

committees composed of members of Parliament will be formed so that we will be able to render the State a far greater service than we are in a position to do at present. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. R. J. Boylen, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 23rd September, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Water supplies, (a) as to estimated financial returns	1014
(b) as to consumption on Eastern Goldfields	1014
Railways, (a) as to wagon construction and profit	1015
(b) as to reinstating suburban services, etc.	1015
Coalmining, as to review of tribunal's decision	1015
Traffic, as to delay in proceeding with charges	1015
Education, as to new school, Georgetown, South Perth	1016
Shops, as to facilities in new areas	1016
Housing, as to softwood frames and fire protection	1016
Dairying industry, as to proposals for Commonwealth assistance	1016
Basic wage, as to allowance for rent	1017
Industrial enterprises, Kwinana, as to expenditure and works	1017
Superphosphate, as to effect of transport surcharge	1017
State trading concerns, as to reported consideration of disposal	1017
Tram services, as to discontinuance	1017
Mining, as to lead treatment plant, Northampton	1018
Health, as to x-ray examinations, Geraldton district	1018
Native flora, as to prosecutions and further protection	1018
Petrol, as to application for increased price	1018
Bills : Licensing Act Amendment, 1r.	1018
Margarine Act Amendment (No. 1), 2r., Com., report	1018
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 2r.	1038
Physiotherapists Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	1039
Rents and Tenancies Emergency Provisions Act Amendment (Continuance), 2r.	1039

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

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) As to Estimated Financial Returns.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Minister for Water Supply:

What was the estimate of financial return at the time each of the following water supply proposals was approved:—

- (1) Reticulated supplies: Wittenoom, New Hall's Creek, Boddington, Dalwallinu, Dwellingup, Kojonup, Margaret River, Pinjarra, Yarloop, Kulin, Kodj Kodjin area, Merredin to Bruce Rock, Mt. Magnet, Port Hedland, Morawa, Carnamah, Mingenew, Brunswick, Wellington Dam to Narrogin, Bullfinch relay to increase supply, Toodyay relay to increase supply.
- (2) Non-reticulated supplies: Badgebup, Lake Grace, Galena, Bending, Hyden Rock, Dandagin, Gaby's, Holland's, Holt Rock, Mendels-Wongoondy, Nambadilling, Nullagine, Perenjori, Borden, Dumbleyung?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Reticulated supplies:

Reticulated Supplies.	Estimated Annual Revenue £	
Wittenoom Borge	No estimate.
New Hall's Creek	No estimate.
Boddington	400	
Dalwallinu	600	
Dwellingup	300	
Kojonup	750	
Margaret River	633	
Pinjarra	800	(taken over from local authority.)
Yarloop	380	
Kulin	
Kodj Kodjin Area	Part of Comprehensive Water Supply Scheme.
Merredin-Bruce Rock	
Mt. Magnet	945	
Port Hedland	No estimate.
Morawa	600	
Carnamah	500	
Mingenew	880	
Brunswick	780	
Wellington Dam-Narrogin	Part of Comprehensive Water Supply Scheme.
Bullfinch supply	increased 28,000	
Toodyay supply	increased 85	

(2) The department has never rated in connection with non-reticulated supplies; consequently no financial return was estimated for these supplies.

(b) As to Consumption on Eastern Goldfields.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) How many gallons of water were used for mining purposes and drawn from the Goldfields water supply during the years 1949-50 and 1950-51?

MINING.*As to Lead Treatment Plant, Northampton.*

Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has the construction work on the erection of the treatment plant for lead ores at Northampton been suspended?

(2) If so, why?

(3) Will he give an assurance that construction work will be restarted at once?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Owing to shortage of loan moneys.

(3) Construction will be recommenced immediately the availability of finance permits.

HEALTH.*As to X-ray Examinations, Geraldton District.*

Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Health:

When will the mobile x-ray plant be available to carry out examinations in the Geraldton district?

The MINISTER replied:

It is proposed to carry out an x-ray survey of the Geraldton district in the second quarter of 1953.

NATIVE FLORA.*As to Prosecutions and Further Protection.*

Mr. HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) How many prosecutions have been made each year since 1950 against persons destroying or mutilating wild flowers, contrary to the provisions of the Native Flora Protection Act?

(2) As a further step towards the preservation of our native flora, will he consider giving blanket protection to all wild flowers within 50 miles of Perth?

(3) Will he ensure that the splendid posters, concerning the protection of flora, draw by Mr. A. A. Webb and issued by the Forests Department, are conspicuously displayed in all immigration centres and schools?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Nil.

(2) All wildflowers named in the schedule to the Act are protected, although the picking of only five and all orchids within a radius of 50 miles of the G.P.O. is prohibited.

With modern transport, obvious difficulties would accompany the prohibition of picking of all flowers within 50 miles of Perth.

Consideration would be given to the protection of any additional plant required.

(3) Posters prepared by the Forests Department relating to the Native Flora Protection Act have been displayed in schools in the metropolitan area and hills districts and on suburban railway stations. It is the intention of the Forests Department to have additional posters with a change in type prepared from time to time and similarly displayed.

PETROL.*As to Application for Increased Price.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY (without notice) asked the Attorney General:

(1) Will he inform the House as to the attitude he proposes to adopt at the approaching conference of Prices Ministers with respect to the demand of the oil companies for an increase of 2½d. per gallon in the price of petrol?

(2) Will he take note of the apparent huge amount of money spent by oil companies on advertising, including, as an example, full page advertisements appearing in "The West Australian" on the 18th and 20th September, 1952?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) and (2) At the conference, the whole of the facts surrounding any proposed increase will be fully considered and investigated, and upon those facts a decision will be made. Any costs of advertising will be fully considered on that occasion.

Mr. Hoar: Will a flat rate also be considered?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. Sewell, and read a first time.

BILL—MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 18th September.

MR. MANNING (Harvey) [4.46]: While I am not opposing the Bill, I would like to make a few comments on it. The position is one that we should watch very closely indeed. I believe there is quite considerable pressure being put on at present for an increase in the production of margarine and that it will be competitive on the market with butter. Margarine manufacturers have seized the opportunity, when dairy products are high in price, to press for an increase in the production quota allotted to them. Those are the grounds on which we should watch the situation very closely.

I do not oppose the Bill, as I realise that there is a need for an increase in the quota because of the growth in population, and I know that the production of

BASIC WAGE.*As to Allowance for Rent.*

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Attorney General:

(1) Are the basic wage declarations of the State Arbitration Court based on the same figures as supplied in the quarterly summary of Australian statistics?

(2) Has he knowledge of the footnote to the table of Retail Prices Indexes (b) Rent, which concludes—"Rentals of new tenanted houses completed since the end of the war are not taken into account?"

(3) Is the figure for "House Rents" in the schedule concerned only with houses more than ten years old?

(4) Will he introduce legislation to ensure that average rents as actually paid including Commonwealth-State rental houses, are included in future figures for the court's consideration?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) The "C" Series retail price index figures supplied by the Government Statistician to the Court of Arbitration are, for corresponding towns, the same as those published in the Quarterly Summary of Australian statistics.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes. These statistics are computed under the Commonwealth Census and Statistics Act, 1905-1949, and regulated by them. I understand that it is considered the number of houses built since 1942 by private persons for rental purposes is negligible.

(4) No, as the matter is governed by the Commonwealth Act.

**INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES,
KWINANA.***As to Expenditure and Works.*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Acting Premier:

(1) What sum of money has been expended on work in the Kwinana area in connection with the projected industrial enterprises?

(2) What are the principal works that have been carried out to date?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) £125,500.

(2) Pipeline for a water supply, a summit tank and small pumping station. Also contour surveys, hydrographic surveys, some borings and mapping of about 5,000 acres of land.

SUPERPHOSPHATE*As to Effect of Transport Surcharge.*

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Acting Premier:

(1) Has he considered the possible effect of the proposed surcharge of 15s. per ton on super, on charges by road carriers not registered with the Transport Board in areas close to works?

(2) Can he suggest any practical means of preventing road transport costs increasing by 15s. per ton in these areas?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) The effect of an equalisation of payments scheme involving a surcharge is being examined from all aspects.

(2) Road hauliers' charges for transport of superphosphate are limited by Prices Control Order No. 603, which will continue to apply whether an equalisation scheme is introduced or not.

STATE TRADING CONCERNS.*As to Reported Consideration of Disposal.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Acting Premier:

(1) Has he yet heard, or read, a report that the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Government is seriously considering the matter of selling the Commonwealth line of ships to private individuals or companies?

(2) Does his Government propose to sell the vessels of the State shipping service?

(3) Has consideration been given, or is consideration being given, by the Government to the disposal of all or any of the following State-owned instrumentalities:—

Wyndham meatworks;
State brickworks;
State saw mills;
State engineering works;
Wundowie project?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) I have read Press references to this subject.

(2) No.

(3) No.

TRAM SERVICES.*As to Discontinuance.*

Mr. YATES asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many tram services have been discontinued in the metropolitan area since the 1st January, 1947?

(2) Which are the suburbs concerned?

(3) How many trams have been disposed of by tender?

(4) What was the average price obtained?

(5) Is it the intention of the Government to discontinue the tram services in Barrack-st., in the near future?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Six.

(2) West Leederville; Nedlands, via Subiaco; Mt. Hawthorn-Osborne Park; South Perth; Victoria Park; Maylands.

(3) Fifty small and 12 large.

(4) Small £37 and large £109 (discounting one burnt out which brought £10 only).

(5) No.

(2) As these delays cause nervous disorders with consequent deterioration of health in certain types of individuals, will he give instructions that in all cases where the department intends to prosecute, charges must be made within a reasonable time of the occurrence of the alleged offences?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Some two or three months ago there was a certain delay in presentation of traffic prosecutions but now, with the rearrangement of staff of the traffic branch, which has been necessary through the ever increasing number of offences, very little delay is likely to occur.

EDUCATION.

As to New School, George-st., South Perth.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Will he state whether the new school in the course of construction in George-st., South Perth, will be completed and ready for occupation on the resumption of school after the Christmas, 1952, holidays?

(2) What is the grade of the school?

(3) What will be the estimated construction cost?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is expected that the erection of the South Kensington School will be completed before the reopening of schools in February next.

(2) The school will be a full primary school, i.e., it will accommodate pupils from Infants to Standard VI.

(3) Approximately £21,000.

SHOPS.

As to Facilities in New Areas.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is the policy of preference to ex-servicemen for the occupation of shops in new areas still being observed?

(2) If not, why not?

(3) Is it a fact that more shops are being provided in the City of Perth than in newly-settled areas?

(4) Is he aware that lack of shopping facilities is causing considerable inconvenience to mothers of large families in these new areas?

(5) Is he further aware that because of the low purchasing power of the £1, additional expense intensifies that inconvenience?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) No.

(4) I am aware that inconvenience is caused in two new areas. In one, erection of shops has commenced and in the other, plans and specifications are now being prepared.

(5) Yes, and to that end the policy has been to provide shopping facilities in all new areas as soon as the development of such areas justifies the erection of shops. The availability of funds also determines the shop building programme.

HOUSING.

As to Softwood Frames and Fire Protection.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

Because of the fact that in some of the newly-settled areas there are many houses made of softwood frames, and many with exterior dressed pine weather-boards, thus increasing the fire risk, will he inform the House what steps are being taken to provide effective fire protection?

The MINISTER replied:

All land is cleared before construction commences. Internal linings are of plasterboard to main rooms, together with asbestos dados in kitchen and bathroom and asbestos lining in laundry—materials acceptable to fire insurance underwriters. Fire hydrants have been and are being provided in new areas as determined by the W.A. Fire Brigades Board. Adequate clearance between adjacent houses is insisted on.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

As to Proposals for Commonwealth Assistance.

Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What action has been taken by the Government to secure financial assistance to initiate proposals to assist dairy farmers to increase cleared areas up to 150 acres?

(2) As the delay in commencing this proposal is causing continued hardship to dairy farmers concerned, will immediate further action be taken to secure necessary finance?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

(1) Proposals already submitted to the Commonwealth Government to assist dairy farmers to increase production by the clearing of additional areas are being actively sustained.

(2) As clearing is not possible during the winter, these negotiations have not delayed the commencement of work.

(2) What quantity of salt water has been used per annum for mining purposes since the ban was lifted in 1950?

(3) What was the average price per 1,000 gallons paid by the mining companies for the water mentioned in No. (1)?

(4) What was the total number of gallons used from the Goldfields water supply mains in Kalgoorlie and Boulder for the years mentioned in No. (1)?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

- (1) Year 1949-50—501,416,000 gallons.
Year 1950-51—551,423,000 gallons.

(2) The Goldfields Water Supply Department has no specific information. It is understood that in Kalgoorlie the quantity would have been of the order of 120 million gallons per year.

- (3) Average price mining water—
1949-50—5s. 4.66d. per 1,000 gals.
1950-51—5s. 3.78d. per 1,000 gals.

(4) Total consumption Kalgoorlie-Boulder (as measured by master meters ex Mt. Charlotte reservoir)—

- 1949-50—1,029,244,000 gals.
1950-51—1,048,993,000 gals.

RAILWAYS.

(a) *As to Wagon Construction and Profit.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware that Tomlinsons Steel Ltd. made £80,477 net profit for the year ended June, 1952?

(2) Is he aware that this company designed and manufactured 492 railway wagons to various orders for the same year?

(3) Does he know that the company claims to have made 25 per cent. of the railway requirements since 1946?

(4) To avoid profit-taking in future, will he have all railway requirements made in the Midland Junction Railway Workshops?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) A statement to this effect has appeared in the Press.

(2) The Railway Department's records show that 424 wagons manufactured by Tomlinsons Steel Ltd. were delivered during the year ended the 30th June, 1952. It is known that a number of wagons was manufactured by the firm for the Midland Railway Company during the same year. The W.A.G.R. wagons were not designed by Tomlinsons.

(3) Up to the 30th June, 1952, a total of 1,694 wagons complete was delivered by Tomlinsons. This represents approximately 15 per cent. of the department's total goods wagons on that date.

(4) When the present leeway in the department's requirements of rollingstock is overtaken, it is planned to manufacture normal requirements in the railway workshops.

(b) *As to Reinstating Suburban Services, etc.*

Mr. BRADY (without notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

As it was reported in last evening's "Daily News" that it was believed a Cabinet subcommittee is considering the withdrawal of the suburban rail services, will he state—

(1) Whether such is the position?

(2) Whether the unemployment created by such a move has been considered?

(3) Whether it is considered that current road bus fares are excessive?

(4) Whether it is realised that many sick and invalid people are unable to use the road bus services?

(5) Whether it is realised that rail road maintenance will have to be effected even if suburban services are reduced.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

The hon. member was good enough to give me some advance notice of this question, and in reply I would state that a Cabinet committee is considering the whole matter of suburban rail services and is taking into consideration all the points mentioned by the hon. member, and a great many more. It has not yet arrived at any decision. As soon as a decision is reached, it will be made public.

COALMINING.

As to Review of Tribunal's Decision.

Mr. MAY asked the Attorney General:

Is the procedure laid down in Section 323 (1) and (2) of Act No. 84 of 1948 (Mining Act Amendment Act) identical with that set out in a similar section in the Justices Act?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

No. Section 323 of the Mining Act confers jurisdiction on the Arbitration Court to review decisions of the Western Australian Coal Industry Tribunal. No procedure has been laid down otherwise than by the President in connection with the current review.

TRAFFIC.

As to Delay in Proceeding with Charges.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Is he aware that the traffic branch of the Police Department frequently allows months to pass before proceeding with charges against motor drivers alleged to have contravened traffic laws?

butter is falling behind requirements. Nevertheless we should bear in mind that it is the Government's policy considerably to increase the productive capacity of existing dairy farms, and if possible to double their output. It is also the Government's policy that there should be 1,000 new farms supplying dairy produce. If that policy is given effect to we should see a great increase in the volume of dairy produce. We cannot afford to have this developmental work hampered through competition in the form of an over-supply of margarine. The present quota is 340 tons, and it is proposed to increase that to 800 tons, which is much more than double. On the other hand, as pointed out by the member for Vasse, the population has increased only by one-fifth so that an over-supply of margarine is possible.

When there is a shortage of a particular commodity, there is need for an increased production of that commodity. We have in this State vast areas that have not yet been developed, and there is need for people to go into those areas to develop them and engage in the production of dairy produce. The South-West has been largely developed by butterfat producers and, if we are going to develop the State further, I think it is the butter producers who will go to the far corners and out-of-the-way places to undertake that work. The reason is that it is not necessary for butter to be sent to market every day, and it is possible to send cream to market two or three times a week quite satisfactorily from out-of-the-way places where transport is infrequent.

We have today instances of unemployment in the city such as do not exist in the rural districts and that will apply even more should there be something of a recession, as work can always be found in the country. The development of our dairy lands offers opportunity of employment for many men, and factors such as that should be borne in mind when we are thinking of allowing an increase in the manufacturers' quota for margarine.

The member for Leederville had a good deal to say about the inability of the basic wage earner to buy butter, but I would remind him, and other members who may hold that view, that butter is one of the commodities listed under the "C" series index. If we agree that the basic wage earner cannot afford to buy butter—though provision is made for it in the basic wage—and has to rely on supplies of margarine, butter should be taken from the "C" series index and margarine placed in its stead, which might result in a reduction of the basic wage. I do not oppose the Bill, but I think a quota of 800 tons per annum is too great.

I believe that in future years there will be a great increase in our dairy production as there are large areas of the State

that, when developed, will produce considerable quantities of dairy products for which a market will be required. It must be remembered that rayon is supplanting wool, that synthetic products have encroached on the rubber market and oil is to a great extent replacing coal. We do not want margarine to replace butter. As this is to a large extent a dairying State we should do all we can to preserve the market for dairy products.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood) [4.52]: I support the Bill though I am, to the best of my knowledge, the only actual producer of butterfat in this Chamber. I am a producer in a small way only, but I do receive my cream cheque regularly and notwithstanding that personal interest in the dairying industry I still support the measure. There has been some discussion about the pronunciation of the word "margarine." The member for East Perth set out to show that it was "margarine" and the member for Eyre said it was "marjarine," and then reverted to "margarine." I did not set out to discover what was the correct pronunciation, but Dr. Sutton this afternoon informed me that the "g" should be hard and that the product is named after a Frenchman, who I think was called Margary. After seeing what happened to the member for Eyre I am not prepared to say what pronunciation should be used.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I think we must follow custom.

Mr. HEARMAN: The custom followed by the member for Eyre was apparently to change his mind. Reference has been made by the member for East Perth and the member for Melville to Holland and Denmark, and they said that the consumption of margarine in those countries is considerable. I am not in a position to query the figures given, but I point out that the position in those countries is not altogether comparable with that in Australia. They are countries that export their dairy products for a high return at world parity prices, while we are compelled, by our inter-Government agreement, to sell our surplus to Great Britain unless we receive her permission to sell it elsewhere.

Denmark and Holland are able to take advantage of world parity prices, selling their butter in the best market and importing in lieu relatively cheap margarine. The Australian butterfat producer cannot sell his product at anything near world parity prices, and the butter he exports to Great Britain is sold at a price lower than that ruling in Australia. The suggestion that unrestricted consumption of margarine in Western Australia will not have a deleterious effect on the dairying industry in this State, because it has not had that effect in Holland and Denmark, is not based on completely sound

reasoning, but nevertheless I believe that the dairying industry must face up to the fact that butter has been in short supply and that we cannot take up the untenable position that, though we cannot guarantee to supply the market, we will not allow a substitute to be used.

Hon. E. Nulsen: What is the difference in price received for the exported butter as compared with that consumed in Western Australia?

Mr. HEARMAN: I understand that Great Britain is paying Denmark in the vicinity of 5s. per lb., which is considerably more than she is paying Australia. The Australian dairy farmer would be better off today if he could sell his product at world parity prices.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Then he would be better off to export any surplus?

Mr. HEARMAN: Yes, if he could get away from the 15-year inter-Government agreement. In about February of this year there was a shortage of both butter and margarine, and many people believed that butter would be permanently in short supply. I am certain that the move to increase the quota of margarine to be manufactured in this State arose to some extent from the experience earlier this year, though the position at that time was unusual. At that stage we had a decline in butter production in Western Australia, with a marked falling off after Christmas and the season in the Eastern States was late. Normally the industry there gets into full production about that time, but there was a lag and production was still poor so that the importation from the Eastern States that normally takes place during the summer months did not eventuate.

I am informed that there was also at that time difficulty in securing supplies of raw materials for the manufacture of margarine, and that made people think that the existing quota was not big enough. In fact the quota had not been reached, but the shortage of raw materials meant that the product was not available freely on the market. It was that unusual combination of circumstances which led to a shortage of both butter and margarine and I do not think it is likely to occur again. I have obtained from the Dairy Products Marketing Board its estimate of production for the ensuing 12 months. For the 12 months ending August, 1953, it estimates that Western Australia will produce 259,000 boxes of butter, as against the known production of 260,937 boxes for 1951-52, and that shows only an estimated decline of production of approximately 2,000 boxes. Of the expected 259,000 boxes it is estimated that 256,000 will be suitable for local consumption. That means that 3,000 boxes of second grade butter will be exported in the ensuing 12 months that will be difficult to sell on the open market.

Consumption is estimated at 309,250 boxes, which will leave a balance of 52,750 boxes to be imported from the Eastern States.

The present indications are that the Eastern States should be able to supply that quantity of butter, and the only thing that may perhaps restrict supplies at the moment or make it difficult to obtain them here will be the shipping position. Of course, a lot can happen between now and next February. We may find that local production will not reach the estimate and we may also find that the amount available in Victoria may not be as great. However, the present indications are that there should be no shortage of butter for the general public next summer. That would indicate, I think, that probably there is no need for any great increase in the amount of margarine to be manufactured locally.

I point out to members that butter is marketed on an Australia-wide basis but it might so happen that we shall be exporting it in the next month or two and importing from the Eastern States. However, it is not suggested that we should lose anything by what we export in the next month or two. At the moment some butter is going into store and the position is that there are 10,826 boxes as opposed to 3,311 boxes stored at this time last year. Therefore, the storage position shows that we are about 7,500 boxes better off.

As to the sales of butter, there does seem to be some buyer resistance. The total number of boxes sold up to August, 1952, was 25,096, as opposed to 31,148 at the same time last year. There is a falling off there of approximately 6,000 boxes. This can only be taken to indicate that the supply position as far as the consumer is concerned in March, April and May, which will be a short period, is considerably sounder this year than it was last year. All this seems to indicate that the public will not experience the same shortage of butter next year as they experienced this year. As to the restriction of the manufacture of margarine, I am in complete accord with what the member for East Perth has said and I think we are both in good company because Dr. Sutton, the chairman of the Dairy Products Marketing Board, agrees entirely that there is nothing that this State Government can do to stop the importation of margarine. Under Section 92 of the Constitution, we cannot do anything about it and no matter how we try, it will still come into this State from the Eastern States if a sound market is developed for it.

It might be advantageous if we considered what happened with the importation of dairy products from the Eastern States in the 1930's. In that period local dairymen suffered considerably from competition from Eastern States butter. As it was imported into Western Australia and sold here, it meant that we had to export more of the local production than we should have. At one stage the Govern-

ment of the day decided to control that by issuing import licenses only to local manufacturers of butter. That move was quickly circumvented by the importers becoming manufacturers. So the butter still came in to this State, despite the efforts of the Government of the day to the contrary. However, the position has materially changed since then.

One of the reasons why substantial imports from the Eastern States occurred was that the quality of the Western Australian butter was not as good as it is today. The member for Leederville was on pretty sound ground when he said that the consuming public of Western Australia was butter conscious; they are more than that, they are particularly fastidious about it. Since the 1930's the quality of our butter has materially improved and it is estimated that there will be only 3,000 boxes of locally produced butter that are not likely to be consumed here next year. The threat of importation of dairy products from the Eastern States, therefore, has been met by improving the quality of the Western Australian product.

I would like to know from the Minister, when he replies to this debate, how the figure of 800 tons mentioned in the Bill was arrived at. I do not say that the figure is a wrong one, but it is a little more than I expected, particularly when we take into account the existing quota of 364 tons and also the indications relating to the butter supply position for next year. When the existing quota was fixed in 1940, world conditions were upset by war, and probably considerable difficulty was experienced at times in exporting any product from Western Australia because of the shortage of shipping. I do not think that the figure of 364 tons bears any relation to the population today. The member for Vasse suggests that the proportion might conform to an increase of 20 per cent. on that figure. Personally, I cannot see any purpose in basing any calculation on that 364 tons. All I want to see is that the local industry is protected against any flood of margarine from the Eastern States. I do not think that anything this State Parliament does is likely to affect it very much.

Hon. E. Nulsen: If we do not manufacture the margarine here it will be imported from the Eastern States.

Mr. HEARMAN: That is what I was endeavouring to convey. The only thing is that the fixing of the quota at 800 tons may have an effect on the dairy farmer. However, all I ask the Minister to do is to explain how the figure was arrived at. To members on both sides of the House who represent districts that might be considered to be consumer electorates, I would like to point out that they should not think for a moment that they have necessarily done a good job for their constituents if

they simply make the margarine readily available to them, although the cost of butter is 4s. 2d. a lb. and margarine 2s. 7d. a lb.

If they will study the position it will be found that they have not done a good job at all. If they stop thinking at that point, they have failed completely to appreciate the value of the butterfat section of the dairying industry. Broadly, that particular section of the industry performs some very useful functions. It supplies butter, it supplies replacements for whole-milk herds, and if these replacements are not readily available to wholemilk dairymen it must mean a reduction in the whole-milk output and, conversely, it will mean an increase in the cost of wholemilk. Therefore, those members have not done the consumer much good if they reduce the cost of butter by allowing the use of margarine and consequently raising the price of wholemilk.

Mr. Rodoreda: Why do not the whole-milk people do something about it?

Mr. HEARMAN: There is a simple explanation for that. If a man is milking 50 cows and he has to replace 10 per cent. of them every year, it takes a milk-producing calf about three years to mature. If he has to replace five cows every year, he must have five heifers running around his property, five two-year-olds, five yearlings and five poddies on the bucket. Is the member for Pilbara going to suggest that all that young stock is not going to take in feed that is now going down the necks of the cows producing milk?

Mr. Rodoreda: Do the cream producers rear cows?

Mr. HEARMAN: They produce the cows, separate the milk and have that available to rear the calves. In the dry areas where land is not so expensive they can run younger stock and sell them to the wholemilk producers. Young stock at the moment is at a premium because of the competition from the wholemilk producers in trying to obtain them. Therefore if the butterfat section of the industry is not allowed to flourish and the dairymen give up rearing young stock not only for replacements but for their own herds as well, that must have an effect on the cost and quantity of the wholemilk produced. Furthermore, a considerable quantity of beef is produced in the South-West. In fact, in that area there is far more beef produced—which is consumed in Perth—than in any other area. Therefore, if we affect the production of beef, the price must go up even higher.

What members for consumer electorates have to consider is: Will they be doing a good job for the man on the lower income? The repercussions will be felt in the butterfat industry. The price of wholemilk is

going even higher, as will also that of meat, and both commodities will be hard to get. It seems to me that merely allowing margarine production to be increased is not the solution. If margarine substantially replaces butter, it will bring only a great deal of additional trouble.

Mr. Graham: That is an Australia-wide matter; it would have to be on a national basis.

Mr. HEARMAN: Not necessarily! The whole milk problem is one of our own because we cannot import.

Mr. Graham: But any restriction we place on the manufacture of margarine here would give—

Mr. HEARMAN: Yes, I agree there. I am coming to that. The next thing I wish to mention is the responsibility of members of Parliament. I hope that members, such as the member for East Perth, will think over what I have said and realise that the butterfat section of the dairying industry is valuable. Apart from the fact that it has developed the industry, as mentioned by the member for Harvey, the repercussions of allowing it to go under will be fairly widespread, and will affect those people that some members are seeking to protect by allowing the production of margarine to be increased. Personally I think we must allow more to go in, but we should do it with our eyes open and with a full realisation of what the consequences of too large a replacement of butter by margarine could mean to us.

Whether members of Parliament come from what might be termed consumer areas or producer areas, I suggest they try to view this matter objectively, and point out to their constituents that all the troubles that have beset the consumer recently are not going to be solved by an increase in the amount of margarine manufactured in this State. In my opinion, that will not solve the difficulty. As members of Parliament, we have a duty both to the butterfat section of the dairying industry and to the dairying industry generally; we also have a duty to the public. I think that the public's interests and the interests of the industry do not conflict as they may appear to at first glance. The public is dependent for more than just milk on the industry, just as it is dependent on the butterfat section for more than just butter.

As I explained before, beef and veal will also be affected if the butterfat section goes under. The interjection made a short while ago by the member for East Perth is quite a sound one, and it brings us to the point that the protection of the dairying industry against the inroads of margarine is a Commonwealth matter. This House cannot do a great deal. We can do something, but not a lot; I think

it is a Commonwealth matter. The member for Vasse talked about the desire to protect the dairying industry and subsequently mentioned how other industries were being protected. He instanced the case of tariff barriers to protect the steel industry. Of course, it was not the State Government but the Commonwealth Government that imposed the tariff barriers. The hon. member did not make it clear whether he thought that to be a Commonwealth or a State matter. I am certain that the only protection that can be given to the dairying industry is by the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. E. Nulsen: The Commonwealth Government cannot amend Section 92.

Mr. HEARMAN: I am not suggesting that it can, but if the member for Eyre will bear with me, I will tell him of two suggestions I have. If it becomes necessary the Commonwealth Government can place an import restriction on the raw materials necessary for the manufacture of margarine. We know that the Commonwealth Government can put on import restrictions. If the Government does not want to do that, then there are certain sources of raw materials available for the manufacture of margarine—

Mr. Read: Whale-oil.

Mr. HEARMAN: There are also animal fats available in Queensland from which margarine could be manufactured. If the Commonwealth Government wished, it could put on an excise duty of, say, 1s. a lb., which could be paid in to a dairying industry fund; I am sure the member for Warren will agree that that would be a good thing.

Mr. Graham: The member for East Perth would not.

Mr. HEARMAN: I should not expect the hon. member to agree. I am merely trying to point out that there are avenues which the Commonwealth Government can use to protect the dairying industry, if it so desires. It seems to me that there is a certain measure of hypocrisy in members of this House saying that we can protect the dairying industry by legislation against an increase in the use of margarine. There is quite a bit we can do in this House, but unfortunately, as far as I can see, this Bill does not do it. I think the Bill could be amended to accomplish that, and at the same time there is need to protect the public in the use of margarine.

We have a dairying Act which stipulates that butter shall conform to certain standards. I have read the Act carefully, and as far as I can see there is no restriction on the quality of margarine which can be manufactured and sold in Western Australia, except perhaps a reference to the amount of butterfat that should be used. There is also a reference to the amount of arrowroot that should be included. I

understand that arrowroot is incorporated in margarine for the purpose of enabling chemists who might have to analyse samples of it to determine quickly and easily that it is margarine. Apparently they find it easy to pick up the arrowroot content on analysis. It is also laid down in the dairying Act that the overrun shall not exceed 22 per cent, of which no more than 16 per cent. will be moisture, and that no preservatives will be used. The reason for that is that if we are going to manufacture butter that will keep and we do not use preservatives, the butter will have to be made under clean and hygienic conditions.

If preservatives are used, they might possibly cover a multitude of sins. So we find that the butter industry is controlled by the dairying Act while the margarine industry is not. The member for East Perth discussed the question of what he called the pliability of margarine. The same problem has arisen with butter except that in that case it is called "spreadability." If butter is found hard to spread and a little water is incorporated, it will then spread quite easily. There is nothing in the Act at the moment to stop manufacturers of margarine incorporating considerable quantities of water if they wish to.

Mr. Graham: The usual practice is 20 per cent.

Mr. HEARMAN: I am not concerned with what the usual practice is but with what could happen. At one stage, I understand, 30 per cent. of water was used, and it was claimed that one factory product was made out of water! While there is a restriction on butter manufacturers, it seems to me that manufacturers of margarine have very nearly an open go.

The Minister for Lands: Margarine is, of course, subject to the Health Act.

Mr. HEARMAN: It is, but so is butter; it was when the manufacturers were putting in about 30 per cent. of water, but it did not stop them. I would like the Minister to consider that aspect. Personally, I think one of the best ways in which we can afford a measure of control in this matter is to ensure that the standard of margarine manufactured and sold to the public in Western Australia is good, and not shoddy stuff. If local manufacturers are made to conform to a high standard, and we have heard a lot about the incorporation of vitamins and so on and how margarine can be made as good as butter, it would improve the quality of margarine imported from the Eastern States. There is nothing in the Act to say that margarine should be as good as butter. When the manufacturers sell their margarine, they say it conforms to British standards and contains vitamins A. and B. I am not sure that we in Western Australia require the same vitamins as they do in Great Britain.

Mr. Graham: Vitamins A. and D.

Mr. HEARMAN: Let us not quibble about a couple of letters of the alphabet! I still think we may not require the same vitamins here as they do in England. It may not be necessary to fortify the margarine with those vitamins.

Mr. Graham: They eat the same class of butter over there.

Mr. HEARMAN: Yes, but I am pointing out how this can be done. Whether it can be done in margarine sold at 2s. 7d. a lb. I am not clear. Some vitamins can be incorporated, and it is a question of which are most desirable. I hope the Minister will not rush this Bill through the Committee stage tonight, and that he will consider the question of ensuring that the conditions of the manufacture and sale of margarine to the public of this State are at least as strict as they are for the production of butter and other things. I would also like the Minister to give consideration to the fact that the Act requires all sorts of things to be done, such as notices to be put on the table when margarine is served, and on shop counters and so on. Apparently there should be a notice in the dining-room here when margarine is served. Most of these conditions are, of course, honoured in the breach. I would also like the Minister to consider making provision for the raw material from which margarine is made to be shown plainly on the label. The manufacturers should not object to that.

There are all sorts of stories about margarine. In days gone by it was not considered a good substitute for butter; it has improved since then however and today it is quite a satisfactory substitute. It is not the only substitute that can be used. I do not think any reputable manufacturer would balk at showing on the label the raw material from which the margarine is made, whether it be whale oil, vegetable fats or anything else. If we can insist that reasonably good margarine is manufactured for sale in Western Australia it will ensure that if the Eastern States desire to compete with the Western Australian market they will have to put out a good product.

Though I do not necessarily quarrel with the figure of 800 tons mentioned in the Bill, I would like to know how the Minister arrived at it. I would like to know more about it. I would also like to see closer supervision of the conditions under which margarine is manufactured and also of its contents to see that the public is informed. I trust that members will bear in mind that any large scale increase in the substitution of margarine for butter to an extent that it will affect the butterfat section of the industry is undesirable, not only from the viewpoint of the industry but also from that of the public.

MR. McCULLOCH (Hannans) [5.38]: I am pleased to support the amendment contained in the Bill, though I do not think there should be a maximum figure mentioned at all. The maximum allowed previously was 364 tons and this has caused a shortage of margarine in recent years. The Kalgoorlie Municipal Council and other authorities on the Goldfields have written to me stating that it is not possible to procure margarine on the Goldfields; nor could they buy butter a short while ago. This was also the case in the metropolitan area at one stage of the piece; it was not possible to get either butter or margarine. Unless we have a large influx of population I do not suppose the maximum of 800 tons will ever be consumed in the next few years. The discretionary power should have been reserved to the Minister, and if we did have a large influx of population it would then have been possible for him to authorise the quantity of margarine necessary to meet the situation rather than wait to bring down a Bill for the purpose.

According to the "Statistical Abstract," the quantity of butter imported during the nine months ended the 31st March, 1952, totalled 2,257,613 lb. and the quantity produced locally was 15,224,913 lb. For the 12 months this would be equal to 18,046,958 lb. and so the quantity of margarine permitted to be manufactured under this measure would not cover the shortage of butter represented by the importations. We shall still have to import about 1,280,973 lb. of butter. Would it not be better, therefore, if the Minister were given discretion to determine the quantity of margarine required to meet the shortage of butter and thus obviate importations from the Eastern States?

MR. HEARMAN: The margarine would not be available because the local manufacturers have not been able to supply the permissible quantity.

MR. McCULLOCH: I do not wish to see the dairymen injured in their business, but I am concerned about the hardship being imposed upon the public. I do not believe that the production of a greater quantity of margarine will detrimentally affect the dairying industry. If people prefer butter, they will buy it.

MR. HEARMAN: Provided it is available.

MR. McCULLOCH: Quite so. There is no intention behind this measure of causing injury to the dairy farmers. The object is to bridge the gap that has occurred between the production and consumption of butter. It has been pointed out that the production of butter is likely to fall still further. I understand that some of the milk is being condensed for export to Malaya, and it seems to be recognised that there will be a continued shortage of butter. This is a matter that affects the whole State and not merely the dairying industry.

MR. BOVELL: The way to overcome that is by providing inducement to the industry to produce more butter, not by increasing the manufacture of a substitute.

MR. McCULLOCH: I cannot see that this measure will harm the dairying industry at all.

MR. HOAR: It can and it will.

MR. McCULLOCH: The member for Blackwood spoke about margarine being difficult to spread. In my younger days, we youngsters were fed on margarine and our experience was that it was much easier to spread than butter, but that, of course, would depend upon the ingredients used in its manufacture. I recall that in 1932, when I visited the Old Country, I went to the market at Glasgow and saw Australian butter at 83s. a cwt whereas Danish butter was 96s. That butter was retailed at 10d. and 1s. per lb. respectively. I believe that quite a number of people are unable to tell the difference between good margarine and butter. Margarine was served in the dining room here and I do not think any member was aware of the fact.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: You are pretty right there because it was said that arrow-root had to be added to margarine in order that the difference could be distinguished.

MR. McCULLOCH: In 1930 the number of people employed in primary production was 391,000 and today it is 353,000, a decline of 38,000 notwithstanding that the population of the State during the same period has increased by 50 per cent. It is necessary to do something to stop that decline. The dairy farmer and, in fact, all workers in rural industries require an incentive. I have seen dairy farmers working under very primitive conditions, and I believe that something could be done to assist them, even along the lines suggested by the member for Vasse.

The absence of stability is detrimental to the industry. Wages continue to chase prices, costs go up, and producers—particularly producers of gold—are in the doldrums. If we could return to a stable economy, the development of properties could be continued on sound lines. If steps are not taken to stop the decline, the industry must come to an end. I have read a statement to the effect that this country, in the course of a few years, will have to import foodstuffs from abroad in order to feed its people. The Minister for Lands gave figures indicating that this will happen in the case of butter. If the same trend continues, this primary producing State must inevitably become an importer of foodstuffs in order to satisfy the requirements of its own people.

I repeat that we should not fix in the Bill a maximum quantity of margarine that may be manufactured in any one year, but that the Minister should have discretion to determine what the quantity

shall be. He would be at fault with the position and, if a shortage of butter occurred, he should be able to direct that the manufacture of margarine might be increased in order that the requirements of the people might be met. I do not think anyone need feel perturbed about margarine being used in preference to butter. On the Goldfields butter is costing 4s. 4d. a lb. and margarine 2s. 8d. a lb. The basic wage adjustment was a matter of only 5s. 9d. a week, equal to about 1½ lb. of butter. Hence I maintain that the people in the outback areas should be permitted to purchase as much margarine as they desire.

No local authority would advocate an increase in the quantity of margarine to be manufactured if that would be likely to injure the wholemilk industry or any other branch of the dairying industry. People on the Goldfields do not get much in the way of wholemilk. Many thousands of people are trying to subsist on a pension of £3 a week, and they would be assisted considerably if they could buy margarine at 2s. 8d. a lb. to spread on their toast instead of having to pay 4s. 4d. a lb. for butter. I am pleased that the measure has been introduced; its introduction has been long delayed, and I hope that in Committee, consideration will be given to the suggestions that have been offered. I support the second reading.

MR. READ (Victoria Park) [5.43]: I intend to oppose the second reading. After having listened to the various speeches, my attitude might not have much effect, but if I am the only one in opposition to the Bill, I shall vote against the second reading. In so doing, I am taking a long view. I consider that the proposal in the measure is nationally unsound for the simple reason that ours is an agricultural country and should be taking steps having as their object the building up of production from the land. I was surprised to hear representatives of milk producers and dairy farmers generally indicating their support of the Bill. Admittedly, butter is high in price and at times is in short supply. However, I do not think that is any excuse for allowing a substitute to come on to the market which might get a hold and become a habit for all time with the people.

At present we have a shortage of potatoes, but we are not looking around for some means of producing synthetic potatoes. People are trying to produce synthetic wool, and if they succeed the substitute will undoubtedly bring about a reduction in the price of real wool; and it will have a big effect on our great primary industry of wool raising. The Minister was quite wrong in bringing forward this Bill. This being an agricultural country, he should do his best to foster the primary commodities that we produce from the earth. The purpose of the Bill is to

boost the consumption of edible fats which are a substitute for butter, and it encourages secondary industry and manufacturing to the detriment of agriculture. This, in Australia, is a great mistake, and it is one we have been making for many years.

Ours is one of the few countries capable of producing more and more food from the earth. Other countries have no new land capable of being brought under cultivation, and so they are forced to produce food substitutes. The Minister said that the demand for margarine had increased all over the world. Of course it has. What else could people do in countries where agriculture had expanded to its fullest extent? They could do nothing but provide substitutes for a product which we in Australia can very well produce.

I have read that in Holland and several other countries the authorities are educating the people to use margarine because they are not capable of producing more butter, or butterfat—and they rely on their export of butter for their revenue. But that is not so in Australia. We are one of the countries that are using margarine. We read in the paper of the 13th September, under the heading, "Britons Will Pay More for Rations" that—

The price of rationed food—bacon, cheese, sugar, butter, margarine, cooking fat and lard—will rise in Britain on October 5.

This, of course, is because the countries on which Britain depends for food cannot supply the amount required. As a result those countries have to resort to margarine made from vegetable or mineral oils as a substitute for butter. Vegetable oils are not produced in Australia, and so they have to be imported. Apart from ordinary animal oil, which is in short supply, we would have to use whale oil for the production of margarine in this country. I believe the price of whale oil is decreasing and so those concerned are looking for some other outlet for it. In Holland and Denmark the people are educated to eat margarine as a substitute for butter, because those countries are not capable of producing more butter.

We in Australia should not educate our young people to demand margarine instead of butter, because we will lose for all time these potential consumers. We know that the price for margarine is 2s. 6d. a lb. and for butter, 4s. 2d., so it is easy for the population to get into the habit of eating quantities of the lower priced food.

Mr. Bovell: Once the butter producers are got rid of, margarine will not remain at 2s. 6d. a lb.

Mr. READ: Quite so.

The Minister for Lands: They will not be got rid of, though.

Mr. READ: We in Australia are not selective of the food value of the commodities we eat. Mothers give to their children lunches, which are not a balanced ration to take to school. The mothers have no idea what is good for their children. They would just as soon put margarine on the bread, as butter, because they have no idea of the food value. As an illustration, a mother often gives her child 9d. or 1s. to buy his lunch, and he buys a few biscuits and an ice cream and spends the rest on sweets.

Mr. Needham: She knows she cannot afford 4s. 2d. a lb. for butter.

Mr. READ: In answer to that I would say the price of butter is taken into consideration in fixing the basic wage.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: For how many children?

Mr. READ: The price of margarine is not taken into consideration. The member for Leederville said there was an extreme preference by the people for butter, and so the sale of butter would not be affected if margarine were in plentiful supply, and that that was all to the good. But what I am afraid of is that we will be educating the people to eat margarine instead of butter. Very little margarine is used in Canada. Lever Bros. were allowed to produce margarine in that country, but the standard was made so high that it did not pay them to manufacture it. So the people are eating very little, if any, margarine, but have gone back to butter. The Bill before us lays down no standard for the manufacture of margarine, whereas every care is taken in the production of butter to see that the content is up to the standard laid down by law. A letter on the subject, written by the Women's Service Guilds of W.A., appeared recently in the Press—

We were interested to read that the Government is bringing forward a Bill to consider an increase in the quota of margarine in this State. At the last State Executive meeting of the Women's Service Guilds, the following motion was carried:—

That in view of the fact that butter is 4s. 2d. a lb. and margarine 2s. 6d. a lb., and that the quota of margarine, 364 tons, was only sufficient to last the State three months, an application be made for the quota to be at least doubled, and the margarine vitaminised to make it suitable for table consumption.

There is the kernel of the nut. These people have passed a motion asking for something that they do not know much about, except that they have stipulated that the margarine should be vitaminised to make it suitable for table consumption. The Bill contains nothing to compel the

manufacturers of margarine to vitaminise their product. If they had to do that, the price would immediately rise. We cannot extract vitamins from other substitutes and incorporate them in these edible fats without affecting the price.

Butter contains vitamins A and D, which are so necessary, but as I have just said, there is no standard for this substitute. The idea is that we should produce extra margarine because for the time being there is, perhaps, a shortage of butter; and, in addition, the price of butter is high whereas that of this edible fat is low. So, members on both sides of the House seem to be in favour of allowing this manufacture to go ahead. This would be all right if the House had the power at the end of, say, 12 months or two years, to prevent the continued production of margarine, but no such power exists. Taking the long view, I say it is wrong to bring forward a Bill of this nature.

[Mr. Rodoreda took the Chair.]

MR. HOAR (Warren) [5.58]: Quite a number of members have said they believe the effect of the Bill, to increase the maximum quota of margarine in the State, will not be harmful to the butterfat industry. Whatever the way they may desire to approach the subject, the view they have expressed is surely based on wishful thinking. If we look at this proposal as a guide to the future, then the butterfat section of the dairying industry could go out of existence within 10 years or less, because margarine today constitutes a serious challenge to butter. The member for East Perth, as a member of the House Committee, has told us that for a number of weeks we have been eating it ourselves and most of us did not know.

We know that the colour of margarine is right, that its texture is right and that its taste is right, and we also know that the nutritional value of it can be made right. What member in this House, or anyone else, can imagine for a moment that a commodity of this description, which costs only 2s. 6d. a lb., will not have a serious influence on the dairying industry? It must have a serious effect, and it is my opinion that it could very well sound the death knell of the butterfat producers within a very short period of years.

If we look at it from the housewife's point of view we can see the effect that it could have. These days a housewife has to take serious stock of her weekly budget because the prices of various commodities have got completely out of hand. There is no sense of real values today and if a housewife is given the opportunity to buy a substitute which is equal in nutritional value, at a cost of 2s. 6d. a lb., instead of 4s. 2d. a lb., she will seize it and budget accordingly. She

will gradually wean her family away from the use of butter and on to margarine. I am sure that would happen in almost every home in this State.

The Minister for Lands: No it would not; you know that is not so.

Mr. HOAR: I know that it would happen.

The Minister for Lands: Why do you not deal with the Bill?

Mr. HOAR: I intend to. I am leading up to it now, but my previous remarks are applicable to the subject-matter of the Bill. It may interest the Minister to know that I propose to support the measure because I can do nothing else, but it hurts me very much to support one of this description for the reasons I have given.

The Minister for Lands: But your reasons are not soundly based.

Mr. HOAR: I do not know how much the Minister knows about the dairying industry.

The Minister for Lands: Just as much as you do, and perhaps more.

Mr. HOAR: The Minister does not keep his eyes open very much.

The Minister for Lands: That is all right; that is your opinion.

Mr. HOAR: Yes, it is, and I do not think the Minister understands very much about the dairying industry.

The Minister for Lands: I will tell you all about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister must keep his remarks for his reply.

The Minister for Lands: I keep my eyes on the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must wait until he replies.

Mr. HOAR: While the Minister is keeping his eyes on me he is losing sight of the dairying industry and that is what I am trying to point out to him. If an amendment could be made to the Health Act to provide that vitamins "A" and "D", which we have been told are required to bring margarine up to the nutritional value of butter, must be included in the manufacture of margarine, it would be quite suitable. But if anybody says that the production of margarine will not have a serious influence on the production of butterfat, he does not know what he is talking about.

If a dairy farmer, because of the increased sale of margarine in this State, is unable to sell his product on the local market, where else can he sell it? Surely the Minister would not say that a dairy farmer should sell his product on the unprofitable overseas market! He would get less money for his butter there than if he produced it for the local market.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. HOAR: Even if the overseas prices were suitable, and our butterfat was exported, we would be in the position that we would be consuming a fictitious product while our butter was going overseas.

The Minister for Lands: The Bill does not allow for that.

Mr. HOAR: But that will not happen. The position will be that in a short number of years the dairy farmer will realise that he has no market for his butterfat and the natural thing for him to do, without disturbing the general economy of his farm will be to turn to some other avenue. I suggest that he will first look at the wholemilk industry and the by-products that are obtained from wholemilk. Unfortunately the bulk of our dairy farms today are still based on the old homestead principle which is anything from 100 to 160 acres in extent, and consequently these farms are incapable of carrying sufficient fat stock or sheep to give the farmer the living that he requires. These farmers will therefore, have to look towards the production of wholemilk, or anything else that will tide them over for the time being. But there is no guarantee that the wholemilk situation, and the by-products therefrom, will be a secure avenue to the dairy farmers.

Only recently the member for Hannans mentioned that we lost the Malayan market for some of our milk by-products; we lost it because European countries, who are accustomed to a lower standard of living than we are, are able to produce the same product at a cheaper rate. If we intend, as I hope we do, to refuse to reduce our standard of living within Australia then we will be faced eventually with a situation where we have no market, overseas or local, for the great bulk of our milk products, whether they be in wholemilk, produced as wholemilk, in tins or in other forms.

There is always that danger and difficulty facing the dairying industry, and the economics of the industry must of necessity be upset by taking from it the demand for butterfat. So whatever the Minister says he must see the writing on the wall in that regard.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. HOAR: Because the demand and market for milk products may deteriorate, dwindle and finally disappear within a matter of years, except for local market requirements, the dairy farmer, who has been plitforked out of the production of butterfat, will have only an avenue such as the production of potatoes open to him. The production of potatoes is governed very strictly by the Potato Marketing Board, which controls the areas and acreages of potatoes that shall be grown each year and the dairy farmer will have to fall in with the board's plans.

Mr. Bovell: And there are frosts to consider, too.

Mr. HOAR: Within a matter of years our dairy farmers—that is, those who are unable to participate in the wholemilk scheme generally—will be forced completely out of business as a result of the manufacture of products such as margarine.

Mr. Hearman: They will not be able to grow potatoes because the board will not let them.

Mr. HOAR: That is exactly what I have been pointing out and there is a limited market for all other goods they can produce. I do not say that the Government, and members on this side of the House, are voting for this Bill because they think it will have that effect, or because they have any disagreement with the dairying industry and think it should not be supported. But I am certain that I am right in my assumptions.

The Minister for Lands: Do you think the extra quota of margarine, as allowed for in this Bill, will have any effect on the production of butter in this State?

Mr. HOAR: I certainly think it is the thin end of the wedge. Margarine will be advertised by its manufacturers to such an extent and in such colourful wrapping as will appeal to the housewife that butterfat will be on the way out. I repeat that I think the Minister should give consideration to an amendment to the Health Act to bring the nutritional value of margarine into line with that of butter.

The Minister for Lands: Getting back to the question of potatoes, do you think, if the demand for potatoes was here, the Potato Board would stop production? It would take more than a board to stop it.

Mr. HOAR: That is another argument altogether, but the Minister knows perfectly well why the Potato Board is in operation; it is to ensure a stabilised price to the growers.

The Minister for Lands: Exactly.

Mr. HOAR: The growers did not receive that before and, if the production is doubled or trebled, all that will happen is that we will get back to the same state of affairs as we had in pre-war days when a man could dig potatoes from another man's crop and take them away so long as he left the fork behind.

The Minister for Lands: It is no use producing something you cannot sell.

Mr. HOAR: That is exactly what I am telling the Minister. I say that there will be no opening in the potato growing industry for dispossessed dairy farmers because they will not be able to sell their products.

The Minister for Lands: I agree.

Mr. HOAR: Then the useful employment of his farm will be limited to dairying for wholemilk purposes only and, as I say, there is no guarantee in regard to that. This Government has recently promised another 1,000-farm scheme for Western Australia and we have a tremendous area of land that stretches from our south coast. This is some of the most fertile and useful land from a dairying point of view, that we have in the State and would be used in the course of time. But this Bill is the thin end of the wedge and it will progressively reduce the need for an increase in the number of our dairy farms.

The Minister for Lands: No Government would allow that.

Mr. HOAR: I think the Government has introduced this Bill without knowing its full implications.

The Minister for Lands: That is quite all right.

Mr. HOAR: I am trying to look a few years ahead to see what will happen as a result of this legislation. This Bill will not be an incentive for dairy farmers to take up land in the heavier rainfall areas because they will not be able to sell their produce.

The Minister for Lands: Are there any dairies for sale today?

Mr. HOAR: I do not know, but I suppose the Minister looks at the newspapers to see if there are.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Minister for Health: Do we get enough wholemilk now?

Mr. HOAR: I think there is a demand for it at the moment. We know that we could use much more than we are using, but if all the areas which are now devoted to the production of butterfat were changed to the production of wholemilk a difficult situation would arise. Consequently we will have to look for export markets for our by-products, and at present the indications are that the cost of production in European countries is so much lower than our own that they will beat us to those markets and we will be left with our wholemilk to throw down the drain. That is what will happen in the foreseeable future.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HOAR: I was saying that the anticipated extra sales of margarine, particularly the present-day commodity, will cause a serious revolutionary change in a matter of a few years throughout the whole of those areas that are now producing butterfat. It might well alter any previous conception we have had regarding the future of land settlement schemes there. There is a trend that is not started

in five minutes. It has been apparent for a great number of years. I refer to the drift away from the land, particularly as it concerns the butterfat producers. That trend will be accentuated as the result of the passage of this legislation.

It is interesting to note that over the 10-year period, from 1938-39 to 1949-50, margarine production in Western Australia has increased over sixfold, which is a far greater increase, of course, than the percentage additional population over that term. I assume that the Bill will be passed and that being so, I assert that by its provisions we shall increase margarine production in Western Australia 14 times over.

The Minister for Lands: How could that be when we are on a quota?

Mr. HOAR: That means to say that the increase since 1938-39 compared with what the production was in 1949-50 is 14 times as much.

The Minister for Lands: You are not taking the figures since the 30th June this year.

Mr. HOAR: I am taking the maximum that has been permitted and which, by means of the Bill under discussion, is to be increased to 800 tons, and I say that we have increased by 14 times the quantity of margarine produced in this State in 1938-39. That cannot be denied. I do not think there are comparable figures regarding margarine production in any other part of the Commonwealth.

A few weeks ago an attempt was made by the margarine producers in the Eastern States to influence the Minister for Agriculture in Victoria, and so strong was the threat against the butterfat producing industry that he refused to agree to any further increase because he appreciated the effect it would have on butterfat production in that State if the request proffered by the margarine producers was granted. What threatens Victoria threatens Western Australia and every other State. Irrespective of what the Bill may contain, I do not believe that we have given sufficient consideration to the challenge that has now been thrown down to the butterfat producers.

Up to 1950 and for the previous three years, the average consumption of butter in Western Australia was 23.07 lb. per head of the mean population. In the same period butter substitutes, the greater proportion of which was margarine, consumed per head of the population was 4.96 lb. If the Minister works the figures out and traces the position back, as I have done, he will find that the percentage increase I have mentioned is correct in almost every particular. What are we going to do from now on if we increase margarine production in this State to meet the added demand? It simply means that people will use more margarine and

less butter. They require a certain quantity of fats per year, and if they do not get it in one form they will get it in another.

In effect, we are going to encourage the consumption of margarine as against the consumption of butter. That is the position as I see it. What brings me to the point of unfortunately having to support this legislation is the fact that, due to no fault of their own, butter producers are simply incapable of supplying the demand of the public at present. By no stretch of imagination can they be expected to supply the demand of any further increase in our population. The people need fats of some kind, and it is our duty to make it possible for their requirements to be met. However much we may deplore the fact that we are encouraging the use of a substitute as against the real article, we must make provision for the people to be able to buy the margarine they require.

As has already been explained in the House, owing to the provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution, we are unable to stop the importation of margarine from the Eastern States, and if it is necessary to increase the availability of that commodity here, are we to allow people in the other States to manufacture it and export it to Western Australia, or are we to provide additional employment for our own people and allow them to manufacture the increased quota? The demand for margarine is great. However much the basic wage has increased to cover the consumption of butter, it has never been what it should be if the people are to be adequately supplied with butterfat. As a result, there has been an increased demand for this quite useful and tasty article as an addition to the people's diet, and I do not think we should have any objection to that.

I certainly would have strong objection to anyone trying so to alter the provisions of the Bill as to leave the door wide open without the provision of any ceiling for the production of margarine. It is bad enough to have to agree to an increase in the quantity produced, but the position would be far worse if we threw the door wide open and gave the margarine manufacturing concerns free entry on their own terms. I object to the principles embodied in the measure. I regret very much it has been necessary for the Minister to bring the matter before the House. In the circumstances, due to the fact that the dairying industry cannot hope to cater for the present-day demand for its product, I reluctantly support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HILL (Albany) [740]: I am sure that all who have the welfare of the State at heart must deplore the necessity for the Bill. We must, however, face facts, however unpleasant they may be. We

must face the fact that if the Bill is not passed, margarine will have to be imported from the Eastern States. Rather than that should happen, it is better to have the local product in preference to the imported article. At the same time I hope everything possible will be done to help the dairying industry and to make popular the consumption of butter and the consumption of margarine unpopular.

The member for Blackwood said he was probably the only butter producer in the House. Butter production has been one of my side-lines for many years. I know what it is to be tossed by the bull, to be kicked by the cow, and to sit pulling four strings of misery and pouring the liquid into the bucket for seven days a week for 52 weeks of the year. It is deplorable that the dairying industry is on the down-grade. When I was in the Eastern States last year, I spoke to a Minister for Agriculture and I asked him if he had any remedy to counter the downward grade in the industry. His advice was to do away with the 40-hour 5-day week and the position would rectify itself.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Naturally he would say that.

Mr. HILL: The dairyman has to buy what he requires on the basis of a 40-hour five-day week and has to produce on the basis of a seven-day week and very much longer hours.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: What provision would you make if you had your way?

Mr. HILL: I would provide a fair standard of living for everyone and not one at the expense of the country. The member for Kalgoorlie referred to the terrific loss incurred as the result of the group settlement scheme. He would do a much better job if he were to consider what the dairying industry has meant to the State. I will tell members something about the dairying industry in my electorate and generally in the southern end of the State. It was in 1908 that a young lawyer named John Patrick Dwyer drew up an agreement which preceded my taking up a holding at Kalgan.

Two years later an officer was sent down by the Government to encourage the production of potatoes. In 1917 we had a record flood and throughout the State 5,000 tons of potatoes were destroyed. I was talking to one of the potato growers and he said to me, "I thought I was going to have a very big loss with regard to all my potatoes. However, I saved a few and I have had a terrible job trying to get rid of them." It will be seen, therefore, that if the crop of 5,000 tons had not been destroyed we would probably have been in a worse position than ever. About 1920 the Albany Chamber of Commerce convened a public meeting with a view to discussing what could be done to assist the farmers

in the district. The outcome was the formation of a company which operated the Albany Butter Factory. I did not take an active part in the early stages of the company's existence, but subsequently I was elected a director.

I will never regret the time or money I spent in connection with the operations of the original butter factory there. In course of time, it had to hand over its assets to Westralian Farmers Ltd., but during its life-time it helped to start the dairying industry in the southern end of the State. In 1939 we had another flood. That year there was a very big crop of potatoes in the Albany and Denmark districts and, in fact, throughout the Plantaganet area. There was a promise of a first-class market but unfortunately 11 inches of rain fell and practically the whole of the potato crop was destroyed. The effect of the loss was not felt so severely as it was in 1917 because practically all the potato growers engaged in the dairying industry as a side-line.

During the debate the Minister interjected with a query as to whether any dairy farms were available for sale. I do not know of any that are available, but I would point out that if any member travels around the Mt. Barker area he will not see Jersey or Guernsey bulls running in the paddocks but Hereford bulls. That means that the farmers are switching from dairying to an easier occupation. Our task is to encourage the farmers by making the position better for them. It is a heavy task. I make the suggestion to the Minister that farmers with marketable timber on their properties should be allowed to retain the royalties paid on the timber so that they may use the money to pay for further improvements to their properties.

I regret the necessity for this Bill but realise that we need more fats for the population. While I support the measure, I trust that in Committee the quota will be reduced and that, in any event, the Government and this House will continue to try to improve conditions of the men and women on dairy farms, because the dairying industry in this State has been very important to it and will continue to be so.

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands) [7.46]: I support the Bill, and consider that all members should do so when it is realised that even today there are some people who cannot afford sufficient butter for table use.

Mr. Hoar: That is a shocking state of affairs.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I would prefer to see the limit of 800 tons raised to allow manufacturers to produce as much as they wish and as much as they can find a market for. I believe that if there is a market for a product, it should be supplied in full. Some members have expressed con-

cern at the adverse effect this Bill will have on the dairying industry. I do not believe that an increased quota will seriously affect dairy farmers who are producing butterfat. The amount of margarine used only for cooking purposes overshadows by far the amount used at table. Furthermore, the majority of housewives will always prefer butter to margarine for table use and will always provide butter for the table if it is economically possible.

Concern has been expressed by members that people will switch from butter to margarine if increased quantities of margarine are made available. I do not think that will occur. The average family buys about 2lb. of butter per week. At the present price, that is 8s. 4d. per week. The cost of an equivalent amount of margarine would be 5s. I do not think any housewife whose husband was receiving the basic wage of £11 12s. per week would worry about paying an extra 3s. if she preferred butter. On the other hand, if it is not a case of economic circumstances, people should not have to purchase butter if they prefer to eat margarine. We all have different tastes, and a housewife should be entitled to purchase margarine if she desires to do so.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Do you think anyone prefers margarine to butter?

Mr. OLDFIELD: There may be some who do; I do not know. I should not think it was the case, but I am not going to say it is not.

The Chief Secretary: The member for East Perth said he did.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Anybody who would stand up here and say that no-one would prefer margarine would be taking a big risk of being wrong. When a housewife prefers to buy margarine, whether the reason be economic or merely a matter of taste, she should be allowed to exercise her choice. If it can be argued, as some members have argued, that an increased consumption of margarine will adversely affect the dairy industry, we might just as well consider introducing a Bill prohibiting the importation of rice in order to stimulate the consumption of potatoes.

Mr. Nalder: You think that rice is the same as potatoes?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I think that if the member for Victoria Park were to speak on carbohydrates and the function they have in diet, he would demonstrate that rice and potatoes perform the same office in a balanced diet. If we went to the extent of saying we would prevent the importation of rice in order to benefit potato-growers, I think we would be reaching a great degree of absurdity, and any argument on the lines that this Bill will have an adverse effect on dairymen is equally senseless.

Mr. Bovell: How would you know?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I might ask the member for Vasse what is wrong with this Bill. How does it affect dairymen? Are they afraid of competition?

Mr. Bovell: Not from you.

Mr. OLDFIELD: No, they might not be. I will eat butter. However, I fail to see why any one industry should be stifled so that another may be promoted. Is not the manufacturer entitled to just as much consideration in the economy of the State as is the primary producer? I might mention also that the manufacturer of margarine provides employment, and if there is increased consumption of margarine, it will mean increased employment.

Mr. Nalder: How many extra would be employed?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I do not know. Does the hon. member? It stands to reason that if 30 people are employed in manufacturing 300 tons, about 80 people would be employed in manufacturing 800 tons. However, I do not believe there would be any alarming increase in the consumption of margarine as a result of increasing the quota, and I do not think dairymen have anything to be afraid of. Whatever figure is ultimately agreed upon, I will be greatly surprised if the consumption reaches 800 tons within the next 12 months. With all the arguments submitted in opposition to the Bill, there is one great issue at stake, and that is whether the housewife is going to be permitted freedom of choice as to what product she will spread on the family's bread. I can only support any measure that is going to allow consumers freedom of choice as to whether they eat margarine or butter.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. L. Thorn—Toodyay—in reply) [7.55]: I would like to express my appreciation of the contributions to the debate. The majority of speakers confined their remarks to the Bill, though a few wandered far away from it, in my opinion. Grave doubts were expressed as to the effect of the measure on the dairying industry. As a matter of fact, I noticed in the Press a statement that it was a heavy blow to the dairying industry. That is quite misleading to the public, because this Bill is not a blow to the industry. All it does is to allow local manufacturers to produce margarine locally instead of our importing it.

The demand for margarine is established, and we know that the product is coming into this State from elsewhere. How unfair it would be, and what a foolish policy, if we did not increase the quota so that our own factories could equip themselves to supply the demand. I appreciate the remarks of the member for

East Perth. He has a very good understanding of why the Bill has been brought down and he contributed very reasonably to the debate.

There is only one suggestion of his that I cannot agree with. He said that he would be moving an amendment in Committee, and supplied me with that amendment. I must inform him now that I cannot agree to it, because the Minister for Agriculture has given some undertaking to the dairying industry that the maximum output of margarine will be 800 tons. That may not be reached; it all depends on the demand. Figures have been quoted here concerning the increased manufacture of margarine, but the manufacture of margarine in this State has been at a very low figure and it was only when the Commonwealth Government reduced its subsidy on butter that the demand for margarine took place.

It has also been mentioned that the price of butter is in the "C" Index and is allowed for in the basic wage. As Minister for Labour, I want to tell members that it is allowed for a mother, father and two children. If there are seven or eight children in the family, there is no allowance for those extra units.

Mr. Manning: That is the idea of child endowment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member did not mention child endowment; he mentioned basic wage.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Would you agree to reduce the basic wage on that argument?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That is all right, then.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I would not. This Bill is purely and simply to give the opportunity to manufacturers in this State to supply extra margarine. The matter is in the hands of the Minister for Agriculture. If it is necessary—that is, if the demand exists—the quota can be increased to 800 tons, and I expect that the Minister would take that course. But he would only do it because of the demand that existed, fully appreciating that if he failed to do so, the product would come here from the Eastern States. No Government, of whatever political complexion, would do anything to injure the dairying industry, and that was borne out when the then Premier, Mr. Wise, first introduced the legislation. On that occasion he made it clear when he pointed out that the maximum included in the Bill could not be exceeded. One can appreciate that members representing dairying districts should express concern at this measure, as it is their job to look after

the dairying interests, but I do not wish the public to think that the Government would do anything to injure the industry.

Mr. Graham: Will you do anything to help it?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We are doing all we can and have put certain propositions to the Commonwealth Government. The Premier is at present in Canberra on State business—

Mr. May: Is he fixing up about Kwinana?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The dairying industry is the subject before the Chair, and I will stick to it. While in Canberra the Premier will make strong representations with regard to the dairying industry. Members know that the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture has announced that he will do all he can to help the industry in this State to increase production, and we are aware that the Commonwealth Government is most sympathetic. As I have said, the falling off in butter production is largely attributable to the different uses to which whole-milk is now put. Members have mentioned how dairymen are changing their activities and that is only natural, as the man on the land always concentrates on whatever proves to be his best market.

The fat lamb position 12 months ago is a case in point. The peak was 300,000 lambs and this year, owing to the drop in the price of wool, lambs are flowing into the meatworks in a steady stream. That market has become more profitable. A further factor is that some country areas have lacked sufficient rainfall, though I do not think they would come into the picture to any great extent as the prime lambs must come from those areas with plentiful rainfall and consequent green feed. The member for Blackwood asked how we arrived at the maximum of 800 tons.

The dairying section of the Department of Agriculture examined the statistics of consumption of margarine and, in its wisdom, arrived at that figure. The position will be closely watched by the Minister for Agriculture and I can assure the House that the maximum quota will not be reached unless the demand is there. The member for East Perth made out a fairly good case for not including a maximum and pointed out that demand would govern the tonnage manufactured but, as I have said, an undertaking has been given and we do not want to disturb the butterfat producers by altering the figure. I ask members to support the Bill as printed.

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

Ayes	35
Noes	5
Majority for					30

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Moir	
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder	
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Needham	
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nimmo	
Mr. Doney	Mr. Nulsen	
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield	
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen	
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Rodoreda	
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Sewell	
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Sleeman	
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Styant	
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn	
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin	
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts	
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Wild	
Mr. Manning	Mr. Yates	
Mr. May	Mr. Kelly	
Mr. McCulloch		(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Read	
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Boveil	
Mr. Mann		(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title and citation:

Hon. E. NULSEN: I am wondering whether you, Mr. Chairman, will permit me to move an amendment in regard to the word "margarine." I want to move that the letter "g" be struck out and that the letter "j" be inserted in lieu. There seems to be a good deal of misunderstanding in regard to the pronunciation of the word but the majority of members seem to use the word "mar-j-arine." If I could move to that effect we would have some uniformity.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I could not accept an amendment on those lines. The word is printed "margarine" and it is not our job to deal with a question like that.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Very well, I will not argue.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2—Section 25 amended:

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

That all words after the word "by" in line 2 be struck out with a view to inserting the following words:—

"deleting in Section 25 subsection (1)

"(a) all words after the word 'year' in line six of paragraph (a) down to and including the word 'December' in line nine;

"(b) all words after the word 'Australia' in line eleven of paragraph (a) down to and including the word 'tons' in line twelve."

That does not appear to make sense but if it is agreed to the relevant section in the Act will read as follows:—

The Minister may—

(a) by notice in the "Government Gazette" declare the maximum quantity of table margarine which holders of table margarine licenses, taken in the aggregate, may manufacture in any year commencing on the first day of January in that year otherwise than for export beyond the Commonwealth of Australia.

Members will recognise that this will give effect to the ideas that I fore-shadowed when speaking to the second reading. It is absurd to have a stipulated maximum and I believe it is the task and responsibility of the Minister, on the advice of his departmental officers, to take stock of the situation and regulate the manufacture of margarine in accordance with the local demand. It is useless anyone trying to deceive himself that by restricting the production of margarine in Western Australia any less margarine will be consumed. It is only a question of whether it shall be manufactured in Western Australia or elsewhere.

I have been informed that the normal consumption of table margarine in Western Australia is 1,000 tons per annum whereas the Bill provides for a maximum of 800 tons. In other words 200 tons will have to be imported from the Eastern States annually, and all that members will have to do will be to decide whether it is better to bring the finished product to Western Australia or bring the vegetable fats to our own State so that we can manufacture the finished product here. I believe that approximately 1,000 tons per annum has been imported from the Eastern States over the past few years.

Mr. Hearman: But that is mostly for cooking.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so.

Mr. Nalder: A lot of it would be used by cake and biscuit manufacturers.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. I think that for many years manufacturers of cakes and biscuits have used a substitute for butter. But it is foolish to stipulate an amount in the Act and it is wrong for the Minister to give a solemn pledge or undertaking to any concern. Surely we are not asked to show our loyalty to a Minister because of a certain undertaking that he has given, but rather should we, as a deliberative body, determine the issue on its merits. From inquiries, I have found that in Tasmania there is not and never has been a maximum limit. Since control was instituted in 1940-41 in the various States, it has been left entirely to the discretion of the Minister in Tasmania.

In Queensland, it is also left to the discretion of the Minister and he refuses to exercise it, but allows any manufacturer to provide according to his own desires and permits the market to govern the output of each factory.

Mr. Nalder: Your suggestion would actually reverse the position; that only 600 tons should be produced.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am in favour of the Queensland system. In Western Australia we have two manufacturers. In my view they could produce such as they were capable of doing. However, if there were 20 tons produced per week and consumption was only 10 tons, they would soon tire of producing that excessive quantity. Anything less than the quantity in demand in Western Australia would be imported from the Eastern States and anything more would be surplus stocks left on their hands. It is not my intention to ask people to use margarine or endeavour to persuade them to use butter. I leave it to each family to make its own choice, which should be unfettered. There should be no artificial restriction imposed by a Minister.

But if there is a feeling that there should be some limitation in order perhaps to save an industry, I am prepared to leave it to the discretion of the Minister as my amendment will allow, but not to stipulate any set amount. In 1940, Mr. Wise, as Minister for Agriculture, introduced a Bill limiting the output to 364 tons, but why I do not know. However, it is now found that that quota is inadequate and the position needs to be rectified. Why should Parliament, in an elementary matter such as this, have its time wasted by considering amendment after amendment in order to deal with the position as it arises, and then only perhaps after a certain amount of hardship has been caused to the people or dislocation has been caused to manufacturers? It is intended to leave the amount of 364 tons, as mentioned in the Act, in the Bill, but the amendment goes on to say in words to this effect, that notwithstanding that 364 tons appears in the Act, this figure shall be considered as being 800 tons.

Why the figures "364" were not deleted and the figures "800" inserted in lieu, I do not know. That was all that was required. I have never previously seen a Bill drafted in such a form. My amendment, if accepted by the Committee, will not result in one pound more of margarine being consumed by the people of Western Australia. All it will do is to provide that if and when the consumption of margarine in Western Australia is in excess of the quantity proposed by the Minister, or any amount for which he grants licenses, the difference will have to be imported from the Eastern States. Whatever the demand for margarine is locally, such quantity should be manufactured in

this State by our own factories and employees. However, the Minister, by opposing my amendment, is going to ensure that when the demand for margarine exceeds the quota that he allows, the excess quantity will be imported from another part of the Commonwealth. Surely that is not fair or reasonable! I am sure that those who talk about the freedom and liberty of the subject will agree that it will be for the housewife to decide what commodity she shall purchase, and she should not be hampered by an artificial restriction imposed upon her by us.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for East Perth has made it plain what he desires to do with the Act. I still strongly oppose his amendment. When Mr. Wise, as Minister for Agriculture, introduced the existing legislation, he fixed the maximum production at 364 tons leaving a margin for any increased demand. The hon. member has stated that he has been informed that the demand at present is 1,000 tons, but it is nowhere near that figure. In fact, the two factories here manufactured very little margarine until the price of butter increased. It was only then that a demand was created and they have not yet manufactured margarine up to the quota allowed. The Bill allows for another 436 tons, which is a very good margin.

The departmental officers have examined the position fully and feel that a sufficient margin is being allowed for the demand that will be created in this State over the next 12 months. It is for us to take the advice of those officers. I conferred with the Minister for Agriculture about the amendment moved by the member for East Perth. The Minister said that he felt certain there would be quite sufficient for any future demand. He had given an assurance to the dairymen to that effect, and they were entitled to some consideration. I hope members will support the quota provided in the Bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH: I support the amendment moved by the member for East Perth. I do not think a maximum should be mentioned in the Bill. It is that which caused the previous trouble.

The Minister for Lands: It never caused any trouble at all.

Mr. McCULLOCH: It caused a considerable shortage. It is all right for the Minister to say that manufacturers did not produce 364 tons.

The Minister for Lands: They did not.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Why could not people get it?

The Minister for Lands: It was not produced.

Mr. McCULLOCH: At that time neither in the metropolitan area nor in the Goldfields could people get butter or margarine. The Minister for Agriculture said it was

due to a lack of vegetable oils, though he was not certain about that. As the Minister, he ought to know. We should try to stop what occurred before happening again. During the very acute shortage of butter and margarine, in the metropolitan area and elsewhere, people were scalding milk to get butter. I think the Minister for Health will know that if 9 pints of milk are scalded, 1 lb. of butter will be obtained. The manufacturers would not produce margarine that was not required. If the Minister had the discretion and the population did increase, as it has done recently, then we could manufacture margarine here instead of importing it. We do not seem to have enough initiative. We are encouraging secondary industries but not primary industries.

Mr. Styants: Not us; the Government.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Now we are going to put a maximum on a commodity which is of great concern to the public. Rather than import the stuff, the Minister should have discretion to say to manufacturers of margarine, "We require so many more tons. Go ahead and manufacture it." I support the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister should look at this matter fairly. It would appear that he has given an undertaking that not more than 800 tons shall be allocated in licenses to margarine manufacturers. Because of that, he will not agree that no maximum should be specified. By there being no stipulated maximum, the Minister is still allowed to issue licenses in the aggregate totalling only 800 tons or, if he prefers, 600 tons. It is left entirely to his discretion, and the fact that there is no restriction mentioned in the Bill does not mean that the Minister cannot limit the amount specified in any license to any figure he wishes. Under the present Act, even with my proposed amendment the Minister can refuse to allow a single pound of margarine to be manufactured in Western Australia. He knows that. Therefore any undertaking given can be honoured by him.

I suggest to the Minister and those representing dairying interests that if next year the Minister refuses to grant licenses to either of the two firms operating in this State, it will make little difference to the amount of margarine consumed in Western Australia. The only difference would be that any one of about 20 different brands of Eastern States products would be imported into this State. Accordingly, nothing will be lost if the Minister agrees to this proposal. It will prevent the Minister and his successor from dealing forthwith with the circumstances that might arise, and make it necessary on future occasions for an approach to be made to Parliament for some adjustment of the maximum as the Minister thinks the circumstances dictate. It is

totally irrelevant if the demand in Western Australia is 1,000 tons or a lesser amount. It will merely indicate what quantity is to be manufactured if the quota is less than the annual consumption. Let us get rid of yet another restriction.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	25
Majority against	9

Ayes.

Mr. Graham	Mr. Needham
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. May	Mr. Styants
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Moir	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Mann
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Manning
Mr. Brady	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Oldfield
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Read
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Yates
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Corneli
Mr. Hutchinson	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—New Section 25A added:

Mr. BOVELL: I move an amendment—

That in line seven of the proposed new section the words "eight hundred" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "four hundred and fifty."

If any increase is justified, it should be in accordance with the increase in population. When Mr. Wise was Minister for Agriculture, he considered that 364 tons was sufficient to provide for the needs of the community. Since then the population has increased by approximately 20 per cent., and I suggest an increase in the quantity by approximately the same percentage.

Reference has been made to the decline in the production of butter. In "The West Australian" of the 3rd September appeared a statement by the chairman of the State Dairy Products Marketing Board (Dr. G. L. Sutton) headed "State Must Import Big Quantity of Its Butter." It said—

Western Australia will have to import 50,000 boxes of butter to meet needs from about the end of March next year It was not expected that there would be any difficulty in obtaining enough butter to meet needs, but the major problem would be shipping space between the Eastern States and Fremantle.

I have discussed this matter with the Minister for Supply and Shipping who has informed me that she expects no difficulty in obtaining shipping space to transport the butter here. In view of those statements, we should not permit the manufacture of margarine beyond a total of 450 tons. Reference has been made to Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Though the Eastern States may ship their margarine to Western Australia, I believe that we would have a right to say whether it should be distributed.

Mr. Graham: How could you do that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Of course, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Styants: Why "of course?"

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Because it will not hold water. The hon. member stated that we should increase the quota according to population. If we adopted that policy there would be a possibility of the population starving, because supply and demand control the position. The demand exists, and this Bill has been introduced to meet it.

Mr. BRADY: I am sorry the Minister has opposed the amendment. Members are losing sight of the fact that we are sacrificing the State's economy in order to bolster up manufacturers in the Eastern States. I understand the Lands Department is throwing open many thousands of acres to encourage people to go to the South-West and Great Southern, and the idea is that they should raise dairy herds and produce dairy products. This kind of legislation is most discouraging to that sort of people. Here are the remarks of the manager of the Rural and Industries Bank with regard to dairying, appearing in the annual report for the year ended the 30th September, 1951:—

Seasonal conditions were by no means uniform throughout the dairying districts, but generally, there was a slight improvement in the year's results.

In the lower South-West more attention is being paid to the cultivation of sidelines, particularly with regard to the acreages planted to potatoes and passion fruit.

For the year ended 30th June, 1951, 6,953 tons of butter and 770 tons of cheese were produced, against the previous year's output of 6,705 tons and 703 tons respectively.

The number of dairy cattle decreased from 226,413 to 224,481.

So in the year 1951 the butter production was stepped up by 250 tons and cheese by 70 tons. But it will be most discouraging to dairy farmers if we tell them that we are going to allow margarine to be introduced into Western Australia in any quantities. They will turn from dairying

to growing potatoes and that sort of thing. We should be doing all we can to encourage men in the dairying industry to continue their work.

One member said that even at 364 tons, the present figure, the output is 600 per cent. greater than when the manufacture was first permitted. If the production is raised to 800 tons that will represent an increase of 1,400 per cent. It has been said that margarine will come from the Eastern States. I think that is where the Government and the Minister for Lands should show some initiative and try to have local products stepped up to provide for emergencies. There should be an inquiry as to where all the butter is being used and where there could be reductions in certain quarters in times of shortage. Probably I might be ridiculed for suggesting that at Parliament House butter should be supplied at only one meal instead of at two meals. The consumption might also be reduced in places where cakes are manufactured and in icecream factories.

Then it should be ascertained whether some inducement could be held out to manufacturers of dripping and lard with a view to those products being made more palatable and thus substituted for butter. We are doing wrong in encouraging the introduction of margarine. During the division, the Minister twitted me with not looking after the interests of the workers. The workers I represent are railway workers and I want to see them continue in full-time employment. While they may be in employment at Midland Junction this week, there is a possibility that they will be at Busselton or Augusta or some other part of the State next week. If anything I do leads to people leaving the dairying industry I will be assisting in depriving railway employees of work. I want to see railwaymen and other people in industry receive encouragement in their particular avocations.

I do not want to see workers using margarine, but, if possible, eating butter, because I think the latter is the better product. The way to encourage them to use butter is to make a greater allowance in the basic wage for its purchase. At present 5s. 6d. is the figure and that will buy 2lb. of margarine. If the workers were allowed 10s. they could use over 2lb. of butter. That is the way to tackle the problem, not by encouraging industries in the Eastern States to send their products to Western Australia. I feel that we are getting too much Eastern States stuff over here, and the Government is not using sufficient initiative in regard to the stimulation of local products. The more we can do for local manufacturers the better.

Mr. MANNING: I am not happy about the quota of 800 tons, and I support the amendment. If we allow 800 tons to be

produced here and we have 1,000 tons coming in from outside, this State will be well and truly flooded with margarine and that will have a dampening effect on the butterfat producer. The fashion is to go in for milk production, and while dairymen are turning from butterfat to milk they are reducing the availability of butter. We must accept this amendment because we cannot afford to have the State flooded with margarine and thus be unable to urge butterfat producers to manufacture their product. The rising basic wage has had a lot to do with the rising cost of butter production, and if we can boost the ability of each farmer to increase his production, we must reduce the cost. The cost of butter will come down accordingly. We should give all possible encouragements to the dairy farmer to step up production because while he does that he is developing the country and bringing down the cost of his product. This, in turn, will mean a reduction in the price of butter, which is desirable.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	35
Majority against				29
Ayes.				
Mr. Brady	Mr. Manning			
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Read			
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell			
				(Teller.)
Noes				
Mr. Abbott	Mr. Moir			
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder			
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Needham			
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nimmo			
Mr. Doney	Mr. Nulsen			
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield			
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen			
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Rodoreda			
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Sewell			
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman			
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Styants			
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Thorn			
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin			
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Watts			
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild			
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Yates			
Mr. May	Mr. Kelly			
Mr. McCulloch				(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. GRAHAM: At present two companies manufacture margarine and of the quota of 364 tons, one is allowed to manufacture 234 tons and the other 130. The concern with the lesser quota is, I understand, an entirely local company. Can the Minister tell us how the spoils, shall I say, will be divided between the two companies? There may be some diffidence on the part of members to vote for the Bill in its entirety if it is felt there will be discrimination against a local concern.

The Minister for Lands: Would you care to say how you would like to see it done; whether the quotas should be equalised or stepped up pro rata?

Mr. GRAHAM: If ever I am Minister for Agriculture I will make the decision. This point is relevant because, to take it to the extreme, it may be the intention of the Minister to leave the Western Australian company with a quota of 130 tons and grant 670 tons to the other concern, which would be grossly unfair.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I asked the hon. member to say what he thought should be done so that I could pass his opinion on to the Minister for Agriculture. I should say that a previous Government fixed the quotas on the capacity of the manufacturers.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will make representations to the Minister for Agriculture on the matter. I do not know what he has in mind, so I cannot inform the hon. member what the Minister intends to do.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think a fair arrangement would be equality as between both firms. The local concern has been in an inferior position up to now, but its manufacturing capacity has only recently been considerably increased. I feel that now it would be able to manufacture up to half the quota decided upon. Where two firms are in competition, and one is a purely local concern and the other has some Eastern States attachments, I feel it is only fair that the local firm should have at least equal opportunity with the other.

Mr. Rodoreda: What happens if another local firm is established?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: These two firms have pioneered the manufacture of margarine in Western Australia, and it would appear to be somewhat unfair to cut down deliberately their quotas as an invitation to someone else to commence. I am never one for supporting monopolies. If sufficient indication were given to the Minister that a new local firm desired to get into the business of manufacturing margarine, then it could be given its opportunity. I take it such a firm would be given a small quota to begin with and would have to go through the same process as the local firm did; that is, prove its capacity to provide an article of good quality and of the standard required. With two firms operating, as at present, it is only reasonable that the local firm should have at least the same opportunity as the Eastern States firm. I hope the Minister will give that aspect consideration.

Clause put and passed.

New clause:

Mr. BOVELL: I move—

That a new clause be added as follows:—"4. This Act shall remain in force until the 31st October, 1953, and no longer."

That will give 12 months in which to see whether this proposal works satisfactorily without detriment to the dairying industry.

Mr. Moir: You would not support that provision in the industrial arbitration legislation.

Mr. Graham: Would not this measure have to be in operation for a full calendar year before we could know how it worked?

Mr. BOVELL: The flush season will commence shortly and this will cover the full calendar year as far as the industry is concerned. If the legislation is not continued when the matter is raised again the quota will return to 364 tons. This new clause will remove any danger to the dairying industry.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You cannot amend an Act for a period.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment, if agreed to, would not be fair to the manufacturers of margarine who, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said, are preparing to supply the demand, one of them having recently put in extra machinery. As the legislation already provides, the Minister has control of the manufacture of margarine up to a maximum of 800 tons and, as I have said repeatedly, no Government would allow margarine to be manufactured to an extent that would interfere with the dairying industry.

Hon. E. Nulsen: You have discretionary power up to 800 tons.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. The Minister has all the power necessary to make the position secure.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The position will be reviewed all the time.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is so. I cannot accept the new clause.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	5
Noes	36

Majority against	31
------------------	----

Ayes.

Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brand	Mr. Needham
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Read
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Slezman
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Styants
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Yates
Mr. May	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

New clause thus negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver—Subiaco) [9.20] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill, and I hope that it will not be a contentious one. The Act, as it stands, prohibits a person from conducting a business as a pharmaceutical chemist unless he is the holder of a license from the Pharmaceutical Council. On the recommendation of the council, the Government has decided to amend the section of the Act relating to licenses, so that migrants from Europe and elsewhere can be admitted to the practice of pharmacy, provided they satisfy the council as to their qualifications and ability.

It is feared that this may adversely affect our own students and prevent them from practising as master pharmacists, especially if external capital is used to buy pharmacies in this State and migrants licensed under the new proposals are appointed as managers. It might then be possible for the owner never to see the business and his knowledge of such business might be only through the annual balance sheet. This, of course, would not be in the best interests of service to the public. Such practices have created difficulties elsewhere, notably in New Zealand, and consequently in that country action similar to that proposed in this Bill has already been taken. Therefore it is proposed to insert in the Act the words "and unless he is domiciled in this State." By doing that we will ensure that the public will be served by pharmacists who have a personal interest in the progress of Western Australia and in the service they render to the public.

The measure provides for the insertion of a new section in the Act requiring a person taking over a pharmacy for a period exceeding three business days, and the person engaging him, to notify the council of the fact. We know that the person in charge of a pharmacy is charged with the legal responsibility for the custody and proper handling of dangerous drugs and narcotics. In policing the provisions of the Act and regulations it is therefore necessary that the Pharmaceutical Council be informed of the name of the responsible person.

Further amendments of the Act are proposed to deal with the qualifications which must be held by a person seeking registration as a pharmaceutical chemist. As previously mentioned, the Pharmaceutical Council, with the support of the Pharmaceutical Association of Australia and New

Zealand, has recommended the registration of migrants who have suitable qualifications or who, by a refresher course or special training, can attain the standard set in this State. Members will realise that the variety of qualifications likely to be claimed will be so extensive as to debar them from being specified in the body of the Act. Migrants with apparently high academic qualifications will not be suitable for registration unless they have command of the English language. Many will no doubt claim qualifications of which the council will require substantiation by special examination or supervised work. Therefore a new paragraph confers discretionary power on the council as to whether qualifications claimed are worthy of recognition or otherwise.

Further, some recognised examining bodies or societies confer courtesy degrees on persons considered worthy of the honour. The amendment would make clear the point that the possession of courtesy degrees granted by bodies recognised by Western Australia does not confer the right to practise as a pharmacist in this State. At present, the Act provides that any of the several articles mentioned in the fifth and ninth schedules to the Act shall be deemed poisons. This wording is not as intended, as the schedules serve different purposes, thus making it unsuitable for some articles to be placed on both schedules. I hope I have made that point clear, but I will explain it further in Committee. It is desired that the words "in either the fifth or the ninth schedule" be substituted for the words "in the fifth and ninth schedules." The Bill is not a long or contentious one, and if it is read carefully members will see that it contains some necessary amendments. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Johnson, debate adjourned.

BILL—PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th September.

MR. NEEDHAM (North Perth) [9.27]: This Bill is one that offers little room for debate. It has two objects: Firstly, to authorise the board to become a corporate body; and, secondly, to validate or legalise any decision of the board during any temporary vacancy. Both those powers are essential. Physiotherapy is becoming, if it has not already become, one of our important social services, and if the board is to carry out its work properly and successfully, the protection and powers sought under this Bill are essential. For those reasons, I support the second reading of the measure.

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—RENTS AND TENANCIES EMERGENCY PROVISIONS ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 16th September.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [9.32]: My contribution to the debate on the Bill will not be unduly long. In the first instance I want to protest emphatically against the procedure being followed, namely, the bringing down of a continuance Bill which denies us the opportunity not of discussing it, but of making any amendments to those sections of the Act which it is felt, in the light of experience, require some attention. We are placed in the position, shall I say, of having to pass the Bill because of the terrible repercussions that there would be if there were no legislation controlling rents or providing some protection for tenants against the threat of eviction. This is grossly unfair to members and equally unfair to the thousands of people who are affected by its provisions.

The observations I desire to make are few. I think it is wrong that the existing Act, taken in conjunction with the repealed legislation, namely, the Increase in Rent (War Restrictions) Act, should provide that a person who is the owner of property can increase his rent by 20 per cent., subsequently increase it by a further 10 per cent. and, in addition, have the right to approach the court for a further increase. I am aware of not a few, but many cases, during this year, of increases of 10 per cent. in the rentals being made and shortly afterwards approaches being made to the court and further increases obtained. At present there are many such applications pending. In order to submit his application all the property owner has to do is to have his property valued by a valuer and on that basis the weekly rental is fixed on a certain percentage.

Members are well aware, that in numerous cases, there is a great disparity between the valuation of one valuer as against another. However, not too many tenants are prepared to meet the expenses of obtaining the services of another valuer to have a check made against the valuation obtained by the owner of the property. Accordingly, they have very little alternative but humbly and meekly to submit to the new charges. Under the provisions of the old Act an owner of premises could not have it both ways. If he applied to the court for an increase

in rental he was debarred from applying for the automatic increase provided in the legislation. I consider it is necessary that some change should be effected in that particular provision, but we are denied any opportunity of tampering with the provisions of this measure.

Because of this, but for totally different reasons, it is possible that the Bill will meet an unhappy fate in another place. It may be the desire of the majority of members in that Chamber that there should be some watering down or lessening of certain provisions of the existing Act, and unless that is done they may not be prepared to pass this measure. So if there were a re-enactment of this legislation it would give us in this Chamber an opportunity of re-shaping it to conform with our wishes in accordance with our experience over the past nine months. In the case of the Legislative Council where there is, I repeat, a grave danger of the Bill being completely rejected, it may have been possible, in those circumstances, to save at least some of the principles of it had the Bill been entirely re-enacted, thus allowing members in another place to make certain amendments in accordance with their viewpoints.

The Chief Secretary: The hon. member is overlooking the fact that the Act was entirely acceptable to members of both Houses. They cannot have changed their minds in only nine months.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not overlooking the fact that it was accepted with a great deal of reluctance by many members in another place.

The Chief Secretary: That is assumption.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is nothing of the sort because, as the Minister is aware, a successful move was made to limit a certain division of the Act by making it expire on the 30th September. It was only in consequence of a compromise at a conference at which the Opposition of this Chamber was not represented that the Legislative Council managers agreed to extend it to the 31st October, but the Minister himself and his colleagues could not prevail upon them to allow it to continue until the end of this year. That amply demonstrates therefore the lack of enthusiasm of the majority of members in another place and that attitude may be shown towards the Bill.

Mr. Griffith: Does not the hon. member think that if the expiry date had been extended to the 31st December this year there would have been no time for Parliament to reconsider it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say that because ever since 1939 the date of expiry has been the 31st of December.

Mr. Griffith: That is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: And on each occasion attention has been given to the Bill in sufficient time to allow both Houses to give it full consideration. There were one or two occasions, unfortunately, when the Bill was introduced exceedingly late in the session but, so far as the existing Act is concerned, part of it expires in October, that is next month, and part of it expires in December. It surely establishes my point that there is a certain diffidence on the part of the majority of the Legislative Council in respect of the continuance of controls as affecting rented premises both in the matter of evictions and also rentals to be charged.

The past twelve months, or the period since the beginning of the year, have surely demonstrated to us, or emphasised what some of us have been aware of for some considerable period, that the present provision of two years residence in Australia to entitle the person to take eviction proceedings is too short. We are aware from information obtained from the Minister for Housing that people who applied in 1947 are still waiting for a house to be allocated to them—notwithstanding the dire circumstances under which they and their families are living—and in many instances the families have considerably increased since these people were granted No. 1 priorities in 1947. Yet it is possible for a person to arrive here from overseas in 1950, and after he has been here two years, that is in 1952, if he has bought the property previously, to give six months notice and automatically become possessed of the house he bought some few months previously. That is having an unfortunate effect on the attitude of local Australians; it creates a hostile feeling on their part towards these new arrivals.

Not once or twice but on many occasions I have been approached by people who have complained bitterly of the unfairness of persons coming from countries that were, for example, arrayed against us in the recently-concluded war, and who are able to come here and toss out into the street good Australians who have resided in this country all their lives. Because of the more refined policy—if I may use that term—now being employed by the State Housing Commission, there is no guarantee that persons evicted will be provided with alternative accommodation, and that in contradistinction to the very definite understanding that was given to members of this Chamber last year when we were considering this measure and measures akin to it. But once again other members and myself are helpless in the knowledge that we can do nothing whatsoever to remedy what must be apparent as a shortcoming in the mind of any thoughtful member. I would be in favour of increasing that term of years to one of perhaps five years, and then in due

course the period could be lessened on the assumption that the housing position was progressively improving.

I repeat it is most unfortunate that a bitterness and hostility are being created as between local Australians and new arrivals, particularly those from countries which were opposed to us during the war. Naturally the local people who have been here all their lives, or for long periods of their lives, resent the fact that they are being evicted by what they term foreigners who have spent a short time in this country. I know I am speaking to no purpose because it is impossible to make any amendment or alteration in the legislation. I am wondering, too, what has happened to the Government or its officers in respect of Section 25 of the Rents and Tenancies Emergency Provisions Act. There are only two lines of it, so I propose to read it. It is as follows:—

A person shall not refuse to let residential premises because it is intended that a child shall live in the premises.

Every day it is possible to see advertisements in the Press stating "no children." We are aware that there are quite a number of letting agencies that stipulate definitely "no encumbrances" and, following that, "children or dogs." So they are coupled together. The prospectus or form setting out those particulars is issued by a gentleman by the name of Wintle. If it is an offence, surely then it should be somebody's job to police the matter. In turning over the page I find the following in Section 30 of the Act:—

30. (1) A person who contravenes the provisions of this Act or the regulations commits an offence against this Act.

(2) On conviction of an offence against this Act the offender shall, if no other penalty is prescribed, be liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred pounds.

I am unaware of one single case that has been taken. It is a shocking state of affairs that young couples who have one child or more should be denied accommodation merely because of that fact. If it was never the intention of the Government to enforce this provision, surely it should never have inserted such a section in the Act, which was completely redrawn only 12 months ago. It is a shocking imposition and yet the Government does nothing about it at all. There are a number of other points that could be taken concerning the unsatisfactory nature of this legislation, but for reasons previously submitted there is no purpose served in stating any objections based on the experience and knowledge that we have gained; there are no facilities before

us to rectify any of the shortcomings of the Act because of the method in which the Bill has been introduced.

I concede to the Government that this is not an innovation; that it was done religiously from 1940 until, I think, about 1948 or 1949, when a few more or less minor amendments were made. So, one can say for the best part of ten years there was merely a Bill to alter the date of expiry of the legislation. This was entirely new legislation, experimental in certain respects, and therefore an opportunity should have been given us to tidy up some of the provisions of the Act. There would have been some divergence of opinion because it is exceedingly difficult to formulate fair and equitable conditions as between landlord and tenant.

All sorts of evasions of the Act are being perpetrated. Receipts are not given or not given for the full amount. I heard of a case today of a landlady in the city interfering with the tenancy in minor matters but nevertheless in an irritating manner, such as removing electric light globes from certain parts of the building, no longer supplying toilet paper, making all sorts of extortionate charges for the use of the bath-heater and refusing to give receipts for additional charges levied.

In many instances, an inoffensive tenant has been evicted by the simple expedient of giving notice because, since the 31st December, 1950, the mere giving of notice is sufficient to get one tenant out in order to be able to accommodate somebody who happens to be a friend or a friend of a friend. This sort of thing is unfair, but it is exceedingly difficult to arrive at a fair and equitable basis. Those are the only observations I feel disposed to make on the Bill because of the utter futility of entering into detail, due to our inability to effect any changes owing to the form of the measure presented to us.

On motion by Mr. Brady, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.