easily contaminated after pasteurisation?

Mr. OWEN: Not if placed in sealed and sterile containers immediately after pasteurisation. It is open to contamination in the dairy utensils if they are not scrupulously clean. At the depot and during distribution by the milkman all utensils must be properly cleaned. Even when the milk is put in a billycan on the verandah of the consumer, there is room still for contamination. During its journey from the cow to the consumer it may become loaded with millions of bacteria. Pasteurisation cannot eliminate the risk of that outside contamination, but it will kill all the bacteria present at the time of processing. Pasteurised filth is still filth and cannot be made either wholesome or palatable. All along the line there should be supervision, to see that the milk is kept as clean as is humanly possible. At present, the health authorities inspect dairies, but unfortunately the inspectors cannot be everywhere or see all that goes on.

If the Bill becomes an Act, I hope every possible step will be taken to keep the danger of infection at a minimum. During pasteurisation, the milk is first heated and then cooled, and the process is not effective unless carried out properly. Some of the pasteurisation plants in the city might be looked upon more as incubators of bacteria than anything else. They heat the milk but fail to cool it rapidly. During the time when the milk is warm, the spores are likely to germinate and then there might be a fresh crop of bacteria, which would be just as prevalent as before pasteurisation. The process should be carried out efficiently and

the milk then put into sterile and hermetically sealed bottles, and delivered to the consumer in that condition. If that were done, there would be less danger of pathogenic organisms being taken into the human system during the consumption of milk.

One or two other points in the Bill are deserving of comment. All stages in the production, handling and transport of milk should be watched by skilled operators and, though the board seeks to do that, I think that could be done better if it confined its activities more to distribution, leaving production in the hands of an authority such as the dairy branch of the Department of Agriculture, which should know more about the production side.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Would you allow them to supervise it at the factory, in processing?

Mr. OWEN: I think that the dairy branch of the Department of Agriculture should know all about the production side.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. OWEN: I was referring to the need for qualified men to supervise all operations in connection with the production and distribution of milk, and from the production angle I think the dairy branch of the Agricultural Department could very well look after that end. The department has the advantage of the services of some qualified men but no doubt more would be needed. From the point of view of stock diseases, the stock branch of the Agricultural Department is already fairly well equipped with officers, although more are needed. From the health side of the business the Health Department, with possibly the addition of more officers, could carry out all that was necessary from that standpoint. On the other hand, for the Milk Board itself to do all these things, for which it will need a staff of officers, will mean a lot of overlapping. The board's officers will be testing cows and the inspectors of the stock branch of the Agricultural Department will be doing the same job. I think that if the board confined its attention more to the distribution side of the problem it would be much better.

I was very pleased to hear that more and more of the metropolitan dairy herds are being transferred to country areas. Everyone knows that the herds adjacent to the city

have a higher incidence of T.B. than the country herds. That is only to be expected. The metropolitan herds are kept in more or less confined spaces, particularly where the night paddocks are concerned. This means that, under such conditions, there is a much greater chance of disease being spread from one animal to another. During the course of his speech on the Bill, the member for North Perth raised the question of monopoly and suggested that all forms of milk production, whether it be wholemilk or milk for cheese or butter, should be grouped together and paid for at the same rate. I think that could be done. I understand that in at least one State the practice is carried out although it is applied not to the whole State but to a prescribed area. In that specified area the milk produced for any one of the three purposes I have mentioned is paid for at the same rate, and a compensation pool has been provided into which bonuses on milk production or subsidies on butter-fat are paid and distributed equally at the end of the year. If that procedure were adopted here it would cut out some of the practices that are followed.

For instance, we might have dairymen who were producing partly for wholemilk and partly for butter-fat. During the flush period only the wholemilk from the tested cows would be used, but when the supply shortened there would be a tendency to draw upon supplies from other cows, whether tested or untested, and thus the purpose of the inspections would be defeated. If all forms of production were brought under the one scheme and the cows tested, whether their supplies were used as wholemilk or for the purpose of butter or cheese, it would be better, and I think consideration should be given to that suggestion.

Mr. McLarty: And the producers would be paid for their milk on a bulk rate?

Mr. OWEN: Yes.

Mr. McLarty: Then that would greatly reduce the quantity of wholemilk. That would be certain.

Mr. OWEN: I think it would be very uncertain. There is another phase about which I am particularly concerned regarding the dairy areas or districts. Practically speaking, the milk-producing area stretches from the metropolis down to the South-West, but along the eastern line there are a few

dairies, in reasonably close proximity to Perth, where wholemilk has been produced and sent to the city for use here. When the dairy areas are gazetted, I hope that the section of the State to which I have referred will not be excluded. There are not very many dairies there but those that have been established are quite well conducted. As the people realise more and more what the country there can produce, I believe the number of dairy herds in that area will be increased. If the Bill be passed it should result in greatly improving the quality of the milk, even though I do not think the provisions of the measure go far enough. It will do something, and on that score I support the second reading.

MR. FOX (South Fremantle) [7.36]: I think the public is mostly concerned about getting a good clean supply and the Bill will provide power to the board to enable it to ensure such a supply to the public. The board will have inspectors, who will have similar qualifications to those possessed by other health inspectors, who should enable a good and wholesome article to reach the consumers. One of the first essentials is to have clean dairies, and the personal element enters into that phase to a great extent. The main thing about securing a clean dairy is to have clean people working on the premises. I believe, with few exceptions, the producers do provide clean and wholesome milk.

Mr. Thorn: All of them?

Mr. FOX: I think most of them do that.

Mr. Doney: Those who do, do, and those who don't, don't.

Mr. FOX: When the board is established on the basis proposed, it will see that those producers who do not provide clean wholesome milk are made to do so. At any rate, I believe that most of the dairymen do produce a good article and do their best to conduct their businesses along those lines. I believe that if their milk were sampled at the dairies instead of when it was being carted round the town, we would not often get unsatisfactory results.

Mr. Withers: At any rate, if sampled at the dairy the milkmen would not have been able to pass the tap at that time!

Mr. FOX: Perhaps the cow with the iron handle does give milk sometimes! I was

told by a responsible official that he once saw five or six vendors near a tap. All but one had a go at the tap and afterwards one filled bottles out of his can and then produced stoppers from his pocket. That sort of thing is not hygienic.

Mr. Doney: There are lots of things wrong about that, besides that particular phase.

Mr. FOX: Under the old Act I do not think the board had the power to prosecute a vendor caught doing what I have described. The next essential for securing clean milk is to have herds that are free from T.B. Under the provisions of the Bill herds will have to be examined and cattle found to be suffering from T.B. are to be destroyed. I believe that the incidence of T.B. has been greatly reduced during the last few years. Most members can recall the rinderpest epidemic in 1924 when it was necessary to kill off all the stock in infected areas. A few months ago I was speaking to a veterinary practitioner, who told me about the killing off of a number of cattle in the Fremantle district at that time, and said that out of 58 cows killed, 48 were badly affected with T.B. That represents between 80 and 85 per cent. of cows affected with T.B. at that time.

I heard the member for Albany say the other night how badly goats in a certain area were affected with T.B. None of the goats in the Fremantle area was affected with T.B., probably because they fed on jam tins or something of that sort. The only cattle slaughtered at the time that did not have T.B. were the small Dexter Kerry cattle.

Mr. Mann: They are not of much use as milkers, anyhow.

Mr. FOX: I am merely mentioning the fact. Since the introduction of the Bill of last session, quite a lot has been said and written about pasteurisation. Most of the letters in the newspapers have been written by medical men who, as a result of their training, ought to be in a position to give an opinion on the merits of pasteurisation. Doubtless they deal with matters of this sort in their daily practice. However, only general statements, unsupported by definite instances, have been made of disease occurring or epidemics arising from the consumption of unpasteurised milk. Before we embark on compulsory pasteurisation, we ought to be assured beyond doubt that pas-

teurised milk is best for the health of the community. Until we are given such an assurance, the question of whether an individual should drink pasteurised or unpasteurised milk should be left to his choice. Today I was speaking to a man who drinks a lot of milk, none of it pasteurised, and it would be impossible to find a better specimen of manhood anywhere. If he is an example of what unpasteurised milk will do, it is good enough for me.

At Whyalla, in South Australia, as other speakers have mentioned, the milk is not pasteurised, but the Broken Hill Proprietary Company has taken steps to ensure that the herds are free from T.B. or other disease likely to be communicated to humans through the milk supply. The milk there is treated and handled in a clean and hygienic way. When units of the American Forces were here, the officers took great trouble to ensure that the men were supplied with pure milk. Herds were tested to see that they were free from T.B. and other diseases and, although the Americans had to pay a little extra for the milk, it was obtained from the herds so tested.

If we can obtain a clean milk supply in that way, it will be better to continue as at present until the Milk Board is in a position to deal with the whole of the supply and, if desired, have the lot pasteurised or, after arranging for quick transport from the dairy to centres of consumption, provide pasteurised milk for those who want it and unpasteurised milk for those who are satisfied with that.

It is admitted that pasteurisation destroys the germs in milk. Well, I want to know what becomes of the destroyed germs. I suppose that they continue to float around in the milk and that it is not long before they start to decompose. I believe it is a fact that pasteurised milk becomes putrid much quicker than does unpasteurised milk. Some of the farmers amongst members who have had quite a lot to do with milk might be able to give the explanation.

Mr. Mann: We cannot from our own personal point of view accept pasteurisation.

Mr. FOX: We have been told that pasteurisation destroys certain elements in milk that scientists cannot isolate and also destroys certain vitamins. After the vitamins and other essential elements have thus been

destroyed, the doctors go on to recommend the eating of oranges and other fruit to make good the deficiency caused by pasteurisation. What is the use of destroying one essential in milk and then putting consumers to the expense of buying other things to take the place of the elements destroyed? I believe that all this talk about bacteria has had the effect of scaring the people. Why, we could not live or do anything without bacteria. We could not have bread, cheese, butter, penicillin, to say nothing of that very important food, beer, without bacteria. So much talk about bacteria has scared the public stiff. How is it that the human race has survived if bacteria is so deadly? I suppose we have all taken into our systems a large amount of bacteria, but the body is able to resist the onslaught of harmful bacteria.

Mr. Thorn: Can you explain that?

Mr. FOX: I know only what I have read. I do not suppose any member is competent to give a definite opinion on the question whether there is any one bacterium in milk. He would have to be a scientist to be able to say. I am speaking only from what I have read, just as every other speaker on the Bill has done, including the Minister who moved the second reading. In that respect we are all in the same boat.

Mr. Watts: The Minister knows more about it than you do.

Mr. FOX: Possibly he has read a little more than I have done. I hope the board takes steps to ensure that the producers of milk enjoy a decent standard of living. If there is one industry that can rightly be described as drudgery, it is dairying. We have all heard of little children rising at 5 a.m. to milk cows, sometimes delivering the milk, and then going to school and falling asleep at their desks. The bonus granted by the Commonwealth Government has relieved the difficulties of dairymen to a great extent, and I believe that the industry is now on a fair basis and the people engaged in it able to enjoy a decent standard of living. The dairymen are also able to pay their employees a decent wage. There is no reason why they should not do so. If it is going to cost the public a little more to ensure that the people engaged in this very important industry, including the employees, enjoy a decent standard of living, nobody

would raise any objection. If the board is able to bring about improved conditions, it will have done a good job.

In the past, work in the industry has been shunned by many men. I see no reason why the industry should not be put on a sound footing so that young fellows will be attracted to work of this kind, work that would carry with it a decent house on the farm and amenities similar to those enjoyed by people in the city. If a young fellow had a decent standard of living in the country he would be ten times better off there than he would be in the city with the same amenities. Another person to whom I think sympathetic consideration should be shown is the man who delivers the milk. It is very nice to be able to lie in bed at 4 o'clock in the morning when a gale is blowing and the rain is pelting down and listen to the milkman delivering milk on the verandah.

Mr. Thorn: I cannot see anything nice about that.

Mr. FOX: It is very nice for the man lying in bed as he thinks of the man delivering the milk and getting wet through.

Mr. Cross: He should not wake up.

Mr. FOX: That is another person in the industry whom we should see gets a decent standard of living. Another subject on which I wish to say a word or two is surplus milk. The member for Murray-Wellington lives in a district where there is a very large number of dairies; there is also a very large number of dairies in my electorate, which adjoins that of the member for Murray-Wellington. There should be no such thing as surplus milk at all. If the vendor does not want the milk he will not take it. If he does want it, he should be prepared to pay the proper price for it. I know there are honest vendors who do the fair thing.

I met a dairyman in Fremantle today and asked him how he got on as far as surplus milk was concerned. He said, "I get the proper price for it." But a dairyman, a personal friend of mine, some three or four years ago was taken advantage of by the vendor. The vendor would take the milk for two or three days at the proper price fixed by the Milk Board, and then, towards the end of the week, he would say, "I do not want your milk today, but if you will give it to me for 3d. or 4d. less



than the fixed price I am prepared to take it." What was the dairyman to do? He used to sell his milk at the lower rate. Happily, I suppose that class of vendor is in the minority. This is another matter that the Milk Board might look into; surplus milk should be cut out altogether.

As I said, I would like to see the whole control and distribution of milk taken over by the Milk Board, much in the same way as is done in the metropolitan area of Wellington, New Zealand, where 80 per cent. of the milk consumed is controlled by the Milk Board. In New South Wales also the greater part of the milk is controlled by the Milk Board, with the exception of the milk that is distributed by the dairyman-vendor. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

**MR. CROSS (Canning) [7.53]:** Generally speaking, I intend to support the Bill. When the previous measure was before us we had a great deal of discussion over it. There are one or two changes in this measure, however, which I am certain will not be welcomed by those in the industry. One such provision is designed to give the Commissioner of Public Health power to revoke the license of a dairy. With that provision I do not agree at all. At present, both the issue and the revocation of a license are controlled by the Milk Board, which I think knows more about the matter than the Commissioner of Public Health will ever know. It is all right for the Commissioner to send an inspector round to inspect a dairy. I agree that he should have the right to do so. I agree also that he should have the right to prohibit the sale of milk from a dairy which is found to be not in a clean and satisfactory state until such time as that position is remedied. But he certainly should not have the power which it is proposed to give him by this Bill to cancel a license, as that would be giving him the right to take away from a person his living and his assets and so ruin him.

I say that because of a case that occurred in my electorate. The proprietress, Mrs. F. J. Roberts, of one of the largest distributing dairies in the metropolitan area, was recently prosecuted after the Public Health inspector had paid a visit to her dairy in Suburban-road. I do not

know whether the Commissioner of Public Health paid much attention to the facts of the case at all, because some six or seven weeks elapsed before the prosecution was heard in the court. The Milk Board had made an inspection just prior to that and ordered certain repairs to be put in hand. I have known this dairy for a long time, even in the time of the late Mr. Roberts, and it is one of the best conducted dairies in the metropolitan area, as I am sure the Milk Board would admit. The woman had been ill and could not get labour to effect the necessary repairs, which should have been carried out while she was sick in bed. If the Commissioner of Public Health had had his way he would have cancelled the license; yet when the prosecution took place the repairs had been carried out. The Milk Board would have dealt with the matter in a much better way.

In the last ten years, since the Milk Board has been in operation, there were in my district some of the worst dairies in the State; but the board approached the people in a diplomatic manner and got them to make changes, so that there has been a revolution in the dairies, and today I venture to say they are of the cleanest and best in the State. Much credit is due to the Milk Board for the diplomatic and fair way in which it compelled these people to adopt hygienic methods in their dairies. As I say, I do not propose to support for a moment this proposal to give power to the Commissioner of Public Health to revoke licenses. As an illustration, take hotel licenses, which are issued by the Licensing Court. That court has power to issue and cancel hotel licenses. The Commissioner of Public Health has power to inspect hotels and compel the licensee to effect certain hygienic improvements, but he has no power to cancel the license if the work is not done, although he may be able to prosecute the licensee for a breach of the Health Act. It would be just as ridiculous to give the Commissioner of Public Health power to cancel hotel licenses. I have given notice of an amendment to strike that provision out of the Bill. I point out to members that such a provision was not included in any of the other measures dealing with milk that have been passed by Parliament. The case I have quoted will be an indication to mem-

bers of how such a provision could operate harshly and unfairly against the proprietor of a dairy. I do not know what attitude the Minister will take up, but I know the attitude I intend to adopt.

Mr. Mann: That is a serious threat.

Mr. CROSS: I notice the Bill does not give power to the Milk Board to control prices, that is, as between country depots and the metropolitan distributors or vendors. I think some such provision should be made. In agreement with the member for South Fremantle, I consider that if something like that were done, there should not be any such thing as surplus milk, and it should be made illegal for any vendor to offer a lower price than the proper price to a producer for what he terms surplus milk. I know what takes place. I know well enough that the milk one gets in the cans one day did not come from the cows the previous night. That reminds me that more attention should be given by the Milk Board to the methods by which milk is brought from the South-West to the city proper, because what I complained about some years ago is still operating. The cows are milked at night and the milk is taken to the main road and picked up by a truck some time during the following day. That is still occurring, because only this morning I saw cans of milk in more than a dozen places on the roadside between Harvey and Armadale.

Mr. Mann: Is that where you were?

Mr. CROSS: Yes.

Mr. McLarty: At what time?

Mr. CROSS: Before lunchtime.

Mr. McLarty: They would be empty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CROSS: I know it is the practice to take this milk on to the main road and leave it there until it is picked up by a truck. Nobody can tell me that milk which has been chilled at the dairy and then taken on to the road and left exposed to the increasing heat of the sun in summer and afterwards transported to Perth, is in a good condition. I do not know why some of this milk could not be taken by a special Diesel coach which would run to Perth as quickly as the trucks do. The people would know at what time the Diesel coach would be at a siding and could meet it and place their milk on board.

It could then be brought to Perth much quicker.

Mr. Rodoreda: Would they know what time the Diesel coach would be there?

Mr. CROSS: They would know! Apparently they do not know what time the truck is likely to arrive.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear!

Mr. CROSS: Only a few months ago, I was on a dairy farm at Brunswick Junction. They milked there in the afternoon and the milk was taken to Brunswick the next morning at 8 o'clock. Some of that milk would have been delivered in Perth two or three days later, because it is taken into the local depots and stored there. They do not always sell all the milk immediately. As members know, at the week-end large numbers of people often get a pint or two pints extra. That extra milk is milk which has been stored in a chilled condition for some days.

Mr. Watts: What will this Bill do to improve that?

Mr. Wilson: They ought to put whisky with it!

Mr. CROSS: The member for Collie says they should bottle whisky with the milk. If anything can be said for that idea, it is that if the milk were diluted with whisky the whisky would kill all the germs.

Mr. Mann: I am not too sure about that.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You should know.

Mr. CROSS: I believe the dairymen, especially those in my district, welcome the Bill, but that they are anxious to see the alterations I have mentioned. There is one thing I have been advocating for a long time but for which there is no provision. Those comprising the retail section—the vendors—have no representation on the board yet the retailers are one of the most important links in the chain. These distributors have to work seven days a week. They work at night-time. They must work at night, because in Victoria Park some milkmen are delivering as early as 11 p.m. That is something to which the board should give attention. Quite a large area in Victoria Park is served long before the milk is supposed to be on the street. The distributors are not supposed to deliver before 1 a.m., but some of them start delivering at 11 p.m. and, on occasions earlier. That is wrong.

Mr. Mann: Why?

Mr. CROSS: If the milk has come from Brunswick Junction, it is already about three days old before it is used, and each time it is left on a verandah or a road it is subjected to a change of temperature; and I do not believe that is of any benefit to the quality of the milk. It is all very fine for the member for Beverley to talk!

Mr. Mann: Cannot dairymen who are milking cows at Victoria Park supply the milk earlier?

Mr. CROSS: There are no men milking cows in Victoria Park.

Mr. Mann: I meant, in the Canning area.

Mr. CROSS: There are some in my area, but none at Victoria Park. The milk from Victoria Park comes from outside. As a matter of fact, the general trend is to remove dairies from the metropolitan area altogether. Mighty little consideration has been given to the metropolitan dairymen—I mean those who have the cows and do the milking. Those in the outer metropolitan area have had very little Government help to assist them in building up their businesses. They have supplied the metropolitan area for a long time, and the people who are trying to grab the business—and who are gradually getting it—are those from the South-West, who have been spoon-fed from the word “go.”

Mr. Thorn: Who is responsible for that?

Mr. CROSS: The hon. member's party when it was in power.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are not discussing parties in power at present.

Mr. CROSS: The vendors have no representation on the board, although they pay a considerable proportion of the income of the board and play an important part in the industry. They should be treated with every consideration because they perform the most useful service, not only to dairy farmers but to the consuming public as well. I hope the Bill will be passed with the amendments I have indicated.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [8.8]: When I heard the Minister addressing himself to the second reading, and when he was about half way through his speech, I came to the conclusion that he was about to recommend to the House not only that there should be no compulsory pasteurisation of milk, but

that such pasteurisation as now takes place should be prohibited—

The Minister for Agriculture: A lot of it should.

Mr. WATTS: —for I had never heard a more complete case, up to that stage, against pasteurisation of milk as a remedy for the evils said to be associated with its consumption when it is unpasteurised. But then the hon. gentleman commenced to withdraw from the somewhat strong stand he had taken up on the subject, and came to the conclusion that if we pasteurised milk and so killed not only the harmful germs but the useful bacteria as well, we might be doing far more harm than good. The Minister added—

I am not saying that we shall be doing so, but there is a possibility, and whilst we have any doubt about it are we entitled to prescribe that such a thing shall be compulsorily done and leave no option?

So he came to the conclusion that he would leave the question of pasteurisation to the consumer of milk, who would decide whether he would have the product that came from the pasteurising works or whether he would have milk that was not so treated. I do not know that this measure makes any great contribution to the solution of the problem of supplying the metropolitan area with better milk. I have read with care the report of the Metropolitan Milk Board which was distributed this evening. The board does not complain, in that report, as one would assume it would had it contended that it was short of necessary power. By inference, throughout the report, the chairman of the Milk Board who, I presume, is responsible in the main for the report, indicates that the board is taking action here and there, but that it is hampered because of shortages of material, because of difficulties in obtaining skilled staff and suitable bottles, because the geographical situation of milk depots does not tend to assist the board in the satisfactory distribution of milk, and because of many other matters of that nature. But I do not find, except perhaps in regard to the transport of milk, that the board makes any substantial complaints as to the weaknesses of the measure under which it has been operating for something like 12 or 13 years, although it is not quite the same Act as was passed in 1932.

Because it does not seem to me that this Bill makes any great contribution to the im-

provement of the metropolitan milk supply, I really cannot get enthusiastic about it. I would like to have seen all members read the report of a departmental committee, which has been tabled in the Legislative Council, because in it there is quite a lot of information about the milk supply in Western Australia, and the metropolitan supply in particular, which might lead them to the conclusion that something in addition to what is in the Bill is very requisite. I have here that report which was prepared by a committee composed of Mr. A. McKenzie Clark, Chief Veterinary Surgeon (Chairman); Mr. M. Cullity, Superintendent of Dairying; Dr. A. N. Kingsbury, Bacteriologist, Public Health Department, and Mr. W. E. Stannard, Chairman, Metropolitan Milk Board. The committee was asked to inquire into and report upon—

1. The incidence of disease in dairy cattle which may be communicable to man.

2. The incidence of milk-borne diseases amongst the community with special reference to tuberculosis.

3. Means whereby such diseases, if they constitute a menace to the public health, may be controlled or eliminated.

Several other matters were also referred to the committee. In the course of its report the committee made considerable reference to the diseases found existing in dairy cattle. I give the respective diseases with the relevant affection of the human being. They are—

- (a) Tuberculosis—transmitting tuberculosis.
- (b) Contagious abortion—undulant fever.
- (c) Mastitis—sore throats and gastro-enteritis.

The committee said in regard to tuberculosis—and I point this out to the member for South Fremantle—

There is evidence to show that this disease is prevalent in dairy cattle, in varying degrees throughout the State. The number of dairy cattle slaughtered under the Dairy Cattle Compensation Act for advanced tuberculosis over the past nine years are as follows:—

1936 .. .. .	135
1937 .. .. .	132
1938 .. .. .	127
1939 .. .. .	135
1940 .. .. .	185
1941 .. .. .	185
1942 .. .. .	96
1943 .. .. .	129
1944 .. .. .	141

Data from the same source indicates that 69 per cent. of the 116 dairies in the metropolitan

area are infected with tuberculosis, while of the fifty-five herds of forty or more cows the figure is 90 per cent.

In view of the small amount of tuberculin testing that has been undertaken it is not possible to give an exact incidence of positive factors. However, it is estimated from the testing done that of the 20,000 cows supplying milk to the metropolitan area, 5 per cent. of 15,000 would show positive reactions on application of the tuberculin test, whilst of the remaining 5,000 cows not less than 25 per cent. would react.

We then pass on to contagious abortion, and the committee states—

This disease is widely spread throughout the herds supplying milk to the metropolitan area.

The committee dealing with mastitis has this to say—

Mastitis of streptococcal and staphylococcal origin is widely distributed throughout the dairying districts of the State. Evidence produced would indicate that nearly all the commercial dairy herds are infected to a greater or lesser degree . . . From the evidence submitted it is concluded:—

- (a) Tuberculosis is widespread amongst dairy cattle.
- (b) Contagious abortion is rife.
- (c) Streptococcal and staphylococcal mastitis may be affecting one-fifth of the milch cows.

I am interested in this mainly for the reason that we have had the Milk Board, with ample power in Parliament to alter the legislation if anyone suggested it required altering, for approximately 13 or 14 years, with these results in 1946. This does not seem to indicate that the activities of the board during the intervening period have made a great contribution to the provision of a better quality of milk from more healthy cows in Western Australia. A little further on in its report the committee tells us of "means whereby such diseases, if they constitute a menace to the public health, may be controlled or eliminated." After dealing with the question of tuberculin tests, the committee turns to pasteurisation and has this to say—

Although bovine tuberculosis can be eradicated from dairy herds, there is little prospect of completely controlling contagious abortion, while the control of mastitis appears to be even more remote. In addition there is the risk of contamination from human sources. For these reasons milk supplies can be rendered safe only by pasteurisation.

The effect of pasteurisation on the nutritional value of milk has been studied by many authorities. It is true that the process results in a slight reduction, but only a very slight reduction in the soluble calcium and phos-

phorus and in the iodine content of the milk and that some destruction of vitamins B1 and C will occur. However, feeding experiments, using pasteurised milk, have shown that the available calcium and phosphorus, the biological value of the protein and the total energy value of the milk remains practically unaltered: pasteurisation causes no significant difference in nutritive value. The small reductions in the vitamin B1 and C content are unimportant because ample supplies of these vitamins are contained in other items of normal dietary.

Pasteurisation kills all organisms which by ingestion are likely to cause human diseases. Therefore, pasteurised milk is always safe provided it is bottled and sealed mechanically in the depots before delivery.

In considering the problem of pasteurisation in relation to the metropolitan area, the committee was unable to reach a unanimous decision. Two members favour the compulsory pasteurisation of all milk; one member recommends that all milk other than that supplied by a dairyman-vendor from his own herd be pasteurised, while the other member preferred to leave to the consumer the choice of pasteurised or raw milk.

So the Minister has adopted the view of one member out of the four. He has not adopted the views of the other three, even to the extent to which they were unanimous. As I have said, the impression that he created in my mind when listening to him—which I did very attentively—was that the best thing we could do would be to shut down such pasteurisation plants as we now have, and go in entirely for a system of cleansing the dairies and removing from among the cattle those that showed traces of the diseases coming within the categories mentioned, and so ensure as far as is humanly possible a satisfactorily clean and wholesome supply of milk to the metropolitan area. The operations of this institution over the last 13 years, as far as the aspect of its operations covering the improvement of the quality of milk is concerned, do not, in the face of this departmental committee's report, appear to have been highly successful.

One cannot but be inclined to ask, in my view, are we going to get anything better under the new proposals than we have had under the existing law? I have looked through the report of the Metropolitan Milk Board and have not found there any serious complaint as to lack of authority to deal with the more noticeable problems related to the metropolitan milk supply. If there has not been a lack of power and authority, what has been lacking? Has it been a lack of desire, initiative, efficiency, or what? It

certainly has not been very satisfactory. I desire to see—as I am sure every member present desires to see—not only the citizens of the metropolitan area but every citizen who desires to purchase milk, supplied with a food that is clean, wholesome, free from bacteria, and in every way of the highest quality that can be obtained.

At the same time we wish to ensure that the producer of the milk receives for it a price that will enable him successfully to function and carry on his business, employing those that he wishes to employ at reasonable rates of remuneration, while he himself obtains in the net result a fair measure of comfort. I feel that the operations of the board in the past have contributed substantially in that direction. I believe it has done much in the interests of the producers and has made it possible for the milk supply of the metropolitan area to be maintained on many occasions at a quantity sufficient to meet requirements in the past. From that aspect I know of no criticism that can justifiably be levelled at the board, but if I understand its position aright—that it has a dual duty to perform, the other half of which is to supply the people of the metropolitan area with a milk supply worthy of the citizens of this State and city—then I am not at all certain that the board has, up to the present time, justified itself in relation to that section of its duty.

I am going to support the second reading of the Bill. I am going to place the responsibility on the Minister and his Government in using the methods that they have seen fit to use, contrary to some extent to the reports of experts with whom they are associated, but apparently in the bona fide belief that they will achieve the results that are required. If they do achieve them by the means proposed to be used, or without using the means that some people think should be used, that will be all right. If they do not achieve those results theirs will be the responsibility, and I have no doubt that the public will recollect that fact.

#### THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. J. T. Tonkin—North-East Fremantle—in reply) [8.25]: The Bill has had a somewhat mixed reception, but I think on balance the support is in favour of the measure, though some members have indicated their intention of endeavouring to secure

amendments in Committee. The feature of the Bill that has received most attention is that there is no provision in it for compulsory pasteurisation. It does not say that there shall not be pasteurised milk. It does not say that the only milk available for consumption shall be pasteurised, and that is what some members desire. The Leader of the Opposition says I have followed the opinion of one member of the departmental committee rather than adopt the view of the majority. That is an inference that he is not entitled to draw, because I am simply allowing the position already existing—where the people have a choice between pasteurised and raw milk—to continue, and it is a mere coincidence that it happens to be the opinion of only one member of the board that that should be so. My reason for not taking any action at this stage to make the pasteurisation of milk compulsory is that there is still a considerable difference of opinion on the subject. Medical men are not infallible.

I call to mind a story, for which I can vouch, to illustrate that clearly. Forty years ago there was an eminent authority who believed he had discovered a new corpuscle in the blood. The news of its discovery was bruited abroad and the medical world was agog over it. A meeting was arranged in order that this medical man might give an explanation of his discovery, and the eminent surgeon, Lawson Tait, was in the chair. After his having made an explanation of the discovery of the new corpuscle there was a period of discussion and one member of the audience, who was not a medical man at all but a mere clergyman, pointed out a possible source of error in the conclusions. He did not say the conclusions were wrong, but pointed out a possible source of error. The eminent medical men present pooh-poohed the idea that a clergyman could be right and a medical man wrong, but the remarkable thing about it was that nothing has been heard of the new corpuscle since that day. The clergyman was named St. Clare.

I mention that simply to show that medical men are human and can err in their opinions. On this question there is no unanimity of opinion amongst them. Denmark is one of the countries that a long time ago went in for pasteurisation. In certain districts there people could get none

other than pasteurised milk while in other districts they could get only raw milk. Scientists in Denmark were keen to investigate the results that were following in the respective districts where raw milk and pasteurised milk were being consumed. Those investigators slowly came to the conclusion that in those parts where pasteurised milk only was being used the incidence of T.B. was rising as compared with the position in the other parts of the country where raw milk was being consumed. Their deductions led them to the conclusion that in the districts where pasteurised milk was being consumed the elements which built up immunity to T.B. were destroyed; and although the people did not contract T.B. directly from drinking milk, they could not resist the attacks of the germs which came to them from other directions.

In view of that and one other aspect respecting which I am endeavouring to get proof, I adopted the course that has been referred to. I have been told that following upon investigations in Denmark the authorities decided to do away with pasteurisation. I do not know whether that is a fact, but I have been endeavouring to find out something about it. Information on the subject has not yet come to hand. I shall not be at all surprised if the information conveyed to me proves to be correct, following upon the conclusions that the scientists in Denmark arrived at.

Mr. Doney: What does the bulk of medical opinion in Perth favour?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: As I said during the course of my second reading speech, the bulk of medical opinion here is undoubtedly in favour of pasteurisation.

Mr. Doney: And you disregard that opinion.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, I simply say that the matter is not yet proven.

Mr. Doney: What more do you want?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I want a lot more than that. I shall next quote from a report of an investigation undertaken by two men, Mattick and Golding, at the Institute of Dairy Science, Reading University. A report of the investiga-

tion is recorded in the "Lancet" (1931, I, 662) and the opening paragraph shows the purpose of the investigation—

For the past five years we have conducted experiments on the relative nutritional value of raw and heated milk. Our results show definitely that some dietetic factors are destroyed when milk is sterilised and to a definite but lesser degree when it is pasteurised, and that, although with the method evolved fresh milk is capable of supporting sustained growth and reproduction in rats, heated milk is no longer capable of doing so. Our earlier feeding experiments on cats, kittens, pigs, rats and calves failed to give such clear-cut results as the present series, chiefly because it was not possible, for various reasons, to continue the experiments for a sufficient time.

Then follows an account of a very thorough investigation, in which rats were fed on raw, sterilised and pasteurised milk. The results of this investigation are epitomised in the summary with which the paper of Mattick and Golding concludes—

A method is described by means of which it is demonstrated that raw milk with biscuit, made only from white flour and water, is capable of sustaining the growth and reproduction of rats. A fourth generation on this diet at the time of writing is as healthy and normal as the previous generations. Sterilised milk (boiled for half an hour) fed under similar conditions failed to sustain life and reproduction beyond the first generation except on one occasion, when a second generation of very stunted rats was produced. Even the original rats (the first generation) failed in many instances to reach maturity. Preliminary experiments with pasteurised milk demonstrated results sufficiently marked to indicate that milk heated at a temperature of 145-149 deg. Fahrenheit for half an hour has undergone changes which have considerably reduced its dietetic value.

I could go on quoting numerous examples, but the fact is that experiments are still going on. If the issue had been decided, why waste time and money carrying out further experiments to ascertain the results, as regards the public, of the use of pasteurised milk compared with the use of raw milk? All the reports go to show that scientists and medical men cannot reach unanimity on the question. There is one school of thought which believes that the advantage definitely lies with pasteurised milk; another school of thought believes that the advantage is with raw milk. In these circumstances my attitude, which is the attitude of the Government as well, is that it would be wrong to be dogmatic in connection with a matter regarding which investigations are still pro-

ceeding. Apart from that, there are other aspects of the pasteurisation problem.

When members speak glibly of pasteurisation they would attempt to lead one to believe that it would be 100 per cent. pasteurisation and would be completely effective. Mention has been made of the situation in New Zealand, and we know that in Wellington the authorities have an excellent method of control over the production and distribution of the local milk supply. I shall quote some illuminating figures with regard to the production and distribution of pasteurised milk there. In Wellington 86 per cent. of the total milk supplied is pasteurised, but of the quantity available there and sold retail only 77 per cent. is pasteurised, and the whole of that milk is bottled. In Auckland 84 per cent. of the total milk is pasteurised but only 70 per cent. of the milk sold retail is pasteurised and of that percentage only 46 per cent. is sold in bottles. It will be seen therefore that there is a large quantity of pasteurised milk that is subsequently sold in bulk in Auckland.

When we realise that pasteurisation kills all the organisms in milk and that subsequently such pasteurised milk will not go sour, but will go bad, we must appreciate what it means to have pasteurised milk sold in bulk and thus be open to contamination, when that milk is bereft of the beneficent bacteria which in raw milk are able to combat outside bacteria. In Christchurch 37 per cent. of the milk is pasteurised but only 15 per cent. of the milk sold retail is pasteurised, and 21 per cent. of the milk is bottled. In Dunedin 50 per cent. of the total milk supply is pasteurised and 31 per cent. of the milk sold retail is pasteurised and only 20 per cent. of it is sold in bottles. If pasteurisation is to be effective at all it must be complete, and the milk must be mechanically bottled after being pasteurised.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Which year are you quoting?

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have been quoting from the report of the New Zealand Royal Commission of 1943.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I think more milk is bottled there now.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Furthermore, to commence to operate pasteurisation is a very costly business. Victoria has made provision for compulsory pas-

teurisation, but that State has not yet been able to put the Act into operation.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It will take a good while.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Figures have been supplied me to show that the cost of having the necessary plant for compulsory pasteurisation installed in this State would be at least a quarter of a million, and then it could not be 100 per cent. pasteurisation covering the whole State.

Mr. McLarty: Who would pay that cost?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The cost of putting the milk into pasteurised condition would, of course, be loaded on to the price of the article, and the consumer would have to bear it, but I feel sure that the consumer would not object if he could be assured that the milk was worth the extra money. We are not able to assure the consumer of that at present because of the difference of opinion that exists on the subject between the scientist and the medical man. The Bill does intend to improve the pasteurisation already being done, to tighten up on the processes being used, to ensure that when the people get pasteurised milk, as they now believe they are getting, it will be a thoroughly satisfactory product. The Bill will give power to do all that, and to this extent it is an improvement on the existing Act.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Will not that be done under regulations?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, under the Bill, because the measure provides that only competent men may be employed about a pasteurising plant. The Bill requires those men to pass an examination for a certificate of competency and the pasteurising plant will be subject to rigid inspection. All that is provided for in the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition said he had read the report of the Milk Board and had failed to see any reference to lack of authority or power. Admittedly, the Leader of the Opposition did not have much time to read the report and it is understandable that he failed to see any reference to the matter, but the reference is certainly there. I quote from page 3, under the heading "Inspections," as follows:—

Inspections of dairies, milk depots, milk vendors' premises, vehicles and shops continued actively. Various matters were brought under

notice which emphasises the necessity of the board being clothed with adequate powers to discipline offenders against hygiene.

Towards the bottom of page 8 of the report is another reference, as follows:—

The board is of opinion that the existing Act is inadequate effectively to ensure a supply of fresh, clean and wholesome milk, and it is hoped that a suitable measure increasing the powers of the board will be passed by Parliament this year.

Does the Leader of the Opposition, or any other member, now need any more assurance that the board considers its present powers inadequate? The Bill proposes to give the board greatly increased powers. The board will be charged with the following matters:—

The regulation and organisation of—

- (i) the production of milk in dairy areas;
- (ii) the supply and sale of milk by dairy-men to milk vendors;
- (iii) the supply, sale and distribution of milk to consumers;
- (iv) the treatment of milk before sale and distribution to consumers, including (subject to the provisions of the Health Act, 1911-1944, and the regulations thereunder) the prescribing of conditions under which certain processes connected with or incidental to the treatment of milk shall be used or carried out;
- (v) the prohibition of the use for human consumption in any form of milk which appears to be deleterious to health or unwholesome; etc.

Members should read the Bill and they would realise that we propose to give the board very wide powers to control the milk from the time it leaves the teat of the cow until it reaches the mouth of the consumer. The Bill empowers the board to revoke the license of any man who is not meeting the requirements of the Act or the regulations. One member remarked what a severe penalty was provided, saying that it would take away a man's livelihood. That power is proposed in order to enable the board to discipline offenders, and to tighten up the control of milk and the conditions under which it is produced and distributed.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The board had that power previously.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It did not! Had it enjoyed that power, there would have been no occasion to include in the report the passages I have quoted. The board has been frustrated on many occasions when it has endeavoured to compel



obedience in men who were not doing as they were required. The board could not get the decisions it needed, owing to lack of power. The power is being provided under this Bill.

The member for Guildford-Midland said he regarded the Bill as a weak one because it did not provide the necessary power to do other than follow the milk. If the hon. member would read the Bill, he would find that powers are provided to enable the board to determine the type of dairy that may be used and the condition of the dairy, and to revoke or refuse a license if the dairy does not meet the requirements of the board. After a license has been granted, the board will have power to inspect the premises and see that the milk is being obtained under hygienic conditions. If there is any laxity in the conduct of the dairyman, the board may take away his license. That is the threat, and a very serious threat it is to a man who is doing well in the industry. Thus there is power at the commencement. There is also power to control the shops or stores where milk is being kept for sale, the board having authority to license the retailer or withhold the license. Power is provided over the processing plants to ensure that the processing is done by competent men under hygienic conditions.

The Bill, it is true, is different from the old Bill inasmuch as it exempts ice-cream manufacturers, but there is a very good reason for that exemption. It is an accepted principle in industry generally that where a commodity is purchased in bulk for the purpose of making it a constituent part of some other commodity to be sold later on, that that constituent part shall not be subject to the same conditions and price as apply to an article which is sold direct to the consumer. For example, take the fruit industry! Would any person argue that a jam manufacturer should be subject to the same control and conditions as regards price and everything else as a man who is going to sell fruit retail at so much per lb.? We know that inevitably there will be a large quantity of milk at certain periods, over and above the State's requirements, for wholemilk consumption. We want to encourage people to keep dairy cows and produce milk not only for wholemilk consumption but for butter-fat.

It is inevitable that at certain periods there will be a surplus. I desire to encourage biscuit manufacturers, ice-cream manufacturers and others to use milk; the more of it they use the better I will be pleased. We do not want to say to such people, "You have to pay the price that the man engaged in the wholesale milk trade has to pay." We want to say, "Use it in your manufacture. Where you are using water now, use milk. To induce you to use it we will give it to you at a price which will pay the producer and at the same time be an encouragement to you to use milk instead of water." If the price is fixed at such an amount as not to pay the manufacturer to use wholemilk he will find a substitute. He will use powdered milk. Why force him to do that? Encourage him to use raw milk and give it to him at a manufacturing price. That is the reason why the Bill contains provision enabling the ice-cream manufacturer to be free from the conditions applying to persons dealing in wholemilk.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What about the children who consume ice-cream? Is there to be no protection there?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. There will be protection.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is extraordinary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member will look at the definition of cream and milk, he will find that it has not been altered and that cream includes milk which has been solidified by freezing. That was the draftsman's method of enabling me to do just what I explained to the House. I desire manufacturers who use wholemilk for manufacturing purposes to be free from the other provisions of the Bill. It is not intended that the small shops which make ice blocks, and sell milk drinks and make ice-cream shall be free from the provisions of the Bill, because there would be a loophole. Such people could say that they were purchasing milk for the purpose of making ice-cream and then sell it in their milk drinks or use it for making ice blocks. That is not intended at all. It is only when a manufacturer buys milk, all of which he uses for manufacturing purposes, that he will be excluded from the provisions which apply to other milk.

Mr. McLarty: And that is at the discretion of the board?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Peters Ice-cream Company is then exempt from the provisions of the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the board grants a certificate of exemption.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: From your remarks I thought otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Provided that the manufacturing company continues to abide by the conditions of the certificate and does not permit breaches to occur, it will be enabled to carry on free from the provisions of the Bill. The board will have power to withdraw a certificate if the company is doing anything which the board believes is against the interests of the milk producer or of the consumers, or anybody else for that matter.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Who issues certificates?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The board! The Milk Board is the one to say whether or not a manufacturing firm is entitled to the exemptions provided for in the Bill. Members said that there should not be any surplus milk.

Mr. McLarty: That is the stuff!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That cannot be helped. There has to be a surplus. We fix a quota to enable us to endeavour to ensure that during the lean period sufficient milk will be available for all of the people, and therefore in the flush season we must expect to have a considerable over-supply. There is such a thing as accommodation milk provided for the purpose of enabling a purchaser who wants a certain quantity of milk to get more than the quota, and he pays for his accommodation milk at the quota price. There will still be a number of producers who in the flush season will have a lot more milk than their quota provides for. If we say that that surplus milk should not be sold, what will happen?

The very thing that the member for South Fremantle said happens now. He said that when the purchaser buys his quota of milk

he takes the surplus milk at a certain price, but there are certain days when he says to the producer, "I am not very much concerned about whether I have your milk or not, but if you will give it to me at such and such a price I will take it." And the member for South Fremantle then said that the purchaser takes the milk at the reduced price. That is precisely what would happen if we made no provision in this Bill for surplus milk, because there would still be surplus milk and it would be found that the producer who had it would say to somebody, "I have a lot of milk here. I cannot sell it under my quota. You can have it. What will you give me for it?" All that surplus will be floating about undermining the very conditions that we want to set up.

Mr. Fox: The board ought to be able to stop that. They should supervise it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the board can stop it there is no harm in having the surplus milk, as only a certain quota is required for wholemilk consumption.

Mr. McLarty: What do they do with the surplus milk?

Mr. Abbott: Make cheese of it.

Mr. Cross: They want to sell it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is an argument now, because surplus milk could be sent to Kalgoorlie and was indeed sent there and bought at the surplus milk price, to be sold at the wholemilk price.

Mr. McLarty: Cut out the surplus milk.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Such a practice cannot be continued under this Bill.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I admit the Bill extends beyond the metropolitan area.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This Bill will cover the whole State and will prevent those practices. The board will get the control of the milk and will be in a position to say that the producer shall not be exploited because he happens at certain periods of the year to have a surplus product. The producer cannot avoid having a surplus product in an industry like the milk industry. The board cannot regulate the cows mechanically, so that they would yield only a certain quantity of milk each month.

Mr. Fox: They could take over all the milk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: During certain seasons of the year, the board will have difficulty in getting the quantity of milk it requires.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And Kalgoorlie will go without!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Therefore we have to endeavour to encourage more people to enter the industry so that more will be produced. But as soon as we ensure that we have sufficient milk being produced in the lean season, that must mean that in the flush season there will be a tremendous over-supply. What are we going to do with it? Are we to tell the producer to pour it away, or are we to try to open up to him some other market apart from the wholemilk market that will absorb the surplus during the flush period?

Mr. McLarty: Butter-fat milk.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is the idea of the surplus milk. We provide a surplus milk price for the quantity over and above the quota and the accommodation milk.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You must have milk all the year round for Kalgoorlie.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What is left to discuss in connection with the Bill may best be discussed during the Committee stages. I am entitled to assume that the Bill in some form or other will pass this House, as very few members have expressed their intention to oppose the measure. Therefore we can believe that in principle the House agrees with giving the board additional power and doing something to ensure that the people in this State will have good, clean, wholesome milk supplied to them. That is the aim of the Bill. It may not go as far as some members would like, but the opportunity is always open for an amendment to be made later. This is recognised as a very definite improvement upon existing legislation, and for that reason it is entitled to receive the endorsement of the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Rodoreda in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Application of this Act:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister should give us further information as to how the board is going to meet the extra impost placed upon it in regard to the supply of milk. The clause says the Act shall apply and have effect in all parts of the State except those parts which the Governor, by proclamation from time to time, declares shall be excluded. We know that we are not over-flush with milk during what is known as the lean period; and if the Government is going deliberately to issue proclamations from time to time preventing milk from going to Kalgoorlie and elsewhere so that it can remain in the metropolitan area, we will have a good deal of complaint from Kalgoorlie and other areas.

I am led to make remarks of this kind because the Minister said, in dealing with Kalgoorlie, that surplus milk will be available and controlled because the board's jurisdiction is extended. Are we to take it that the board will function during the flush period and then cease to function and accept no responsibility to maintain the supply when the flush milk is not available? I do not know how it is worked today, but evidently the board accepts no responsibility and the dairyman must make certain arrangements with business people to maintain a supply to Kalgoorlie. Surely they cannot rely today upon the surplus milk for Kalgoorlie! But it would appear now as though the board is going to control and regulate the supply so that the surplus milk will be disposed of in other districts and not be available in the metropolitan area; and then again, when there is no surplus milk, the metropolitan area will get all its requirements and the other end of the State must go short. The Minister should make some further explanation of this clause.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: I welcome this clause as one of the most important in the Bill, representing as I do a country constituency. We feel that now the experimental stage of this measure has been passed and the sale and distribution of milk have been placed upon a basis which is giving

satisfaction to the people in the districts controlled, its operations should be extended to other parts of the State, particularly with a view to ensuring that the preventive sections of the Act are given effect to. We think that because of the methods applied we shall be able to prevent tuberculosis, mastitis, contagious abortion and those other diseases that are said to be so rampant; and we feel that, as the opportunity arises, the measure should be proclaimed in country districts. A peculiar position could have arisen in regard to the Dairy Cattle Compensation Act and the destruction of cattle infected with tuberculosis, inasmuch as while cattle may be sent from any district to another it would be possible, if the measure applied only to the metropolitan area, to have cattle there free from tuberculosis and other diseases and those in the rest of the country in a very dangerous condition.

It was assumed that quite a number of cattle in Geraldton had tuberculosis. In fact, some that were slaughtered were found to have it. We had several visits from the Chief Veterinary Surgeon in order to put the matter on a more satisfactory basis, but it was not administered in a regular manner. There would be a spasm of activity for a month or two and then nothing done for a year or two, with the result that the position was likely to degenerate into a dangerous one. This clause extends the operations of the Act and the board to country districts where the experience gained during the experimental period will be of benefit to the board, and will tend to make the position better not only in the country, but in the metropolitan area where milk goes from one place to another. I welcome this clause more than any other in the Bill. I know that active steps will be taken to prevent contaminated milk being put on the market. The other provision dealing with pasteurisation seems to be that the milk can be as diseased as possible when it comes from the cow, but that we will prevent it from doing much damage. Well, why not prevent its being diseased at all? That is what the Bill attempts to do and that is the main point in it. This clause is one of the revolutionary aspects of the Bill and it will give a tremendous amount of satisfaction in country districts.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The member for Guildford-Midland wanted to know what would happen with regard to the supplies of milk for Kalgoorlie. No guarantee can be given that there will be an adequate supply of milk for Kalgoorlie, or anywhere else. It will depend on conditions. Given proper control of the industry, there will be every incentive for the board to get sufficient people into it to ensure that the milk requirements of the State will be adequately met. That is the purpose of the legislation. The board will have in mind the requirements not only of Perth, Fremantle and the suburbs, but of places further afield. Steps will be taken not only to ensure a sufficient supply of milk for these people, but to control its production and distribution.

**Mr. Doney:** With the exception of Kalgoorlie the country towns could provide their own, could they not?

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** Kalgoorlie would provide some of the milk required there, but a lot of it has previously been sent from the coast. Once the market is assured we will find people anxious to supply its requirements. Producers who now have no opportunity to supply milk beyond their quota and a certain amount of accommodation milk will know that a market exists for the sale of further milk at whole-milk rates. That is the inducement to step up the production of milk. I cannot tell the hon. member that we will guarantee adequacy of supplies for Kalgoorlie any more than for anywhere else.

**Mr. Doney:** Obviously in the middle of summer it would be impossible.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The member for Williams-Narrogin is imagining that there will be no increase in the number of dairy herds in the State. We are putting a number of soldier settlers on dairy properties. The Government has bought some heifers for the purpose. When they come into production there will be an increase in the milk supply. If we get more people engaged in the production of wholemilk it is reasonable to assume that we will come pretty close to meeting the State's requirements.

**Mr. Doney:** That is so.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** That is all we can do. The Bill proposes to give the board the necessary control and authority to look after the milk requirements of the whole State, and provision is there for declaring additional dairy areas and making the conditions apply throughout.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** I would like the Minister to clarify this point: The board has recognised that a premium of £10 a gallon for a producer is a reasonable amount to be paid on a transfer of a license. If the milk quotas are to be increased and new people to be given quotas, is the board going to charge £10 for them?

**The Minister for Agriculture:** What has that to do with this clause?

**Mr. ABBOTT:** It is intended to increase the area of distribution, is it not?

**The Minister for Agriculture:** Yes.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Therefore a good many new licenses will have to be granted. Are steps being taken to see that immediately a new license is granted it becomes worth £10 a gallon?

**Hon. W. D. Johnson:** That applies to the vendor's license.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Yes, and to the others, too. That is something I would like to see stopped, if possible.

**The Minister for Agriculture:** I do not think it has any application to this clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—Interpretation:

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** This clause makes quite clear what accommodation milk is, but I cannot find anything in the Bill to indicate exactly how accommodation milk is to be controlled or supervised. I could not find anything affecting or referring to accommodation milk other than this interpretation. The Minister must appreciate that at a certain time of the year there is a good deal of this surplus milk which now becomes accommodation milk.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I doubt whether the member for Guildford-Midland is in order in asking the Minister that question on this clause, which is merely one of interpretation.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** An interpretation is given, and it is reasonable to assume that it is there to clarify a clause.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member could have asked that question on the second reading, which was more the place to have done so than here. I cannot let him pursue the investigation he desires on this clause.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** Then I cannot ascertain how accommodation milk is to be controlled or distributed?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am afraid the hon. member cannot, on this clause. He could have done it on the second reading, or can do it on the third reading, but it is out of place in the discussion on the interpretation clause.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** Can I move to to have this definition struck out?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member is quite in order in doing that.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON:** It would give me an opportunity of speaking on it. I do not think it is necessary under the Standing Orders, but nevertheless I move an amendment—

That the definition of "accommodation milk" be struck out.

It is an interpretation of something that cannot be found elsewhere in the Bill. Why do we have to interpret something that does not call for interpretation? No indication is given in the Bill as to what "accommodation milk" means, where it will come from, who will supply it or anything else about it. I think it essential that the Minister should either admit that the definition is superfluous or justify its inclusion by pointing out where it is necessary.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** It is necessary to have the interpretation of "accommodation milk" just as it is to have the interpretation of "surplus milk." This states what accommodation milk is, and, having stated that, every man who is dealing with it will know when he is receiving payment for it. It is milk, in excess of the quota, that the purchaser desires to have. He finds he can sell more milk than he will get under the quota and desires to increase the quantity of his purchase. Under the rules of the board, he is able only to purchase milk in accordance with his quota, but if he can dispose of perhaps 50 gallons more, he is to be accommodated to that extent and pay for that

extra milk at the same price as if it were included in the quota.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Where is that outlined in the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not. The interpretation does not subject anyone to harm, but ensures to the producer that he sells more than he anticipated at the whole-milk price.

Mr. Fox: He is given permission by the board.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, the board gives permission for the extra amount of milk to be sold, over and above the quota, at the same price as if it were included in the quota. That is a desirable and necessary provision. If we stuck hard and fast to the quotas such milk would be surplus milk, to be sold at a reduced price. This interpretation states that there is such a thing as accommodation milk.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. ABBOTT: I propose to move the amendment standing in the name of the member for West Perth. Its object is to make it clear that milk or cream used for manufacturing purposes, and in particular for ice-cream, is not subject to the provisions of the Act. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (ii) of the definition of "cream" after the words "condensed milk," the words "ice-cream" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot accept this amendment. I am in agreement with the object sought to be achieved, but the amendment would open the door wide, because then the definition would cover milk made into ice-cream anywhere, and any little shop selling milk in tea, milk drinks and ice blocks would be exempted. I do not want to exclude it there. I am only prepared to exclude cream used for ice-cream when the manufacturer is purchasing the cream or milk solely for that purpose and not using it for any other purpose. When an ice-cream manufacturer purchases whole-milk and intends to turn the whole of it into ice-cream, I am satisfied to exclude it from this provision. If it is desired to use some of the milk for ice-cream and some for some other purpose, I am not prepared to exclude it, because I have then no control over what is done with the quantity of milk

purchased. If the definition is altered, it will defeat the object I have in mind, so I cannot agree to an alteration.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am afraid there is a nigger in the woodpile. I do not see why we should exempt cream that is to be turned into ice-cream by a big manufacturer.

Mr. Triat: Neither can I.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It seems that "Peter's ice-cream" is having some influence. It has grown into a big manufacturing and distributing organisation. The bigger those organisations become, the more anxious I am to watch and police them. The consumption of ice-cream today is enormous and even during the winter months both children and grown-ups consume it. Why should they not have some guarantee that the wholemilk or cream from which the ice-cream is manufactured is subject to investigation, control and licensing, just as is the milk they drink? For the life of me, I cannot understand why this exemption should be included. It is most dangerous, and I am sorry the Government has agreed to this discrimination.

Mr. ABBOTT: The ice-cream manufacturers and others affected are all subject to the provisions of the Health Act, and if any of their products were unsuitable for human consumption they could at once be brought under the purview of that measure. All that is desired here is to exempt those manufacturers from the requirement to pay for the milk they use at wholemilk rates but rather at butter-fat rates. They should be on exactly the same basis as the manufacturers of butter.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That would be all right. Put that in the Bill and it will be satisfactory.

The Minister for Agriculture: But that is the provision in the Bill! That is the rate at which they will be able to buy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for North Perth has the floor.

Mr. ABBOTT: Unfortunately the member for West Perth who drafted the amendment is not able to be present at the moment. Perhaps he may later convince the Minister on the subject, and the Bill may be recommitted for the purpose of further considering this clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (ii) of the definition of "cream" after the words "condensed milk" the words "ice-cream" be inserted.

The object of the amendment is to see that the milk utilized in the manufacture of ice-cream shall be exempted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I oppose the amendment for the same reason as I opposed the previous one. I give the member for North Perth my assurance that the Bill as it stands, plus the amendment I propose to move at a later stage, will do all he requires and will exempt wholesale manufacturers from the provision in the Bill that would require them to pay wholemilk prices. It is pretty well axiomatic that manufacturers using any product as a constituent part of the article they turn out, would expect to buy that product at a lesser price than would be charged for it if sold for consumption in its raw state. That is a recognised principle. The Bill in this respect will give preference to no particular manufacturer. If a man desires to use milk for the manufacture of biscuits or cakes—

Mr. Abbott: Or butter.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:—or butter, he should not be required to purchase that milk at wholemilk rates. He has certain manufacturing costs which must be met before he is able to put his finished product on the market. As against that, the man who buys the product in its raw state and does nothing to it, but sells the product as he buys it, should pay a higher price than the manufacturer who has to process the article. The Bill is intended to encourage manufacturers to purchase milk in large quantities.

Mr. Doney: At whose expense? At the expense of the man who produces it?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, not any more than is the case with the man who makes butter. The member for Williams-Narrogin would not say that the man who purchases milk in order to make butter should pay for the commodity at wholemilk rates. Such a man would buy at butter-fat rates because he has to process the milk and sell his commodity in a different form. The provision in the Bill really extends to other manufacturers a right similar to that enjoyed by the butter manufacturer.

Mr. Leslie: Is it intended to control the price of the manufactured article in the same way?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. Leslie: Then the producer pays the piper.

Mr. Abbott: What about butter?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Members might as well face up to realities. The big ice-cream manufacturers use wholemilk or cream, because they get those supplies at a cost that enables them to sell their processed product at a price that suits them.

Mr. Leslie: Yes, suits them.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If we force them to pay the wholemilk price, within 24 hours they will cease using wholemilk and will resort to milk in powdered form without any detrimental effect on the manufactured article. Their costs will be cheapened and a large quantity of wholemilk that might otherwise have been sold will remain unpurchased. That is the reality of the position. Did we not realise the same difficulty with regard to butter and margarine? Recognising that margarine is a serious competitor with butter, in order to maintain the stability of the dairying industry we put all sorts of obstruction in the way of the expansion of the manufacture of margarine. In this instance if we endeavour to force the manufacturers to pay wholemilk prices they will merely resort to a substitute for milk and that, instead of benefiting the dairy industry, will be detrimental to it. The provision in the Bill is really protective and not harmful to the industry. Why do members think it was included in the Bill? As a matter of caprice? I firmly believe it is in the interests of the milk-producing industry and other industries to have the provision. A similar provision appears in the Milk Acts of other States.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why was it not included last year?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Because I have had additional time to think about it. Several things appear in this Bill that were not included in last year's measure, and they have been inserted because further arguments have been advanced in

their favour and I have been able to give them more mature consideration. Is not that a logical development with any Bill? Every possible angle cannot be foreseen when a measure is first introduced, but, in the light of further consideration, we find the need for amendments. It is often necessary to amend a Bill before the discussion is finished in this Chamber because of some new angle that has been mentioned.

The member for Guildford-Midland said he regards this as vital. I do not say it is vital, but it is in the interests of the industry and should be included. The object is to encourage people to use milk in their manufacturing instead of something else, and if the price is such that it does not pay them to use milk, they will find a substitute. If we stipulate that the manufacturer shall pay the wholemilk price, he will not buy it.

Mr. DONEY: The Minister's argument is good or bad according as we view it from the standpoint of the manufacture of ice-cream or the standpoint of the producer. It does not matter to the producer who buys his milk so long as the buyer pays a fixed and proper price. The Minister, however, is requiring the producer to sell to an ice-cream manufacturer, and contends that this would be in the interests of the industry. The producer gets an ample market for the milk he produces at a price fair to him. Are we to insist that, while he still has that market, he must sell a portion of his product to a manufacturer? Clearly that would not be fair to the producer.

A precisely similar position obtains regarding wheat. This might be sold overseas at about 10s. 5d. per bushel, but the producer is required to sell at 5s. 2d. to local manufacturers of breakfast foods, dog biscuits and the like. Stronger argument would be needed to get the producer of milk or wheat to agree that this makes for the benefit of his industry. I cannot see that it does. I think, unless the amendment is made, the Minister will have difficulty in getting the provision through the Committee.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Whether I have difficulty or not will not worry me. The Chamber of Manufactures pointed out by deputation that the Bill as introduced previously offered no encouragement to industry in this State. This advan-

tage obtained elsewhere in the Commonwealth, and our secondary industries would be placed in an unfair position as compared with industries elsewhere that had the benefit of a cheaper commodity. The argument appealed to me as being sound and I altered the Bill as introduced previously. If the Committee will not accept my argument, I shall have to be satisfied.

Mr. Watts: What has been the practice?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: So far as I am aware, manufacturers have been able to get milk at the cheap price. If we prescribe the wholemilk price, manufacturers will not use it but will find a substitute. Almost certainly they will use powdered milk instead of wholemilk. If that is regarded as being desirable in the interests of the dairying industry, members will vote to delete the paragraph.

Mr. CROSS: I feel inclined to support the amendment. Manufacturers of ice-cream should pay the wholemilk price. It would be interesting to know the constituents of a carton of ice-cream because I understand that a quantity of custard powder, cornflour, etc., is used and only a very small quantity of cream. The Minister said that manufacturers would use a substitute. They would probably use more cornflour or custard powder. If that happened, let us lay down a standard for ice-cream.

The Minister for Agriculture: That could not be done in this Bill.

Mr. CROSS: No, but there should be no difficulty in compelling them to pay a fair price, and for my part they will have to pay it.

Mr. ABBOTT: I suggest that the producers of wholemilk represent a very small proportion of the dairying industry, and it is simply a question of whether manufacturers are entitled to buy from one set of producers or another. In view of the Minister's assurance I propose to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I propose to move to strike out the third paragraph of the definition of "milk vendor."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is the paragraph which I myself propose to amend, as its wording does not suit



me. If the member for Guildford-Midland would indicate exactly what he intends to do, I would better understand my own position.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The paragraph requires close examination. I do not like it, because I do not think it will protect the people whom the Bill is supposed to protect. I appeal to the Minister to report progress.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not prepared to report progress at this stage. I propose to move to strike out all the words after the word "who" in the first line of the paragraph in question.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has the floor at present and I propose to wait and see what it is that he desires. After he has indicated his intention I will decide what I will do.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: When I have moved my amendment, I think the member for Guildford-Midland will achieve his objective by voting against the words which I propose to insert. As it stands, the paragraph does not do what I think should be done. I apologise to members for not having placed my amendment on the notice paper. I propose to move to strike out all the words after the word "who" in line one and to insert in lieu the words "being the owner or occupier of a milk store used exclusively for the treatment, sale or distribution of ice-cream all milk purchased or acquired by him." The purpose of my amendment is to exclude an ice-cream manufacturer from the provisions of the Bill. He is to get exemption from the board if he shows that the milk he purchases is used exclusively for the manufacture of ice-cream. If the member for Guildford-Midland is against that principle, then he will achieve his object by having the amendment defeated. I move an amendment—

That in the definition of "milk vendor," the words "owns or occupies a milk store which is used exclusively for the treatment, sale or distribution to consumers of ice-cream, or of milk or cream in concentrated form or solidified by freezing" be struck out, with a view to inserting other words.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Guildford-Midland gave way to the Minister in order to give him an opportunity to enlighten the Committee as to what his amendment was. If the member for Guildford-

Midland is willing, I will put the Minister's amendment. If not, I will give him the right to let the Committee know what he wants to do first.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The matter requires more consideration than I feel capable of giving it now. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 28th August, 1946.*

	PAGE
Questions: Agriculture, as to price of feed oats ...	483
Fisheries, as to fish foods in rivers and estuaries	494
Comprehensive water scheme, as to investigation by Commonwealth	494
Assent to Bill	512
Bills: Marketing of Barley (No. 2), 1R.	495
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 1R.	495
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	495
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, report	495
Electoral Act Amendment, 2R., defeated	495
Road Districts Act 1919-1942, Amendment, 2R.	502
Business Names Act Amendment, 2R.	514
Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report (as to second reading procedure—2R., Com. report)	515
Milk, Com. (point of order)	518
Motions: State Hotels, as to use as community hotels	503
Public Works standing committee, as to legislation for appointing	508
Traffic Act, to disallow angle-parking regulation	513

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

## QUESTIONS.

### AGRICULTURE.

#### *As to Price of Feed Oats.*

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (a) What was the guaranteed price for feed oats last season?
- (b) What will be the guaranteed price for feed oats for this season?
- (a) What was the maximum price fixed by the Prices Commissioner for feed oats for last season?
- (b) What will be the above for this season?