

of the Perth City Council and the Transport Board, the matter does not reach any conclusion. We have seen the controversy that took place over an area just outside Parliament House. The House Committee applied to have a certain area set apart for the parking of members' cars, and the Police Traffic Branch granted the request, but there was a great deal of discussion and adverse criticism of the action of the Traffic Department when the matter came before the City Council.

I do not know whether members are aware of it or not, but trams and trolley-buses for many years were not recognised as vehicles under the traffic regulations. That was a curious anomaly which gave rise to considerable difficulty. We have all seen where local authorities have resurfaced roads but where that portion of the road coming under the Tramway Department has been cut up and full of pot-holes. We have also had the spectacle of Government-owned transport being totally unable to lift the number of passengers offering at peak periods, and the Transport Board refusing private bus operators permission to help relieve the situation by picking up the excess passengers.

With all this divided control and the consequent lack of co-operation between the various authorities, it is no wonder that our traffic problem is becoming worse year by year. We will shortly be receiving a report that is in course of compilation by the Deputy Director of Works, and the Superintendent of the Police Traffic Branch. I do not know what the report will contain, but I am sure members will look forward with interest to its being tabled in this House. I am convinced that the solution of this problem lies in the appointment of a statutory body with absolute control over all aspects of our traffic and its future needs.

The appointment of such a body is important, and we should make sure that it is composed of the right type of men, with broad vision, skilled knowledge and ample experience. I would go further and say that such a board should have vested in it legislative authority to implement its decisions. The principles of town planning and traffic control are so closely related and interwoven that if we are to get effective results, there must be close liaison between the two authorities concerned. I hope the Government will cause the fullest inquiry to be made into the feasibility of incorporating into its town planning administration a competent traffic engineering section.

Hon. G. Fraser: Would that not be the best body to which to give the supreme power?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: It might be. As long as there is set up a body with those powers, I think we will be able to solve many problems that are now accentuated

by the division of control among various authorities, none of which has sufficient power to do a complete job. If such a body is established in the future I think this State will be able to be regarded as a model in matters relating to traffic control, whereas today Western Australia is an example of the ineffectiveness of divided control. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. A. L. Loton, debate adjourned.

BILL—CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

House adjourned at 5.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 18th September, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Address-in-reply : Presentation	975
Questions : Railways, as to warning signals, Caledonian Avenue crossing	975
Cement, imported and local, (a) as to Premier's statement and Auditor General's query	975
(b) as to action by Government	976
State finance, as to avoidances or deferment of contractual commitments	976
River pollution, as to introducing legislation	976
Local government, as to land sales for rate recovery	976
S.P. betting, as to charges for "obstruction"	977
Housing, as to Austrian pre-fab. homes and protection against white ants	977
Water supplies, as to de-silting Beela dam	977
Traffic, as to formation of courtesy league	977
Questions by Members, as to postponement	978
Causeway, New, as to opening ceremony	978
Order of Business, as to postponement of Bill	979
Bills : Police Act Amendment, as to leave to introduce, 1r.	978
Land Agents Act Amendment, 1r.	978
Child Welfare Act Amendment, 3r.	979
Physiotherapists Act Amendment, 2r.	979
Margarine Act Amendment (No. 1), 2r.	980

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Presentation.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to announce that, accompanied by the member for Canning, the member for Harvey and the member for Vasse, I waited upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's opening Speech. His Excellency was pleased to reply in the following terms:—

Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

QUESTIONS.**RAILWAYS.**

As to Warning Signals, Caledonian Avenue Crossing.

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

(1) When can it be expected that flashing light warning signals will be installed at the Caledonian Avenue level crossing?

(2) When is it expected that the necessary equipment will arrive from overseas?

(3) How long has this equipment been on order, and what is the hold-up?

(4) How long will it take to install these signals after the arrival of the necessary equipment?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) In the very near future.

(2) Material has now arrived.

(3) Some has been on order since 1948.

(4) Installation is anticipated to take from four to six weeks from the commencement of the work.

CEMENT, IMPORTED AND LOCAL.

(a) As to Premier's Statement and Auditor General's Query.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Premier:

(1) What is the explanation for his stating in the House on Thursday last that the Auditor General's query regarding the quantity of imported cement released being greater than that of local cement drawn by the Government was due to the "fact" that the Auditor General's investigation related only to the period up to June, 1950, when, in actual fact, that officer's report covered the period up to the 31st May, 1951, which was four months after the arrangement to pay the difference between the local and the imported price had been terminated?

(2) As the explanation advanced by him cannot be accepted because it was contrary to fact, what other reason can he give for the Auditor General's query?

(3) Was not the Government's decision one to use imported cement and leave the local cement for private users (except for the quantity which was required for use for raising the Mundaring Weir wall) and to make up to 200 tons per week of imported cement available to private industrial users at the local price to compensate for the quantity of local cement used by the Government at Mundaring?

(4) Was not this arrangement to commence from the 1st May, 1950?

(5) Was the 31st January, 1951, the date on which the arrangement terminated?

(6) What was the quantity of local cement used at Mundaring during that period of 39 weeks?

(7) What was the quantity of local cement used in raising the wall of Mundaring from the 1st May, 1950, to the completion of the job?

(8) On what date was the work of raising the wall completed?

(9) Was not the amount of £34,759 17s. 3d. which was charged against the Loan Fund, Item No. 23 Goldfields Water Supply, the difference between the cost of 6,132½ tons of imported cement (including charges paid by the Government Stores) and the price of an equal quantity of local cement?

(10) During what period did the Government draw the 7,842 tons of local cement mentioned in his statement of Thursday last?

(11) On what works was this cement used?

(12) What quantities were used on each of the works respectively?

(13) What authority exists for charging against any public work which is financed out of loan money an expense not associated with that work?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) The date was misquoted. June, 1950, should read June, 1951.

(2) The Auditor General is an officer appointed to report direct to Parliament. He was reporting, for the information of Parliament, the arrangement made for exchange of imported cement for local cement in bulk for convenience of handling at Mundaring Weir. He expressed his opinion that the job should be charged with the cost of local cement only. The difference in cost of imported and local cement, in his opinion, should be charged to a special item created on the Estimates. The Auditor General has been interviewed and he states that he did not wish to imply that Mundaring Weir had been surcharged for more cement than it received.

(3) Yes.

(4) Yes.

(5) Yes.

(6) From the 26th April, 1950, to the 31st January, 1951, 5,829 tons of local cement were delivered to Mundaring in bulk and 150 tons in bags.

(7) 7,872 tons.

(8) Wall was raised to its complete height before December, 1951, but finishing off was not completed until the 1st December, 1951.

(9) Yes.

(10) 7,872 tons were drawn between the 26th April, 1951, and the 20th July, 1951.

(11) Mundaring Weir wall.

(12) All used at Mundaring Weir.

(13) None, but it is not agreed that Mundaring Weir has been charged with any expense not associated with it.

(b) As to Action by Government.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Attorney General:

(1) What action is normally taken when the Auditor General refuses to pass an item of expenditure in Government Accounts?

(2) Does he intend to take any action regarding Loan Fund Item 23, Goldfields Water Supply, which the Audit office has refused to pass?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) He reports the matter to Parliament.

(2) The matter being before Parliament, it is for Parliament to indicate what action, if any, should be taken.

STATE FINANCE.

As to Avoidance or Deferment of Contractual Commitments.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Premier:

(1) Has he been successful in avoiding or having deferred, any of the State's contractual commitments?

(2) What are the particulars of such avoidances or deferments?

(3) What is the total amount of loan money involved in these avoidances or deferments?

(4) Are any penalties payable by the State as a result of these avoidances or deferments?

(5) Are the deferments of indefinite time? If of certain periods, for what periods in each instance have the deferments been made?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Total commitments for 1952-53 have been reduced from £19,628,000 to £13,559,000 by deferment of payments on certain overseas contracts and the slowing down of deliveries on local contracts.

(3) £6,069,000.

(4) Interest will be payable at the rate of 5 per cent. on payments deferred in respect of overseas contracts. These deferred payments total £3,762,000.

(5) Deferred payments in general have to be met during 1953-54.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It is bad luck for the next Government.

The Minister for Lands: We shall be here.

RIVER POLLUTION.

As to Introducing Legislation.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Will she move to amend the Health Act to provide powers to local health authorities to prevent the pollution of the Swan and Helena Rivers?

(2) If the reply is in the affirmative, when will the amendment take place?

(3) If reply is in the negative, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Local health authorities already have considerable powers to prevent pollution of rivers.

The Swan River Reference Committee is at present collecting information on the subject of river pollution and legislation for its prevention.

Amendments to the Health Act, if any, should await the report of that committee.

(2) See (1).

(3) See (1).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

As to Land Sales for Rate Recovery.

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Local Government:

If the proposed Local Government Bill is not to be introduced this session, will he take immediate steps to amend the existing Act this session to allow for the sale of land by the local authority for recovery of rates after a period of three years instead of five years as at present?

The MINISTER replied:

The original provisions in the Road Districts Act provided for sale of land for recovery of rates after a period of seven years.

The matter was thoroughly investigated in 1946 and the Act was amended authorising sale of land after a period of five years.

So far as I am aware, and in the absence of complaints to the contrary, the existing provisions have worked quite satisfactorily and no application has been submitted for any alteration.

The proposed amendment, therefore, does not appear justified.

S.P. BETTING.*As to Charges for "Obstruction".*

Mr. RODOREDÀ asked the Premier:

(1) Did he notice a headline in "The West Australian" of the 16th September, stating "Farce of the Law" under which Mr. A. G. Smith, S.M., is reported to have said to a street bettor fined for obstructing traffic, "You are making a farce of the law"?

(2) Does he not consider that the whole machinery of the law is engaged in a far greater farce by penalising people for obstructing traffic, when in effect they are not so doing, but are actually engaged in betting?

(3) Does he intend to take action to remedy this position?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) The Commissioner of Police is administering the law in connection with starting price betting in a similar manner as it has been administered for many years under various Governments. It is not intended to interfere with his administration.

HOUSING.*As to Austrian Pre-fabricated Homes and Protection against White Ants.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many of the Austrian pre-fabricated houses bought by the Government have been erected?

(2) Are they available for sale as war service and workers' homes?

(3) If so, in view of the fact that pine wood is used in their construction what guarantee of protection against white ants is being given to intending purchasers?

(4) If being sold as war service homes, does the War Service Homes Division Insurance Scheme against white ants apply at the same value and for the duration of the mortgage?

(5) If not what arrangements are being made?

(6) If they are being sold as workers' homes can insurance against white ants be arranged through the State Insurance Department or private insurance companies for the duration of the mortgage?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) To the end of August last, 73. In addition, 209 houses were under construction as at the same date.

(2) They are available for sale to the tenants who can apply for finance under the War Service Homes Scheme and the State Housing Act as and when funds are available. No funds are available this financial year for purchase of existing dwellings under the State Housing Act.

(3) No guarantee is given to intending purchasers, but every precaution has been taken to make the dwellings white ant proof. In addition, the Maintenance Section of the State Housing Commission maintains constant surveillance by inspection of all the Commission's dwellings.

(4) The War Service Homes Division Insurance Scheme provides cover against white ants for two years from the date of purchase and the Commission's valuation of the property is the value for insurance purposes.

(5) Answered by (4).

(6) As stated in (2), no funds available this financial year under the State Housing Act for purchase of any existing dwellings. The State Insurance Office will not provide cover against white ants and it is not known what cover private insurance companies will provide.

WATER SUPPLIES.*As to De-silting Beela Dam.*

Mr. MANNING asked the Minister for Works:

Owing to the serious position that existed at Brunswick Junction last summer because of the shortage of water, also the filthy nature of the water obtained, will he give an assurance that the work of de-silting the Beela Dam will be proceeded with without delay?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (for the Minister for Works) replied:

Initial experiments disclosed that larger scale experiments have to be conducted before the work of de-silting the basin can be attempted. The larger scale experiments will be undertaken shortly in preparation for de-silting the dam next year.

The de-silting of the dam will not entirely prevent the carrying of some silt into the reticulation, particularly during the winter months. This is because of the steep nature of the catchment with consequent soil erosion.

TRAFFIC.*As to Formation of Courtesy League.*

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

(1) Has the National Road Safety Council given consideration to the formation of a Courtesy League in this State, as a means of lessening the high rate of road accidents?

(2) Is he aware that the teaching of Courtesy Leagues in England is regarded as a major factor for the good manners of English motor drivers?

(3) Is he aware that a gentleman who has had considerable experience of the functions of these leagues in England is

now in Perth and is willing to give his services if it is decided to inaugurate the system in this State?

(4) Will he give instructions that the necessary action be taken to have the formation of a Courtesy League in Western Australia thoroughly investigated?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1), (2), (3) and (4) The National Safety Council of W.A., Inc., over which the State Government has no control, except that it is represented on the Council, has, I understand, considered the question of the formation of a Courtesy League. Further inquiries regarding the matters raised by the hon. member will be directed to the Council and he will be advised of the outcome.

QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS.

As to Postponement.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (without notice) asked the Attorney General:

Almost without exception the Attorney General asks that questions on notice be postponed when they come up to be answered. I would like to know whether he can give the House a reason for wanting Question No. 10 on today's notice paper postponed?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

The questions I am mostly required to answer have to be investigated by departments outside of my own premises. Those connected with prices have to go to the Commissioner of Prices, and those dealing with police matters have to go to the Commissioner of Police.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Do they go through the messenger exchange?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know. I only know that as soon as I receive questions they are sent out to the departments concerned, but I do not get them back in time for the House. The questions are answered as soon possible.

The Premier: It is difficult with a 2.30 p.m. start.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It happens every day.

CAUSEWAY, NEW.

As to Opening Ceremony.

Mr. GRAHAM (without notice) asked the Premier:

At the opening of the New Causeway tomorrow, is it the intention of the Premier suitably to acknowledge the fact that the work was authorised and actually commenced by the previous Labour Government?

The PREMIER replied:

I do not propose, at the opening of the Causeway tomorrow, to look for any political advantage. I was not going to refer to who started the Causeway. I am going there formally to open it.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Were you going to prophesy who would finish it?

The Premier: No, but I will, if the hon. member likes.

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Police, and read a first time.

BILL—LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT.

As to Leave to Introduce.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—North Perth) [2.44]: I move for leave—

To introduce a Bill for "An Act to amend the Police Act, 1892-1945 and where necessary for the purpose of reprinting, to revise certain of the Acts amending 'The Police Act, 1892' (Act 55 Victoriae No. 27)"

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [2.45]: I am a little puzzled at the attitude of the Attorney General in placing this Bill and the previous one on the notice paper because, as he is aware, they have been referred to an all-party or non-party committee to investigate. It could happen that decisions or recommendations could be made that would have a bearing on the point as to whether the Bills should be introduced; or, perhaps, in one case that possibly two Bills should be introduced, and accordingly the Titles would be different. Therefore I think the Attorney General is anticipating somewhat when he gives notice of his intention to introduce these Bills before the committee, which was appointed at the request of the Government, has had an opportunity of going into them. It almost suggests that, irrespective of the viewpoint expressed by representatives of all parties in both Houses, very little consideration is going to be given to any view they express or suggestions they submit if, indeed, their suggestions entail the complete redrafting of one or other of the measures. Accordingly, whilst I do not seek to deny the Attorney General leave to introduce the Bill, I think I should make this formal protest.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—North Perth—in reply) [2.48]: It is not my intention to show any discourtesy to the committee. The Bills submitted to it are in connection with law reform. It did not enter my mind but that Bills would be introduced, although their exact form had not been decided. I do not regard this motion as in any way infringing on the discretion vested in this committee.

Question put and passed; leave granted.

First Reading.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

BILL—CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver—Subiaco) [2.50] in moving the second reading said: This is a very short Bill and, if members read its clauses, they will find it is a necessary one. It provides that the Physiotherapists Registration Board shall be a corporate body and as a legal entity may be represented in court and deal in property in the name of the board. The measure also provides that the authority of the board to carry out its functions under the Act will not be prejudiced by any temporary vacancy in the office of the board. Members of the board are to be protected against personal liability in any legitimate act performed by them in the discharge of any of the duties or functions imposed upon them by the Act.

It is customary to include a protective provision of this nature in the legislation under which a board works. A similar provision is made in the Medical Act, the Dentists Act and the Optometrists Act. As the Act stands at present any legal action arising out of an act of the board would have been taken in the names of the members of the board and not in the name of the board as an entity. Likewise any person aggrieved by an action of the board, who sought redress at law, would take action against the board members as individuals.

Because the board is comprised of persons acting substantially in an honorary capacity, and discharging a high civic duty, it is only right that they should be protected against liability for official acts and from personal legal consequences. It is customary for corporate bodies to have a common seal to be affixed on official documents and this clause naturally follows the new provision incorporating the board. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Needham, debate adjourned.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

As to Postponement of Bill.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [2.53]: Before the Minister rises, Mr. Speaker, I think we should postpone item No. 3 until after Item No. 19. I therefore move—

That Order of the Day No. 3 be postponed until after Nos. 4 to 19 inclusive have been dealt with.

I thought there was such a thing as fair play. The member for East Perth has had his Bill on the notice paper since long before that of the Government, but the Government now wishes to keep his measure well down the list—except on private member's day, when, of course, it will be dealt with in its turn. During the last few weeks the Government has even suspended Standing Orders to allow a private member's business to be dealt with, but it intends to keep the member for East Perth well down on the list. I would like to know how item No. 19 comes to be No. 2, as I think that item No. 3 should be No. 2.

It would be only a fair deal to give the member for East Perth a chance of going on with his Bill before that of the Minister is dealt with, but this is not the first occasion on which the Government has done this sort of thing. A couple of sessions ago the Leader of the Opposition had the temerity to introduce a Bill to liberalise the franchise of the Legislative Council, but the Government said that the idea was theirs, and pushed his Bill to the bottom of the notice paper and brought down one of its own. It had that measure passed through this House after a fashion and sent it to another place where, of course, it was thrown out. The time has certainly arrived when private members should be given a fair go.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [2.56]: I hope the House will not agree to the motion. I thought that the Bill of the member for East Perth might have been introduced some time yesterday, but one never knows how long debate on certain matters will continue in this House and, of course, we did not reach that item. Even had we continued for much longer than we did it would have been a very late hour before the hon. member's Bill was reached. The notice paper today takes its ordinary course and the Government sets its business according to its desires.

The member for Fremantle said that the member for East Perth gave notice of his Bill before the Government announced its intention of bringing down a measure dealing with margarine. The Government sets out its legislative programme some time before the commencement of the session and it does not know what legislation will be introduced by private members. Of course it must get ahead with its own legislative programme, and that is what we have done in this case. We regard the question of giving margarine manufacturers a greater quota as being of importance and it was our intention, long before Parliament met, to bring down such a Bill as early as possible.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Tell us why the Bill of the member for East Perth has been called No. 2.

The PREMIER: The only explanation I can offer is that the Clerks of the House, knowing that there were two such Bills before the House and seeing the notice paper set out last night, numbered one of them No. 1 and the other No. 2.

The Minister for Lands: The Government's Bill was printed first.

The PREMIER: That is the only explanation I can offer the hon. member. I hope the motion will not be agreed to.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	20

Majority against 5

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Moll
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Needham
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lawrence	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Doney	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Will
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Ackland
Mr. May	Mr. Brand
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Cornell

Question thus negatived.

BILL—MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. L. Thorn—Toodyay) [3.0] in moving the second reading said: Since the price of butter was increased from 3/2d. per lb. to 4/2d. per lb. there has been a heavier demand for margarine. Both companies in this State have increased their weekly output and at their present rate of manufacture should pass the annual quota as provided in the parent Act, which is 364 tons. The amendment before the House will increase this figure to 800 tons per annum maximum. Prompted by agricultural interests, various countries have, in their time, imposed restrictions on the margarine industry, but these restrictions are yielding to the pressure of economic necessities and to the realisation that there is a social need for margarine which must be satisfied. Developments in the United States confirm this trend.

In 1947 there were 23 American states where the sale of coloured margarine was forbidden, the intention being to make margarine look unattractive and so reduce the public demand for it. Since then 16 States have abolished this kind of regulation, leaving the manufacturers free to supply according to the housewife's choice. A similar state of affairs exists in Canada, where until 1948, to protect the dairying interests, the production of margarine was forbidden altogether. It is now permitted and, although colouring restrictions are imposed, margarine consumption in Canada has risen to the same per capita level as in the United States and is still rising.

So far as Australia is concerned, margarine was becoming a serious competitor to butter in the early 1930's. Production of butter was growing rapidly and there were some fears regarding the ability to find satisfactory markets, particularly as overseas prices were lower than those in Australia. World trade in margarine was expanding rapidly and it was feared that, if consumption were allowed to expand without limit in Australia, a greater proportion of our butter would be forced on to the export market at lower prices. As the vegetable oils used in the manufacture of margarine were being produced almost entirely outside Australia, this would have meant the sacrifice of the interests of Australian producers to those outside Australia.

To protect the dairying industry, each State passed legislation limiting the quantities of margarine to be made for sale in Australia, and the respective quotas were based upon the approximate sales at the time. This action prevented damaging competition with butter and avoided placing hardships on the makers of margarine.

Mr. Bovell: Do you not think the dairying industry still needs protection?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, and the hon. member will find that it still receives that protection under the terms of the Bill. Since then, however, the position has become quite different. The population of Western Australia has increased from 466,896 in 1939 to 591,602 in 1951, while over the same period butter production declined. In Western Australia there has been a decrease in production of 1,000,000 lb. of butter. I think a little rough mental arithmetic will show that that is about 20,000 boxes.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is certainly rough; I mean the mental arithmetic.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member can check it. This is due, not so much to a decline in total production as to a change in the form of utilisation of the milk. In 1938-39, 77.8 per cent. of the total milk produced in Australia was used for the manufacture of butter, while in 1950-51 the proportion was only 64 per cent. The change both in population and

utilisation means that Great Britain is now receiving only a proportion of the quantities which were available before the war. In 1938 Australia exported 89,891 tons, but in 1951 the total had fallen to 33,300 tons. That is an amazing figure and, as I have already explained, is largely brought about because a good deal more milk is now being utilised in other directions. The price structure for the industry has improved and it is now receiving a return based on the estimated costs of production, which includes a managerial allowance for the producer.

Mr. Bovell: That is on an Australia-wide basis.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Exactly, but we cannot get away from the fact that we are very short of butter in this State at the moment. The price to the producer has been maintained partly by realisation from sales, with the addition of the Commonwealth subsidy. This subsidy has now been partly removed and an extra burden has been thrown on the consumer. While there was little margin in the price between butter and margarine people preferred butter, but the present prices of 4s. 2d. and 2s. 6d. respectively have brought about a strengthening of the demand for margarine.

The Government desires to see people receiving an adequate supply of fats, and in the altered circumstances feels that some relaxation of the margarine quota is desirable. It is not the intention of the Government to sacrifice the dairying industry and this is supported by the fact that the manufacture of margarine will still be controlled. Regarding that point, there is no Government that appreciates and realises its responsibility to the dairymen more than this one does.

Mr. Bovell: Then I wish it would get a move on with the scheme to increase production.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: We are doing all we can in that regard and the Premier is constantly in touch with the Commonwealth Government. During his recent visit to this State, the Federal Minister, Mr. McEwan, gave us every encouragement in that direction and I know that he is doing his best in Canberra to obtain the necessary finance to step up production. I am speaking of those at present engaged in the dairying industry. I am sure all members of this Chamber fully realise the importance of that industry and do not intend to allow anything to happen that will damage it. I have already pointed out that there was a big decline in the manufacture of butter owing to milk being used for other purposes. Within the last seven days Dr. Sutton announced that it would still be necessary for this State to import 50,000 boxes of butter.

Mr. Bovell: But he also said that those 50,000 boxes of butter would be available subject to shipping control.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But we have to get butter. We have not sufficient of it in this State to supply the demand.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Will not the price reduce the amount of butter that will now be consumed by the people?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is evident with a good many primary producers today; the price does reduce consumption. If members have read the recent report of the Egg Marketing Board they will have discovered that the consumption of eggs in Western Australia has dropped considerably, but the export figures have increased. During a recent debate I also pointed out that the consumption of dried fruits is at a very low ebb in Western Australia because the high price of butter prevents housewives from using it for cake-making, and this also affects the consumption of eggs. If margarine is made available to the public it will assist in other directions. I want to impress upon members that the control is in the hands of the Minister.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I think you are impressing the member for Avon Valley very solidly.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, he is a great supporter of mine and of the Government. He is a practical farmer and has a full appreciation of the present position of these various primary products, so I can quite understand the great interest he is showing. I do want to assure the House that the control of the manufacture of margarine is in the hands of the Minister, and no responsible ministerial head will allow the production of margarine to interfere with the butter market.

Mr. Bovell: Is not the quota increase proposed in the Bill far in excess of the increase in population over the years concerned?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I gave the hon. member the figures relating to the increase in the quota and I suggest that he works them out for himself.

Mr. Graham: He is a mathematician, isn't he?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will say this to the hon. member: He need not be concerned as to the increase in the quota of margarine, because I repeat that no Government would allow an excess in the manufacture of that product that would interfere with our dairying industry. There are two margarine manufacturers in this State, so there will not be much difficulty in keeping control over it. We all know what the dairying industry means to this great State. We are endeavouring to step it up.

Mr. Bovell: I am wondering whether this Bill will step it up.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Bovell: Yes, and it is a considered opinion.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: All right! Go for your life!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Surely the member for Vasse is an authority on the question of butter production.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, but—

Mr. Bovell: I represent the majority of butter producers in Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member probably does but he has spent no more time on the land than I have, and he is no more interested in production than I am and many members of the Government, too. So the hon. member can rest assured that the Government will watch the position just as keenly as he will. That is the purpose of the Bill—to step up the maximum quota of margarine from 364 tons of 800 tons.

Mr. Bovell: They are important figures. They show an increase of over 100 per cent., and yet the population of this State has increased by only one-fifth or 20 per cent.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is all right; that is dealing with only one aspect of the position. Will the hon. member admit that the butter production in this State has fallen considerably and that there is not sufficient butter to supply the people, and that was why we had to bring in 50,000 boxes to make up the shortage?

Mr. Bovell: There are many producers today producing more milk products than there were in 1945. So why discourage them by introducing this legislation?

Mr. Styants: Because they have fallen down on their job.

Mr. Bovell: Who has fallen down on their job?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Bovell: That is a typical interjection by the member for Kalgoorlie.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Government has fallen down on its job.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Vasse will have to leave the Chamber if he is not careful.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The manufacture of margarine will be strictly under control. It has been proved that there is a demand for it. There is a big difference between the retail price of butter and that of margarine, and the member for East Perth made the point that there are many big families in this State today that cannot afford to put a full supply of butter on the table, and therefore it is necessary for them to use what butter they can afford and reduce their housekeeping accounts by substituting margarine for the balance of their needs.

Mr. Bovell: We are relying on primary products for our national income.

Mr. Graham: Out you go!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is quite a reasonable statement, as I have already explained. That is, the position regarding quotas; they will be watched very closely. The Minister for Agriculture has no intention of stepping up manufacture to the maximum quantity allowed. He is going to step it up gradually. He is going to watch results and, if it is necessary to peg the manufacturing quota of margarine at a certain figure, he will do so. I say to the member for Vasse—I do not want to stir him up again—that he can rest assured that we will watch the position, particularly in the interests of the dairying industry.

Mr. Bovell: You are not assuring me.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am assuring the member for Vasse now, and I hope he will accept my assurance.

Mr. Bovell: Well, I do not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—
That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [3.19]: The first thing that occurs to my mind on this subject is that we should make up our minds as to the correct pronunciation of the commodity in question. Some pronounce it with the soft "g," as in "margin"; others with the hard "g," as in the word "Margaret." I must confess that I pronounced it with the soft "g" until I discussed the question with representatives of the two producing firms and with representatives of the industry from the Eastern States, and they were unanimously of the opinion that the trade name "Margarine" was pronounced with the hard "g."

The Minister for Health: Why is it not pronounced like that in England where they eat more of it; that is, with the hard "g"?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not my intention to give lessons in English grammar, but perhaps the Minister for Health will ascertain whether it is pronounced with a hard or a soft "g" when a vowel follows. I submit that suggestion for the Minister's consideration. My own Bill on this subject has not seen the light of day, so it would appear that it is sterile. I am indebted to the member for Fremantle for his endeavour to permit my Bill to be born, even though under his motion it would have necessitated a Caesarian operation! However, the Minister's Bill is before us and accordingly we consider that measure.

Let me say at the outset that I think the Government is merely meddling with this problem instead of dealing with it in a proper way, and on a realistic basis. Instead of one Bill after another having to be submitted to this Parliament in

accordance with the changed circumstances, as they affect the dairying industry, or the increase of population or possibly our obligations overseas, surely all of us have sufficient confidence in the Minister for Agriculture of any Government that he, in his wisdom, after receiving advice from his departmental officers would allow sufficient of this commodity to be produced, having regard to the welfare of the people and the welfare of one of our primary industries. Accordingly I think it is wrong that the Bill should stipulate a maximum.

I agree that perhaps the member for Vasse has overlooked the fact that while a maximum of eight hundred tons per annum is set down under this Bill, it is quite conceivable that the Minister concerned next year, or the year after, would grant licenses to an aggregate of perhaps only six hundred tons. But it allows him a margin to determine the amount to be manufactured in this State in accordance with the circumstances existing at the time. I would go further and remove that maximum or upward limit and leave it to the good sense and discretion of the Minister, depending on the conditions which prevailed at that time.

The Premier: I think you must have a maximum set in a Bill like this.

Mr. GRAHAM: I disagree entirely. I should say that the Premier, by inference at any rate, is passing a vote of no confidence, in this instance on his own Government, and may be on some future Government. I have in mind particularly what may be emergency circumstances, where it would be necessary immediately to have a tremendous increase in the production of margarine but, as there is a limitation in the Bill, it would require a lapse of several months until such time as Parliament could be called together for the purpose of increasing the maximum. In any event, I want to say quite frankly that I regard it as an impertinence for the member for Vasse—or for the member for East Perth for that matter—to tell the citizens of this country that they must use butter; that they shall not be permitted to use margarine or any other commodity.

Mr. Bovell: The whole economy of the State is based on primary production and you are endeavouring to wreck that economy.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suggest that the member for Vasse who was so unseemly in his conduct when the Minister was speaking, and who is following the same line now, could quite easily stand up later and make his own speech in his own way.

Mr. Bovell: I certainly will.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the member for Vasse intends to speak I do not think there is any necessity for him to prevent other speakers from doing so.

Mr. Bovell: I am just correcting certain statements.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member is doing nothing of the kind; he is making unruly interjections.

Mr. Griffith: You never interject, do you?

Mr. GRAHAM: I certainly do, but I have never become possessed of a phobia such as the member for Vasse has in connection with this particular Bill. Any mention of margarine is to him as a red rag is to a bull.

Mr. Bovell: Yes, and you are trying to do the bulls out of doing their work!

Mr. GRAHAM: Let me assure the member for Vasse that such a thought is farthest from my mind; both in reference to the member for Vasse and also so far as the bulls are concerned! Provided the food is wholesome, is palatable, is nutritious and is in no way doing any harm to the health of the people, surely it is then a matter for the discretion and the choice of the individual.

Somebody may prefer woollen underwear; somebody else cotton underwear; somebody else may like silk or nylon and so on; it is a matter for the individual to determine for himself. If in my household, as with thousands of other citizens, I prefer to use margarine instead of butter, surely that is my business and not anybody else's. I do not seek to interfere with people who prefer butter to margarine; let them purchase it if they wish, but they should give me the same right to make my individual choice. Surely that is fair and reasonable. But there are other factors to be considered.

Since the 1st July the price has become a predominant factor, and 4s. 2d. a lb. is an exceedingly high figure to pay for butter, particularly when we bear in mind the fact that the economic price of butter at the present moment is 5s. a lb. It is only on account of the subsidy received from the Commonwealth Government that butter retails at 4s. 2d. a lb. at present. As indicated previously, here, in Western Australia, there are no less than 32,600 people who are living on pensions paid by the Commonwealth Department of Social Services. There are very many working men on the basic wage—or only slightly above it—who have large families and who themselves must take sandwiches to work; the same would of course apply to their children. I repeat that 4s. 2d. a lb. is an excessive price for them to have to pay when there is an alternative commodity which serves the same purpose and can be bought for 2s. 6d. a lb.

*Sitting suspended from 3.30 p.m. to
3.50 p.m.*

Mr. GRAHAM: I was saying that certain sections of the community are more or less compelled to buy the cheaper commodity on account of their economic circumstances. The true price of butter is in the vicinity of 5s. a lb.,

but it is being subsidised at present. No-one knows for certain what the attitude of the Commonwealth Government will be in the future. The subsidy could be considerably reduced, or it could vanish completely, in which case I suggest the price of butter would impose an intolerable burden and sacrifice on many people. The Bill proposes that the maximum amount of margarine to be manufactured in Western Australia shall be 800 tons a year. I am informed that this is insufficient to meet the requirements of the local market which is estimated to be in the vicinity of 1,000 tons. Considerable quantities of the commodity are imported from the Eastern States, but I understand there is no segregation of table margarine as against commercial margarine—that is, margarine used for cooking purposes, the manufacture of biscuits and so on.

Mr. Griffith: Neither, of course, can you control the amount of margarine that is imported from the Eastern States.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so, and it raises what I think is the complete answer to any person who opposes the proposition that the local production of margarine should be permitted to be increased. If the local demand is 1,000 tons and we are permitted to manufacture only 800 tons, the restriction will simply ensure that 200 tons will be imported from the Eastern States.

Mr. Griffith: That is assuming, of course, you are right in saying that the consumption will be 1,000 tons.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so, but the local concerns are not likely to produce more than they can sell.

Mr. Griffith: That is true.

Mr. GRAHAM: Anything more required by the public will be made up by importations from the Eastern States. Therefore if the quotas in the aggregate in Western Australia are, for the sake of argument, 200 tons below the demand, then 200 tons of margarine will be manufactured in the Eastern States when it could be manufactured here.

Mr. Griffith: It is purely guesswork on your part when you say that that figure would be reached.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have stated the proposition as an assumption. Surely the sensible thing to do is to follow the pattern of Queensland where firms apply for and are granted quotas, provided their factories conform to certain standards. From memory, I should say that quotas have been granted to the companies there to the extent of about three times the local demand. The Government in Queensland has adopted a sensible attitude by saying "May the best man win". It realises that the companies will adjust their production to suit the market. Of course, the most popular line will be produced right up to the limit of the quota, and brands which are

more or less unmarketable will go out of existence. There is no question of a shortage of margarine in the Commonwealth; or, perhaps, to state the position more accurately, no shortage of the necessary raw material—that is, the vegetable oil for the manufacture of margarine.

Mr. Griffith: Do you mean in Western Australia?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. Griffith: What about Western Australia?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no shortage in Western Australia.

Mr. Griffith: You are not well-informed.

Mr. GRAHAM: When a shipment happened to miss a certain vessel a shortage was created for a limited period, but that was overcome by the intervention of the Government—I think the Minister for Lands, the Minister for Agriculture, and perhaps the Minister for Supply and Shipping.

The Minister for Lands: I explained that we had caught up with it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. The position was overcome. Generally speaking, there is no shortage of the necessary ingredients.

The Minister for Health: There is sometimes a great shortage. I have proved it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have been in practically constant communication with the two local manufacturing concerns, and am prepared to accept their version on this question.

The Minister for Lands: They assured my department that supplies were all right at present.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. Both companies informed me they would experience no difficulty in obtaining sufficient Vegetol—the trade name of the vegetable fat which is imported from the Eastern States—to enable them to manufacture two or three times the present quantity.

Mr. Griffith: Do you know that in July, when you were making all the fuss about the Government not introducing a Bill, the Meadow-Lea company manufactured only 70 tons of its quota of 234 tons?

Mr. Hoar: That is what the hon. member is talking about—the temporary shortage.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is true. The problem has been accentuated to an enormous degree by the steep increase in the price of butter dating from the 1st July. Since then the production of margarine in Western Australia has increased enormously. Spread over the 12 months, the monthly quota of the two companies combined, is 67,946lb. For the month of August they produced 159,778lb., which is two and a half times as much as a normal month's production.

Mr. Hoar: What does the member for Vasse think about this?

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course, the increased production was brought about only because of the tremendous public demand.

The Minister for Health: If the hon. member would read "Hansard" for 1940 at page 1840 he would find out exactly the material that came to the State then and from where it came, and where it comes from today.

Mr. GRAHAM: In reply to the Minister, I read with keen interest the report of the entire debate that took place when the measure was introduced in 1940.

The Minister for Health: The stuff does not come from Western Australia.

Mr. GRAHAM: It certainly does not. Lever Bros. of New South Wales are the sole manufacturers in the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Health: No, they are not.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a terrible lot of denial of my statements.

Mr. Hearman: You are used to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seeking the protection of the Chair?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not in connection with this matter. I think I can defend myself. I hope so, at any rate. There was a time when certain discriminatory action was taken against the local company when some of this vegetable oil was imported from the other side of the world. But a satisfactory arrangement has been arrived at, and both the local manufacturers are experiencing no difficulty in getting their fair allocation, though with—I repeat—interruptions to supplies from time to time on account of transport, but not on account of a shortage of the raw materials with which to manufacture the commodity. I do not wish to be misunderstood in regard to this question. I am not stressing the rival claims of either butter or margarine, but am appealing to members to permit individual consumers to make their own choice where their economic position allows them to do so. We should allow persons who are unable to afford the dearer product to have a palatable substitute.

It is an interesting study to contemplate the arguments submitted pro and con in respect of butter and margarine and the respective food values of the two commodities. I am not in a position to state definitely which is the more nutritious food, but I am informed that several years ago a challenge was issued in the United States, through the leading newspapers, over a considerable period, by the manufacturers of margarine, who undertook to pay a considerable sum of money to certain specified charities if anyone competent to

do so could establish that margarine was deficient in food value compared with butter. I might add that nobody took up that challenge.

I repeat that I am not in a position to adjudicate between the respective claims of these two rival foodstuffs. It is well known that table margarine, as used in Australia, is manufactured entirely from vegetable oils and so there is no question of old fat, lard, dripping and so on being used for that purpose. When the subject was being debated in 1940 a certain member who belonged to the same party as I do—he is not now a member—let his imagination run riot and suggested that in one industrial area dead cats and stock and all sorts of things were being put into the melting pot to provide fats for the manufacture of margarine. That, of course, was ridiculous.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Minister for Agriculture at that time said margarine was better than butter because the butter might come from tubercular cows.

Mr. Hearman: Is it thought that they are going to scour the foreshore of the Swan River for raw materials?

Mr. GRAHAM: I repeat that only vegetable fats are used in the manufacture of margarine. The protagonists of the product suggest that we may consume too many animal fats in our diet and, if one pauses to consider the question, one realises that we do consume animal fats in our soup, meat, sweets and milk, and so it is possible that our diet might be better balanced if instead of consuming further butterfat we used the product of vegetable fats. It is also submitted that while the quality of butter varies in accordance with the season, margarine is completely stable in that regard. It is not subject to the vagaries of quality that may be found in butter. We have all had the experience that towards the end of summer and before the onset of the following winter, dairy products are often of lower quality than during the flush season when plenty of green grass is available to the dairy cattle. From the point of view of consistency of quality, at least, margarine seems to score a point.

The Chief Secretary: Have you any medical opinion to offer on that point?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, but it is common knowledge that when only dry feed is available for the dairy cattle the milk is affected as regards both quantity and quality. We know that as a general rule there is a shortage of milk in the metropolitan area towards the end of summer, due to the falling off in quantity. Butter tends to become rancid if kept for long but margarine remains edible, showing no change whatever in months or even years after manufacture. It is not necessary to keep margarine in a refrigerator, as in the case of butter.

These are interesting points and in addition, margarine can be fortified with vitamins to an extent which, I am assured, is not possible in the case of butter. The margarine manufactured in this State is fortified with certain vitamins, and it will be appreciated that it can be produced with the same vitamin content throughout the year, whereas the vitamin content of butter fluctuates with the season. The manager of one of the local margarine manufacturing concerns was discussing the respective merits of butter and margarine with a recent arrival from Holland, and was informed by the visitor that over the previous 15 years in Holland he had not tasted butter. The staple fat in that country would therefore appear to be margarine, and not butter.

Mr. Needham: Which vitamins are included in the margarine?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sufficiently well versed in the subject of vitamins to be able to say which are added, in what quantity or what would be their effects on the digestive system of the human being.

The Minister for Health: What is the difference in price between margarine and butter in Holland?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no idea.

The Minister for Health: That is one of the main points.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is possible that the same difference would apply in Holland as in Australia. As has been indicated, margarine retails for 2s. 6d., a lb. in this State, while the economic price of butter is 5s. a lb., so margarine is only half as dear as butter and has an appeal on that account. I assume that the Dutch people are concentrating on their export markets and may therefore use margarine so that as much butter as possible may be exported to the countries that are seeking it.

Ap[ro]pos of that, there need be no fear on the part of the member for Vasse or any other member regarding the welfare of the dairying industry in this State, in view of the enormous possibilities of our oversea markets. There is a tremendous market for butter in Great Britain and throughout the greater part of the world there is a shortage of fats which, as everyone knows, are an essential ingredient of human diet. I am not suggesting that we should deny the people of Western Australia, or of the Commonwealth of Australia, a butter diet, if that be their taste or within the scope of their pockets.

The Chief Secretary: What would you eat mostly, butter or margarine?

Mr. GRAHAM: Frankly, I am unable to say because at home I eat both, but chiefly margarine, and so far as the meals and lighter refreshments at Parliament House are concerned, sometimes we have margarine and sometimes we have butter.

Mr. Bovell: Shame on the House Committee!

Mr. GRAHAM: Very few members are able to detect the difference. As a matter of fact, at my table there is usually a contest between members, one trying to tip against the other as to what is served, butter or margarine.

Mr. Griffith: You ask the average mother and she will tell you which is the more nutritious.

Mr. Bovell: And which is more palatable too.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to go into the relative merits of the two commodities. All I am saying is that if there is a plate of margarine and a plate of butter put before the average person, it is impossible for him to tell the difference.

Mr. Bovell: It was not impossible for me to tell the difference on the day the House Committee gave an afternoon tea party. When I asked the steward whether it was butter or margarine, he declined to answer my question.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are rare occasions when margarine does not remain as pliable as butter and this is so in cold weather. One of the stewards made the unpardonable mistake, after having made the curls, of placing them in the refrigerator and of course that gave the whole show away. But when the weather is warm, or the margarine is kept in a warm place, it is almost impossible to tell the difference.

Mr. Bovell: That is proof that the substitute is inferior to the real product.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is nothing of the kind. All that it indicates is that there is a slightly different texture in the two products at the moment. But let me tell the member for Vasse that shortly some more modern machinery will be installed in Western Australia and some other fats of a more pliable nature will be introduced into the commodity. When that is done, whether it be summer or winter, it will be impossible to tell the difference.

Margarine will be manufactured with a harder or more brittle texture and it will be suitable for sending to the North-West, the Goldfields and other hotter areas, while in the colder parts the commodity will be more pliable and finer in texture, so that it will spread just as easily as butter. But, of course, that is of the future. I mention those several matters in passing to indicate the tremendous prejudice that there has been against margarine in the past. I repeat that this product is easy to fortify with vitamins and it can be brought up to a suitable standard.

The Minister for Health: You can always tell the difference when you are cutting it. You do not have to be a good housewife to tell that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not a housewife, but I suggest that the public of Western Australia, with whom we are primarily concerned, should be able to please itself

in the same way as members are able to please themselves. I understand that in Denmark, which is the greatest butter producing country in the world—the member for Hannans, who came here from the other side of the globe, said that they had the best butter, too, and I am unable to contest the point with him, although I know it is butter of a high standard—the people are the greatest consumers of margarine in the world.

Mr. Mann: How do you know that? Can you prove it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have certain statistics and figures before me and I am basing my statements on them. There are two companies producing margarine in Western Australia. One is a branch of an Eastern States firm and the other is purely of local origin. So far as the local firm is concerned, it does more than produce margarine; it produces a number of fruit syrups from pure fruits. That, of course, is assisting primary production and these syrups are used, largely, for flavouring milk drinks. When we realise that the firm's production is 60,000 gallons of fruit syrups each year, and taking a milk drink as using one pint of milk, we can appreciate the fact that thousands of gallons of milk are drunk through the agency of the syrups. We must bear in mind that the use of syrups for milk drinks is more or less seasonal and, incidentally, so is the production of margarine. During the summer months, for some unaccountable reason, the company does not produce as much margarine, and therefore the firm has a balanced production between the syrups and the margarine.

I want to emphasise the point of urgency, as I have done on previous occasions. One of the two companies operating here expects that it will cut out its full quota for the year by the end of next week, and the other firm will do the same shortly afterwards. Accordingly, there is considerable urgency so far as this measure is concerned, and I endeavoured to emphasise that point when seeking leave to press forward with my own measure. Within the next fortnight, at least one of the companies will be breaking the law unless we are able to hurry this measure through and similar action is taken in the Legislative Council; in any event, we are perilously close to the deadline, and that is a position which should not have been allowed to develop. As I have indicated on previous occasions, if for some reason this Bill is not passed in the next couple of weeks—and who knows, the Legislative Council may want to appoint a Select Committee to go into the matter—it will mean that the two companies will have to close their doors for the period between several weeks' time and the 31st December. Surely that is not fair to them and it would certainly be detrimental to the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Griffith: That is not going to happen, is it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know. Any man who can conjecture as to what the Legislative Council is likely to do knows far more than I do. If I may interpolate, if the member for Canning has the confidence of the Legislative Council, could he answer me yea or nay as to whether the rents and tenancies legislation will be passed.

Mr. Griffith: You stick to the Margarine Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that was a wise answer on the part of the hon. member. In New South Wales the quota of margarine has been doubled, which is approximately the position under the Bill before us. In Queensland the quota was increased by 150 per cent., and latterly the quota has been removed entirely to allow the Minister discretion to grant to any concern whatever quota he thinks fit. In Tasmania, so far as I am able to ascertain, it has always been at the discretion of the Minister and no definite limit has been placed in their legislation. As I indicated previously, that is what I think should be the position in Western Australia.

Might I suggest at this stage that I would like the Minister, when replying to the debate, to indicate what attitude might be adopted to the proposition that we do not specify any maximum in the Act, but leave it to the discretion of the Minister? I am making this submission to him seriously because we have almost been caught flat-footed at the present time owing to an insufficiency in the production of margarine. It could conceivably happen that in several years' time we shall be confronted with a somewhat similar situation. Surely there is no member in the Chamber who is not prepared to leave it to a Minister of any responsible Government, upon the advice of his chief officers, to determine that, because of certain exigencies, the production for the forthcoming year should be increased by a certain amount. It may be above or below what is set out in the Bill now. I would like to have some indication from the Minister on that suggestion.

Those are my principal observations on the measure. I conclude on the note that I do not want any member to draw the conclusion that I have no regard for the primary industries of this State, and particularly the dairying industry. I do not think, however, this is a measure on which we should take a narrow view and look at a group of primary producers or workers, but we should have some regard for the State as a whole. As I have some consideration for present trends when unfortunately a number of people are losing their employment this question of being able to obtain a satisfactory sub-

stitute, whether slightly better or slightly worse in nutritional value as a food, becomes one of increasing importance to those people who are out of work, and who rely to a great extent on social service benefits which are losing their value because of the inflationary trend.

We must have regard for the public as a whole and realise that we shall be doing an injustice and creating hardship in many homes unless we adopt a realistic attitude. Even if it were to have some slight effect on the dairying industry—which I do not for one moment contemplate happening—we should be prepared to face the problem, for the common good. A large quantity of butter has been imported into Western Australia. For instance, in the first six months of this year almost 3,000,000 lb. of butter was imported from the Eastern States. Surely that indicates that there can be another spread made available to the people without much harm being done to the dairying industry. When we have some regard to the strong demand by Great Britain for increased butter supplies, and the more or less untapped markets in other parts of the world where there is a shortage of food fats, we have nothing whatever to fear for the dairying industry. Above all else, to the extent that we produce less margarine in Western Australia than there is demand for, we are merely transferring the production of that commodity from Western Australia to another part of the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Lands: That is the point; we will transfer the production to the Eastern States.

Mr. Bovell: Do we get all the materials for the production of margarine from the Eastern States?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, we do.

Mr. Bovell: Then why split straws?

Mr. GRAHAM: We are obtaining far more butter than raw materials from the Eastern States.

Mr. Bovell: That is quite all right; that is a product of Australia.

Mr. GRAHAM: The vegetable oils are also a product of Australia. Instead of the workmen and workwomen in the two factories in Western Australia manufacturing margarine to meet the local demand, the product that he would be consuming locally would be manufactured by employees in the Eastern States. That is the only difference. Instead of the ingredients coming into this State, it would be the finished product, and so economically it would tend to go out of existence or be completely dominated by parallel industries in the Eastern States.

I am pleased to support the Bill. I ask the Minister to give consideration to my proposals which were to have been embodied in my Bill, but as I was prevented

on numerous occasions from proceeding when I so desired, the Government's measure is now before us and there is only one course to adopt, namely, to get the Minister to agree by appealing to him, as I do now, to amend the Bill to conform with my views. However, in any event, whether the Bill is passed in its present form or whether it is amended, it is still a step in the right direction and will give the public a food of some value at a price much less than they are called upon to pay now for butter.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse) [4.28]: The whole basis of Australia's national economy is primary production. In 1940, this Parliament decided that 364 tons of manufactured margarine was sufficient for the State's requirements. In 1945—I have not the figures for 1940, but they would be substantially the same as in 1945—the population of Western Australia was 490,088. There was no complaint then that there were insufficient supplies of margarine to meet the State's requirements. On the 31st March, 1952, the population was estimated at 596,509, which is an increase of approximately one-fifth. Therefore I consider that if the Government had a case—I do not believe it has—for the introduction of a Bill to increase the supplies of manufactured margarine in Western Australia, the absolute permissible increase under the Bill should be one-fifth of the quota approved in 1940.

Over the last few months I have taken particular care to visit stores in the city, and only yesterday I went into Boan's Ltd. and saw there on display three different brands of margarine, namely, "Meadow-Lea," "Kaseley's" and "Snowflake". Therefore I would say that the supply of margarine is greatly in excess of the demand. It appears to me that the Bill will encourage a substitute against a primary product that we have endeavoured to establish in this country for a number of years. The late Sir James Mitchell had vision and foresight when he went to England in 1919 or 1920 and secured a loan at a very low rate of interest in order that a migration scheme could be inaugurated with Great Britain and that the migrants would be employed in the development of the dairying industry here. At that time I was a young lad in Busselton, and the dairying industry was in its extreme infancy. Through the vision of that great Western Australian, the group settlement scheme was commenced and it proved an undoubted success in relation to the national economy of the State.

Mr. Styants: It proved a sink for public money.

Mr. BOVELL: It created and established a primary industry, the production of which replaced supplies that we normally

relied upon other countries, including the Eastern States, to provide. In 1948 I quoted figures in this House showing that at that time Western Australia produced enough butter for its own requirements but that, owing to the extended use of milk and milk products, butter supplies had decreased. Let me emphasise this point, in relation to which I quoted figures in the House the other day: There are fewer producers today in Western Australia producing more commodities from the dairying industry, such as milk, butter and cheese, than obtained in 1945. There is no other industry, primary or secondary, to which any member can point in connection with which those engaged in it have decreased in number and yet the quantity of the commodity produced has increased. That is the position with the dairying industry.

Mr. Styants: Because the farmers modernised their plants.

Mr. BOVELL: They certainly modernised their plants, but they also showed what could be done by a united effort to assist the country's national economy. On the 31st March, 1945, there were 13,028 persons engaged in the dairying industry and on the 31st March, 1951, there were 12,126, showing a decrease of 902. In 1944-45, 9,282,761 gallons of wholemilk were produced and the output of milk for manufacturing purposes, including that required for butter, cheese and so forth, was 31,133,239 gallons. In 1950-51, when there were 902 fewer persons engaged in the industry, the wholemilk supply had increased by over 3,000,000 gallons to a total of 12,967,784 gallons, and the milk supplied for manufacturing purposes increased by over 7,000,000 gallons, to an aggregate of 38,321,325 gallons. I think that furnishes evidence that the dairy farmers of this State have pulled their weight under adverse conditions. The labour position in the country districts is most difficult.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: But butter production has gone down.

Mr. BOVELL: The overall production has risen.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: No, it is going down.

Mr. BOVELL: That is not so, according to the figures provided in the answer to my question.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: I do not know about that, but you should read the latest report furnished by the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. BOVELL: I have accepted the official figures quoted by the Minister for Lands, representing the Minister for Agriculture, when he submitted them in this House on the 26th August last. Those are the figures I have just related to the House. Now a Bill has been introduced in this Chamber to threaten those who

have proved themselves conscientious workers in an industry that needs building up. The Bill will threaten their very existence. I repeat that primary production is the basis on which our national economy is built. Protection must be afforded to all primary industries if we as a nation are to survive.

The member for East Perth referred to certain difficulties that families experience in purchasing butter at the increased price. I would remind the House that butter is included in the "C" series index upon which the basic wage is computed, and therefore the matter of cost to the consumer is taken into account in the basic wage adjustment. I agree there may be some difficulty as regards old-age and invalid pensioners, but at the same time I claim the economy of the country should not be threatened by the use of a substitute to overcome those particular difficulties. They could be overcome in another direction altogether.

We must protect our primary industries. Let us consider how secondary industries are protected. Throughout the Commonwealth secondary industry is protected by very high tariff barriers. I believe that to be in the interests of the workers of the nation and I support those tariff barriers. On the other hand, I claim we must protect the foundation upon which our national economy is built. We can not afford to white-ant the basis of our national prosperity and progress by encouraging a substitute such as the production of margarine. Actually, the primary production system of Australia has experienced a rather severe setback in consequence of the Pollard agreement with Great Britain concerning the 7½ per cent. increase or decrease in our saleable product oversea. I believe that at the time Mr. Pollard entered into the agreement he did so in the belief that it was in the best interests of the producers, but it has proved otherwise. We have been kept more or less to the conditions of the agreement, which has proved detrimental to the primary producers of this country.

We must build up oversea markets at a payable price in order to protect our national income. Many millions of pounds have been spent to find a substitute for wool, but if it were not for the sheep's back Australia would be bankrupt and there would be no employment for anyone. That primary industry has been built up to such an extent in past years that we have relied on the wool clip, and also our export of wheat. We must build up our other primary industries, including dairying, to provide us with a national income, which is the life blood of our very existence. The Bill is not in the best interests of the State as a whole, and I oppose it. I will have nothing whatever to do with it because there is no reason why there should be such a big increase

in the production of margarine. In 1940 the permissible amount was 364 tons, and the Bill seeks to increase it to 800 tons.

Mr. Graham: Was not there difficulty in exporting our butter at that time?

Mr. BOVELL: I am talking of conditions now. Every member in this Parliament representing a country constituency would be betraying his trust if he voted for the Bill.

HON. E. NULSEN (Eyre) [4.42]: For a start, I refuse to call this commodity margarine because it has always been known to me as mar-j-arine. I have been in business for a long time and sold hundreds of pounds of margarine, and I have come in contact with all classes of people—doctors, lawyers, miners and so on—and they have always called it mar-j-arine. The word mar-g-arine sounds a little affected to me, and I refuse to call this commodity margarine. I am glad the Bill has been brought down. I represent a country constituency and my sympathies are with the primary producer who is the economic backbone of the State, as he is, of course, of the other States, but particularly of Western Australia. I feel, however, that butter at present is too dear for some people. It costs 4s. 2d. a lb. as against 2s. 6d. for margarine.

As far as I can learn, margarine is quite as nutritious as butter and has the same vitamin content. Because of the huge difference of 1s. 8d. a lb., we should give consideration to this measure. I blame Governments to some extent for the position of the dairying industry because, had the dairy farmers been put on a better business basis and given a better economic opportunity to develop their farms, their turnover would be greater and, in consequence, their costs lower. Quite a number of dairy farms in Western Australia have only 25 to 30 head of cows to milk. That is not sufficient. Every dairy farmer should have at least 40, and a more economical basis would be 50.

It behoves the Government to give these people a better turnover and so reduce their costs and ultimately bring down the price of butter. The present quota of margarine—364 tons—is not sufficient. I agree with the member for East Perth that it would be better to give the Minister discretionary power in regard to this commodity. The amount in the Bill is 800 tons but that might not be sufficient, in which case the Minister should have power to increase it. I have quite a number of workers in my constituency, particularly on the Goldfields, and they find it difficult to buy butter, which is about 4s. 4d. a lb. there. That is the price at Norseman. Margarine at Norseman is 2s. 7d. a lb., so the difference is 1s. 9d., which is considerable. In consequence, these people might like to have half butter and half mar-

garine. If a person wishes to use margarine, why should he not be allowed to do so? Why should we be one-eyed?

We recognise the importance of the primary producer, but we should be just and impartial by giving everyone an opportunity to study their pockets and to use margarine if they so desire. The member for East Perth has pointed out that the nutritional value and the vitamin content of margarine are equal to that of butter. If that be so, the use of margarine on the Goldfields will not be detrimental to the people there. Another advantage this commodity has is that it can be transported without refrigeration. Butter sent to the Goldfields either turns rancid or melts, if it is in bulk, unless it comes in refrigerated vans. If margarine is required in this State, and we do not produce it, it will be imported from the Eastern States. Why import it when it can be manufactured here? Consideration should be given to that aspect.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: That is a strong point.

Hon. E. NULSEN: I have not much more to say on mar-g-arine—I mean mar-j-arine. For the last 40 or 50 years it has been called mar-j-arine, but now we look at a dictionary and find it should be called mar-g-arine, I refuse to call it mar-g-arine. If we had a surplus of butter in Western Australia we would have no trouble in exporting it. It would be of great benefit to this State if we could produce a substitute for the item that we now consume and if that item could be exported thus helping to balance our imports.

I hope the Bill will be passed because it will be of benefit to most people in this State and will not, as the member for Vasse has tried to point out, adversely affect our primary producers. If I thought the fears of the member for Vasse were well founded, I would not support the Bill even if it conferred some benefit on a few of my electors. But I am perfectly satisfied that the Bill will not be detrimental to the primary producers. I feel that if we can consume more margarine it will be of greater benefit, ultimately, to this State because, as I said, we will then be able to export more butter.

I am sure that the pensioners will appreciate this move because there has been very little increase in their pensions, even though the cost of living has risen considerably. It must be most difficult for these people to buy butter when they have such small sums of money at their disposal. The member for East Perth pointed out that margarine has the same nutritional value as butter and consequently pensioners will derive the same benefit from eating margarine as they will from eating butter. So I hope that the Bill will get the support to which it is entitled and that it will be of benefit to everybody throughout the State.

MR. GRIFFITH (Canning) [4.53]: I want to make one or two observations in connection with the Bill and, at the outset, to say that I support it. Also, I wholeheartedly agree with the pronunciation of the word as used by the member for Eyre. The use of a hard "g" in the word margarine makes it sound so harsh that it could not spread under any conditions.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I think you are right, too.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The member for East Perth has some fears in connection with this Bill. I want to attempt to allay one particular fear and at the same time defend the Government to some extent from some of his criticism. Recently the hon. member stated that he did not think the Government acted quickly enough in dealing with this matter. When the member for East Perth applied for leave to introduce his own Bill, he used these words—

When I gave notice of my intention to move for leave I had no idea that the Government intended to do anything about the matter. As a fact I did have the idea that perhaps a private member on the Government side of the House intended to do something along these lines because I understood that he had had a discussion with representatives of one of the margarine manufacturing firms in this State.

The hon. member may, or may not, have been referring to me; he is not in his seat at the moment, but I think he was referring to me. I did have discussions with representatives of one of the margarine manufacturing firms in this State, and my reason for doing so was because my attention had been drawn to the fact that there was a possibility of the margarine manufacturing firms using up their quotas before anything could be done to increase them. Many weeks ago I brought this matter under the notice of the Minister for Agriculture. I discussed the proposition with him, and told him I was of the opinion that the firms were running a risk of their quotas cutting out because of the contemplated increase in the price of butter, and I thought something would have to be done about it.

At that time, the Minister for Agriculture told me—this was prior to the end of June of this year—that he had the matter well in hand and the Government was discussing the proposal to introduce a Bill to amend the Margarine Act. Some time afterwards I wrote to the Minister for Agriculture pointing out certain matters in regard to quotas, and asked him to reply and indicate the Government's intention. The Minister for Agriculture replied to me on the 21st July and his letter reads as follows:—

I acknowledge your letter of the 15th inst. and have to advise that I have been closely watching the margarine position for some time.

The latest returns show that for six months Kaseley's have manufactured 42 tons of their quota of 130 tons and the Meadow Lea Company have made 70 tons of their quota of 234 tons. Consequently, both have a considerable leeway to make up before the end of the year, Kaseley's having 88 tons and Meadow Lea 164 tons to make in six months.

If found necessary I am prepared to arrange for the introduction of a Bill to provide for increased quotas. Lack of materials could be limiting the output and I have been informed that vegetable oils are in short supply and have offered to take this question up with the Eastern States suppliers with a view to obtaining a greater quota for this State, but I have not yet been advised that it is necessary for this Department to interfere.

I think that shows quite clearly that the Government had the matter well in hand. As a private member, looking after the interests of people in my district, I brought this question under the Minister's notice, but it was quite obvious that discussions had already taken place as to the introduction of amending legislation. I venture to say that the greatest disappointment suffered by the member for East Perth was that he found that the Government had the matter in hand and that he was not able to score by introducing his own Bill.

I do not agree with the member for Vasse. If we were to adopt his viewpoint, and not amend the parent Act, we would simply leave the way open for the local firms to import from the Eastern States as much margarine as they needed. What good would that do? By amending the Act in this way, and providing for an increased quota of up to 800 tons annually, we will give the local manufactures—despite the fact that they have to import the ingredients—the opportunity to manufacture a commodity and sell it to our own people. I think that is very desirable.

The biggest worry of the member for East Perth is that the margarine manufacturers are going to be left flat on their feet, to use his own expression. He is concerned, and has asked the Minister to indicate when he replies as to whether he would be prepared to allow this Bill to be left open and, at the discretion of the Minister, have a quota proclaimed for each year. May I point out, or may I agree, that if it had not been for the increased price of butter there probably would not have been the necessity for the introduction of this Bill because it is the pockets of the people, who cannot afford to purchase butter at 4s. 2d. a lb., and who are looking for a cheaper commodity, which have to be considered?

I do not agree with the member for East Perth when he says margarine is as good as butter, but nevertheless the people

are trying to find a commodity which will suit their pocket and at the same time will be a reasonably palatable one. I would like again to draw attention to the letter written to me by the Minister for Agriculture which shows that the Meadow-Lea company had 70 tons only of their quota of 234 tons made up in July, and the other company 42 tons out of 130 tons. That leaves 88 tons for Kaseley's and 164 tons for Meadow-Lea to be made in the six months to complete the year ending the 31st December. It has been pointed out by the member for East Perth that these two companies are now on the verge of taking up the whole of their quota.

I naturally cannot say what is going to be done with this Bill when it gets to the Legislative Council; I do not know whether it will be passed as we present it to that House. Nor do I know whether the Bill of the member for East Perth will be passed in the form in which he wishes it to be presented to another place, and he does not know what will happen, either. If the Legislative Council saw fit not to pass the Bill, where does the member for East Perth suggest we go from there? I am hoping that the Legislative Council will adopt a commonsense point of view in this matter and that it will ultimately pass this Bill.

Mr. J. Hegney: Do you not think the Legislative Council always adopts a commonsense view?

Mr. GRIFFITH: If the hon. member had as much commonsense as some of the members of the Legislative Council this House might be very much better off!

Mr. J. Hegney: Thank you very much!

Mr. GRIFFITH: The hon. member asked for that; he is always asking for it and I do not give it to him until he does ask for it. Before I was interrupted by the member for Middle Swan I was about to say, in order to allay the fear of the member for East Perth who is somewhat frightened that the local manufacturers' quotas will cut out in about a week's time and that they might be left flat on their feet, and for his benefit, now that he has returned to the Chamber, that I cannot tell what another place is likely to do with this Bill, nor can the member for East Perth tell me what it would do with his Bill if he introduced it? I did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. Graham: I did not say a thing.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I beg the hon. member's pardon. If he cannot give the House an assurance—and I know he cannot because he posed that question to me, and neither of us can give the House an assurance that this Bill will be passed by another place; and the same applies to the hon. member's Bill—then where do we go from here?

Mr. Graham: The difference is that had my Bill been passed six weeks ago the companies could have allocated their production over the year; since then they have been producing at a tremendous rate.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I regret that I have to repeat some of my remarks for the benefit of the member for East Perth as he was not in his place when I made them.

Mr. Rodoreda: He can read them in "Hansard."

Mr. GRIFFITH: I have listened to the member for Pilbara repeat himself on a thousand occasions, and whether he likes it or not he is going to listen to me; if he does not like it, he can go out and have a cup of tea. For the benefit of the member for East Perth I pointed out that these two manufacturing companies had not taken up anywhere near the total amount of their quota in July of this year. When the member for East Perth said the other day that he expected an amending Bill to come from a private member on the Government side I imagine he was referring to me, because I had conversations with one of the manufacturing firms, and I do not think there is any shadow or doubt that he got that from the manufacturing firms concerned; he rang those firms up and they said that I had discussed this matter with them. I do not think the hon. member will contradict that.

Mr. Graham: That is quite right.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The point I wish to make is that the accusation that the Government had fallen down on the job was made by the hon. member. I submit that the Government did not and that it knew what it was doing all through the piece. I am not going to read this letter again because it might upset the member for Pilbara, but the Minister for Agriculture wrote me a letter in reply to mine of the 15th of July, and many weeks prior to that I had a verbal conversation with him and asked him his intentions in this matter. He said that the situation was under control and that he would introduce a Bill when the time was ripe.

Mr. Graham: I was not aware of that, naturally.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The hon. member may not have been aware of that, but he seemed to be well aware of the Government's Bill; he is well aware of certain points but not of others. I do not think the member for East Perth need have any fear that the margarine manufacturers are going to be left flat on their feet. May I point this out to him? If the Bill does not go through in another place, those manufacturers are not going to be any better off and nobody can alter that, either by the Bill introduced by the member for East Perth or by the one now before us.

Mr. Graham: Oh, yes, they would be.

Mr. GRIFFITH: That may or may not be so.

Mr. Graham: You see, one manufacturer that the hon. member mentioned produced over 100,000 lb. of margarine, but he has only about 68,000 lb. left before they cut out their entire annual quota.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Could the hon. member tell me this? How is he to get the Bill passed by another place when it is still on the Address-in-reply?

Mr. Graham: By suspending Standing Orders, as it did with the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. GRIFFITH: That may be! That is another thing the hon. member cannot guarantee.

Mr. Graham: One cannot guarantee anything.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Yes, of course.

Mr. Graham: But you have got to give it a go.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I think we have every right to presume that the Bill will pass through another place in its present form or in an amended form. If we think that no legislation will go through another place, we are simply wasting our time here discussing it.

Mr. W. Hegney: The hon. member is showing to the people of the State that there is minority rule.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The member for Pilbara said he had heard something four times, but I have heard that remark 400 times since I have been here. If the Bill does go through, I would draw the attention of the member for East Perth to this fact: There need not be any fear of the production of 800 tons, as mentioned in the Bill, being insufficient because under the provisions of the legislation the Minister has power to issue a license to increase the quota to the 31st December this year, and on the 1st January, 1953, the company will apply for a new license for a maximum of 800 tons and therefore, between now and any time in January, the manufacturing firms may produce 1,200 tons of margarine, so I am sure even on the guesswork of the member for East Perth, and that is what he bases his figures of consumption on—

Mr. Graham: It was not my guesswork.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The hon. member assumed—

Mr. Graham: I did not assume anything; it was an estimate by the representatives of the firm concerned.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Even if their estimate is correct, they have plenty of time and sufficient of the quota left between now and the beginning of the new year. Parliament will again sit in July, as it normally does and, in the event of the Government's finding that the quota is insufficient, there is good and proper time for it to have

another look at the legislation. If one were to take the lid off the whole thing and leave it to the discretion of the Minister, it is going to have an undesirable effect on the dairy farmer who will simply say, "Well, the lid has been taken right off margarine production; what incentive have we got?"

Mr. Graham: Well, the lid is off now.

Mr. GRIFFITH: It is only off because of imports.

Mr. Graham: They will still come in.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Yes, but we cannot overlook the fact that at least the State manufacturing firms will know they are limited to 800 tons. I think the Government has done the right thing and I will support the Bill.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville) [5.12]: I wish to make a few observations on the margarine Bill.

Mr. Graham: With a soft or a hard "g"?

Mr. JOHNSON: With the kind of "g" I have used, but I do not wish to speak as a member for the dairying districts as has the member for Vasse. I could not help noticing that he was so incensed about allowing a further increase in the production of this product that he spoke with a degree of warmth not used by any of the other speakers. I am not speaking as a mouthpiece for the manufacturers because I have not contacted any of them in any capacity but I wish to put before the House the results of my research into this subject in my own district.

To assure members who represent dairying districts that an increase in the manufacture of margarine of any quantity would not affect the butter sales, I have made inquiries among the majority of shops in Leederville who sell both products. I find that the experience of the managers and proprietors of those shops is that there is such an extreme preference for butter that they have, practically without exception, assured me that given a cooking butter at a price comparable with margarine or even considerably greater than margarine, butter would sell in preference to margarine.

Mr. Hearman: Are you suggesting that there is a strong demand for cooking butter?

Mr. JOHNSON: There is a strong demand for butter that can be used for cooking purposes.

Mr. Hearman: You are suggesting that it be used?

Mr. JOHNSON: I am suggesting that it should. I make that suggestion based on my observations from the people who handle the product in all the shops that I entered. I asked them a series of questions. The first one was: "Can you get enough margarine to supply the

demand for it?" I found that the majority opinion was that at the moment—that is within the last two or three weeks—they have been able to supply the local demand but even so there are certain shops, which normally deal in both products, that still complain they cannot satisfy the demand for margarine because of insufficient supplies.

I am inclined to the opinion that the quota of 800 tons per annum is probably not enough, and for that reason I favour the suggestion put forward by the member for East Perth that no quota be fixed in the Bill. In the places where I was seeking information, I found that the three brands of margarine mentioned by the member for Vasse are available in very few places. One of the three that he mentioned—Snowflake—is not labelled "Table Margarine." It is marked "Cooking Margarine" and does not appear to be available in many shops. The two table margarines are sold in fair quantities and the opinion of shopkeepers is that although it is labelled "Table Margarine," very little of it gets on the table.

Mr. Needham: Is there any difference in price?

Mr. JOHNSON: Although the price of table margarine is 2s. 6d. per lb. and that of butter 4s. 2d. per lb. I am assured that in practically every shop in my district the proprietors are of the opinion that very little of that margarine goes on the table. By all shopkeepers I was told that one or two customers say they mix margarine with butter; particularly those people with large families. I am of the opinion that the breakfast toast of a number of families is probably spread with margarine and not butter. However, I am convinced that the greatest amount of margarine today is used for cooking, especially for cakes and pastry.

The opinion expressed in general is that the supply of margarine that is used in greater quantities now is being used for that purpose. There may be some connection between that and the current fact that the backyard fowl is producing more eggs than she did in the lean season of a short time ago. The making of cakes and pastry absorbs other primary products. The majority of people in my area cannot afford to make a great number of cakes with butter at its present expensive price. They are, however, making an increased quantity of pastry by using more eggs and with the use of the cheaper product, margarine.

I have also found that there are other fats available for cooking in the shops. There is one white substance which sells in fairly limited quantities known as copha, although the price is closely comparable with margarine. Another white substance, lard, which is in considerable demand, has practically disappeared from the

shops. Apparently lard is preferred by a great number of housewives to margarine or butter for the baking of certain types of pastries, but where it has gone nobody seems to know. I presume that lard is still made and must be exported. Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult to get.

Perhaps the Minister for Agriculture could have investigations made into the question of lard supplies, because it is a primary product and the interests of the consumers should be protected. Opinion has been expressed that margarine, being cheaper than butter, is being used by pensioners but my inquiries, both from the shopkeepers and the pensioners, reveal that there is no support for that theory. Pensioners at present seem to buy less butter. Instead of buying a pound of butter at a time, as they were in the habit of doing, they are now buying only half a pound because of the increased price. I made inquiries in every shop I entered and could not find any evidence of pensioners buying any quantity of margarine worth mentioning. As I said earlier, there is a very strong preference for butter. The price factor is an important one, but the butter preference is so great that, even with its price one-and-a-half times that of margarine, the preference for butter still exists.

On making inquiries from people in the wholesale catering trade, I was informed that, in providing supplies for wedding parties and other celebrations, considerable use is made of margarine. I understand that it is mixed with butter to give a product that spreads easily and will maintain an even spread in any temperature and under any conditions. This was the practice of the trade even when the prices of the two products were almost identical. In these instances, the price factor is not the consideration; the point is that the mixture gives a more suitable product for this type of business.

I consider that the manufacture of margarine should be permitted to a greater extent than 800 tons a year for the reason that some employment is created in providing it. If the margarine quota is too low, we shall have importations from the Eastern States, and the employment thus represented will be denied to our people. I am also of opinion that even an unlimited supply of margarine in the State would not materially affect the sales of butter. What affects the sales of butter is not the competition of margarine, but the price of butter; and it behoves the Government and those engaged in the dairying industry to take such steps as will bring butter within the price-range that customers can manage.

This will not be accomplished by placing a limit on the quantity of substitutes that may be manufactured. Generally speaking, people do not like substitutes;

they prefer butter, but they want it at a price they can afford. The answer is to make butter available at a cheaper price, not increase the provision of substitutes. The matter of taste is important. The people need a supply of real fat; if they cannot get butter, they must use a substitute, but I assure members, even those representing primary producing areas, that the butter preference is very strong, and that those who fear that margarine will cut into the sales of butter are being misled by a bogey.

Members representing country areas should take steps to ensure that the dairying industry is made more attractive and that butter is provided at a cheaper price. If the industry cannot be made competitive, they should persuade the dairymen to transfer to a more attractive industry. I spent several of my school years in a dairying district and, in my opinion, dairying is not the most attractive method of making a living on the land.

The land now devoted to dairying could be used for the production of meat, to the great benefit of the people on the farms in that they would have their week-ends free. There could be an increase in quite a number of our vegetable products. I consider that the supply of potatoes and onions could be increased, that more tobacco leaf could be grown, and that other variants could be produced if dairy farmers found it impossible to supply butter at a price the people could afford to pay. There is another course which might be adopted and which I feel sure the Government has not in mind, and that is to increase the basic wage to such an extent as to permit the people's butter preference to over-ride their necessity for using a cheaper substitute.

I should like to comment on some of the statements made by the member for Vasse. One of them was that there had been no complaints in 1945 about the shortage of margarine. I am reminded that the member for Vasse is not a married man; had he been married, he would have been aware of the difficulty of obtaining a sufficiency of edible fats at that time.

Mr. Bovell: You are not envious of my position in that respect, are you?

Mr. JOHNSON: No.

Mr. Bovell: It sounded very much like it.

Mr. JOHNSON: I was trying to give the hon. member a little publicity so that he could join us in the enviable state. The knowledge we have that there was a complaint in 1945 destroys the argument that a one-fifth increase in population is a sound reason for not increasing the margarine supply by more than a fifth. Had there been no complaint at that time, I would agree with him, but I do not think his argument holds water. I am further reminded that people in the butter producing areas are somewhat envious of their brother dairy farmers in the wholemilk

areas. The majority of them would prefer to supply milk for the wholemilk trade in preference to the butter trade; and I even believe they would prefer the cheese trade to the butter trade. Members from dairying districts may be able to put that point more clearly. The fact mentioned by the member for Canning that the supplies were not up to the quota in July does not indicate that the amount manufactured then was sufficient, because at that time shopkeepers were having more inquiries than they could satisfy.

Mr. Needham: And butter was cheaper.

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes.

Mr. Griffith: The output at that time was limited by lack of material.

Mr. JOHNSON: I think that is the fact.

Mr. Griffith: Had the material been available, tons of margarine could have been manufactured.

Mr. JOHNSON: I agree with that.

Mr. Graham: More margarine was produced in July than in any previous month of this year.

Mr. JOHNSON: I agree with that point, but had the supply been greater prior to July we would have been in a far worse position at the moment, because the quota of margarine for the year would have been completely used up by then. I shall conclude by referring to one more statement by the member for Vasse, namely, that the Bill threatens the dairying industry. I feel I have shown quite clearly that what threatens the dairying industry is not margarine, but the price of butter. The Bill does not threaten the cows or the bulls.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melyille) [5.33]: I feel it is incumbent on me, as a former Minister for Agriculture, to make some remarks on this proposal. It was my duty, during the term of a previous Government, to give consideration to this question at different Agricultural Council conferences, and there was in those days a wide divergence of opinion about the steps that should be taken. I have given the matter careful thought, and I believe the Bill is necessary and is a step in the right direction. I ask the member for Vasse to take a realistic view of the subject.

Mr. Bovell: I am taking a long-range view of it.

HON. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, and that is precisely what I want the hon. member to do, and not be fearful at the outset that this is a serious threat to the dairying industry. This is not a subject we ought to deal with extempore, as it requires a certain amount of research and consideration in order that we may come to a fair conclusion. Before the war, margarine sold at about half the price of butter. I might interpolate here that it matters little to me whether we call it

margarine or "marjarine." Webster's dictionary allows both pronunciations, and I propose to call it "marjarine."

Mr. Bovell: We agree on that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The price of butter today even with the aid of a heavy subsidy—a very heavy subsidy—is a long way in advance of that of margarine, which receives no subsidy at all. It is somewhat remarkable that in Denmark, a country that goes in largely for the production of butter, the people use very little butter, but they consume no less than 30 lb. per head per year of margarine. I ask the member for Vasse to reflect upon that. For years Denmark has gone in extensively for dairying, and has produced fine-quality butter, but it consumes very little of that commodity.

The Minister for Health: It exports butter.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Of course.

Mr. Bovell: Those people are denying themselves. You do not want the workers of this country to deny themselves butter.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is all a question of economics.

Mr. Bovell: With that, I agree.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The people of Denmark consume not less than 30 lb. per head per year of margarine.

Mr. Bovell: But the Pollard agreement is not economically sound for us.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Australia uses about 1 lb. per head per year of margarine; America about 5½ lb.; Canada, 3½ lb.; and England, 13 lb.;—about as much as it does of butter. It has been claimed recently that in making butter the best part of the milk, instead of being used, is wasted. There is a school of thought which holds that if we increase the consumption of milk in Australia by one pint per head per day, we will do far more than if we endeavour to provide our people with all the butter they need, because they will get greater nutritional value in that way.

One more important fact which must be kept in mind that the world is requiring an ever-increasing quantity of edible fats and the dairying industries of the world are incapable of keeping pace with the demand, because world production of butter is falling. It has been said, as a result of an authoritative survey by the United Nations Organisation, that the standard of living in any country is closely related to the consumption of edible fats. That is to say, in a country where the consumption of edible fats is high, the standard of living is high; and in a country where the consumption of edible fats is low, the general standard of living is low.

If that is so and the world production of butter is falling it must be remembered that the number of mouths to be fed is increasing daily by 70,000, according to what was revealed by a United Nations survey in 1946, and that by 1960, in order to maintain the present standard of living and feed the then expected population there will have to be an increase of 34 per cent. in the production of edible fats above the present rate. The dairying industry just cannot do it and so we must look elsewhere to see what can be done to meet the situation. Excluding Russia and the satellite countries, the world production of margarine has increased by approximately 86 per cent. from 1.25 million tons in 1938 to 2.33 million tons at the present day. During the same period butter production has fallen by 16 per cent. from 3.93 million tons to 3.3 million tons.

There can be only one answer to that. The dairying industries in other countries with their subsidies have had their opportunity, but butter production has fallen. One obvious reason for that is the difference in the uses to which milk is put and we have not far to go in this State to see that. The Milk Board is reaching out more and more to get supplies of whole-milk. We set up milk bars and introduce all sorts of cool drinks—as well as beverages in the home—that require the use of milk and so, with the greater consumption of milk, it follows that there is a lessened production of butter.

Mr. Bovell: But we have new dairy lands that can be used.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then what have we been doing with them? We must examine the trend not over one or two years but over a long period. I will repeat that excluding Russia and the satellite countries—we do not know much about what is happening there—world production of margarine has increased by approximately 86 per cent., despite restrictions, from 1.25 million tons in 1938 to 2.33 million tons at the present time, and during the same period butter production has fallen by 16 per cent. from 3.93 million tons to 3.3 million tons, and there is the story; restrictions on the production of margarine but, in spite of that, an 86 per cent. increase in production; subsidies for butter production, but a decrease of 16 per cent. With 70,000 more mouths to feed each day and the standard of living being closely related to the consumption of edible fats there is only one answer.

We must provide some source of edible fats other than butter because the dairying industry is not producing what is required. We can take other arguments such as that in making butter we do not use the best elements of the milk, which are wasted, and so it would be better for us to encourage the consumption of milk rather than the consumption of butter.

Mr. Bovell: On that argument you would encourage the substitutes for wool because there is not enough wool in the world.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am talking about margarine, butter and milk, not wool.

Mr. Bovell: The position is the same.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I thought there was enough wool in the world. A year or two ago the then Minister for Agriculture—unfortunately he has since died—made a prophecy with which I strongly disagreed at the time. The Minister for Lands will remember that I made some comments on the statement when it was made and I desire now to show how wide of the mark it was. The then Minister, the late Hon. G. B. Wood, was opening a modern milk treatment plant built by Kielmans Prop. Ltd. at Victoria Park and had this to say—

The milk industry was now in a better position than ever before. At least 90 per cent. of the producers were satisfied and milk consumption was rising steadily.

The chairman of the Milk Board, Mr. Stannard, said that the plant complied in all respects with the board's standards. It would ensure clean milk and clean milk was safe milk.

The plant has a pasteurising capacity of 250 to 300 gallons per hour. It is automatic and includes steam cleaners for cans and bottles and filling and sealing machines.

That was propaganda in support of the consumption of wholemilk. The Minister had this to say—

He believed that in a year or two the State would have more milk than it would know what to do with.

Of course I said at the time that that statement was foolish, as it has now proved to be. Instead of having more milk than we know what to do with we are scratching round looking for supplies, because we have more mouths to feed. The demand for milk all over the world, owing to the increase in the standard of living, is far outstripping supplies. The cow is not mechanical and, although science has enabled us to improve the capacity of the animal to produce and better breeding has encouraged an increase in the production per cow, we cannot get sufficient farms going and sufficient cows in production on them to supply the ever-increasing demand for milk products. I believe there will be an even greater demand for wholemilk in future than exists at present, due to wider use in the home owing to a higher standard of living in many homes.

The Minister for Lands: We were told about 18 months ago that our metropolitan and suburban population had increased by 29,000.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is one reason for the greater demand for milk, and the Milk Board naturally goes further afield to ensure that there will be an adequate supply of milk for consumers. When they are doing that they are not concerned whether it is reducing the butter production, but inevitably it is. In England, this year, they had to reduce the ration of butter from 3 oz. to 2 oz. per person per week, the reason being a falling off in the supply from Denmark and the almost negligible quantities coming from Australia. A ration of 2 oz. per head per week seems ridiculous but that is brought about, not because the demand is not there but because the supply is falling off. We would be just too stupid if we did not permit of any increase in the manufacture of edible fat in Western Australia, when we knew that we could not supply our milk requirements here and our supplies of butter to the United Kingdom were negligible. There is such a big field already open to the dairying industry to produce to its maximum capacity that it need not fear any threat from margarine production.

It will take all we know, both in the production of edible oils and the production of butter, to meet the requirements of the people who have to be fed. The task of this world in the future will be to feed the people. All the time we are advocating an increased standard of living and each in his different sphere is doing his utmost to bring that about. We ask for higher wages in order that these wages will buy more and better food, and a better variety of food and we are trying to do that in other countries as well as our own. We are trying to bring it about in India and in the islands north of Australia. Every step we take in that direction imposes a greater task upon the world to feed those people at that higher standard. We will not do that if we put restrictions upon this commodity and upon that commodity.

I would say that there is ample scope in this world for all the dairy farmers who want to produce butter to do so without being fearful, in the slightest degree, of any competition from margarine. We will have to go all out throughout the world to step up the production of butter, step up the production of milk and the production of edible oils. It is a well known fact that per acre of ground one can produce a lot more edible oil than one can produce milk or butter. It is that knowledge which enables us to believe that it will be possible, using both butter and margarine, to meet the needs of the people throughout the world. And I come back to this point: That the United Nations Organisation, by a very careful survey, has come to the conclusion that the standard of living is closely related to the supply of edible fats. Are we going to limit the supply of edible fats and so limit an increase in the standard of living? I hope the house will pass the Bill.

MR. STYANTS (Kalgoorlie) [5.55]: I can remember the circumstances which surrounded the introduction of a Bill to control the manufacture of margarine in this State. Conditions in those days were entirely different from what they are now. At that time the dairying industry was in the doldrums, due largely to the lack of profitable overseas markets and the lack of finance for the development of properties in this State. I do not think the member for Vasse need fear that the members on this side of the House have no consideration for the welfare of dairy farmers, because a Labour Government introduced the Bill to limit the manufacture of margarine in this State and that was done to safeguard the interests of the dairying industry. At that time there was an abundance of butter available and at a reasonable price, but today we find the position is in reverse. The more butter we use the less there is to export, and consequently we have less credit in our overseas accounts.

The member for Vasse also claims that the dairying industry is the only one in Australia which, in recent years, showed a greater production with a lesser number of men employed. Apparently he has not looked at the statistics of the gold-mining industry. The output of gold-bearing stone is much greater per man today than it was ten years ago. Of course, that has been brought about largely by the modernisation of the plant used in the industry. The hon. member knows the dairying industry well because he has lived all his life in the South-West, and he must realise that there has been considerable mechanisation of the dairying industry within recent years.

Mr. Bovell: It is still a 7-day a week job.

Mr. Styants: Yes, I realise that the cows do not go on strike each seventh day and that they require attention every day of the week; that is definitely a tie to anyone who takes on that work. It is a 7-day a week job but it is not the arduous drudgery that it was 15 or 20 years ago. Even 10 years ago the same primitive methods of taking and handling the milk were in use as had been in operation 35 or 40 years before. When I was a boy in the South-West I had to milk six or seven cows each morning before I walked three miles to the nearest school and the same primitive conditions existed in the industry until the last few years.

Now, the majority of farmers have mechanical milkers; their separators are driven by the engines which supply power for the milking machines and, in addition, instead of having a horse and springcart or dray to take their products to the nearest railway station they have up-to-date motor vehicles to do the job. So

while I do not want to disparage the effort of the dairy farmers in this State, my opinion is that that mechanisation is the reason for the pro rata increase in the production of butter in this State. The member for Vasse also repeated a statement which I have heard frequently in this House—that the group settlement scheme was a wonderful achievement for this State. The hon. member is well versed in financial matters and I do not think he would like to finance the group settlement scheme with its present day returns.

Mr. Bovell: That was a national and not a banking proposition.

Mr. STYANTS: It was a proposition that was almost a total failure for many years after it was inaugurated, I travelled through Augusta and Margaret River in 1937—

Mr. Bovell: Did you travel through there in 1917?

Mr. STYANTS: In 1937 three out of four group settlement farms had been abandoned and a good deal of the country was going back to its natural growth.

Mr. Bovell: That is not so.

Mr. Manning: The scheme was a good one but it failed, because the people who were put on the farms did not understand anything about farming.

Mr. Styants: I do not know anything about that. Probably the type of person put onto those farms had something to do with it. I well remember the late Sir James Mitchell telling a group of people including myself, that in order to get cheaper money we had to take a certain number of immigrants from England and he admitted, as most of us realise, that the type of man we were getting was unsuitable for the dairying industry, particularly in its early stages when the properties required a great deal of clearing. The people who were brought out and put on to the dairy farms did not have bulldozers to assist them in the clearing and many of those people, as I know from conversations with them, had never used an axe in their life while in England. They were settled on heavily timbered ground and the result was that literally millions of pounds have been written off under the group settlement and dairying schemes in Western Australia.

A couple of years ago I asked some questions as to the amount that was written off and was requested not to persist with them because the answers would take so much research. Such a great amount was written off that it would take a couple of clerks even to this day to collate the true figures. So it was not such a financial success as some members in this House constantly repeat. Certainly it is in a much more prosperous condition now due to a set of circumstances over which we

had no control, namely, that there is a considerable demand for dairy products and there are profitable markets offering for them. The member for Canning evidently claims to have been the genesis of this legislation.

Mr. Griffith: Oh no, I do not think I said that.

Mr. STYANTS: At least he said he had made some overtures to the Minister for Agriculture round about July. I think he said that.

The Minister for Education: June.

Mr. STYANTS: It was before the opening of the session, anyhow. Whilst I am not disputing that I think the first steps in this matter were made by the Kalgoolie Municipal Council. It requested Goldfields members to interview the Minister for Agriculture and suggest to him that an amending Bill should be brought down this session to increase the permissible tonnage of margarine manufactured.

Mr. Griffith: The hon. member is a little mistaken. All I did was to tell the member for East Perth that, at the time when he was complaining that the Government had taken no action, we had the matter well in hand.

Mr. STYANTS: I will not dispute that. However, the Goldfields members did approach the Minister for Agriculture and he assured us that he had the matter in hand, and that in all probability the Government would bring down a Bill this session for the purpose which is set out in this Bill. He told us—and this is the point I want to make in passing—that there appears to be quite a diversity of opinion as to why margarine companies have not produced the amount that was permissible under the existing legislation, namely, 364 tons. At that deputation the Minister for Agriculture told us that he understood, from the companies concerned, that there was difficulty in obtaining all the vegetable oils required for margarine manufacture.

As I understand that the vast majority of the margarine manufactured in England is made with whale oil, I suggest that that procedure should be followed here. However, long before the opening of Parliament the Minister said he would submit a recommendation to Cabinet to have a Bill brought forward for this purpose. Later, during this session, in answer to some questions I asked in the House, I was told that the quota had not been increased not because of a lack of vegetable oils or because of difficulty in securing them, but rather because of the lack of demand for the product.

The Minister for Lands: I think that was so until the price of butter increased. The figures indicate that they only manufactured a very small quantity prior to the increase in the price of butter.

Mr. STYANTS: That is so; it was lack of demand. I think that was the real reason. Of course, I entirely agree with the member for Leederville who said that there was a distinct preference for butter. I know quite well, from my own point of view, even with the increased price of butter, that I would not be likely to buy margarine in place of butter, except for cooking. While it is agreed that the price of butter has risen steeply over the last few months, I realise that there has been compensation for that and probably the sharp increase in the butter price was responsible, to an extent, for the increase in the basic wage. I think the member for Leederville obtained the right opinion from the storekeepers in his electorate when they told him that very little of the table margarine sold found its way on to the table and was used in place of butter.

I do not think the member for Vasse need worry greatly about margarine supplanting butter in general use. I do not believe the statements I have read, and heard made here, that margarine has the same nutritional value as butter. From my own personal tastes I know quite well that I would much rather pay the additional price for butter—it may be said I am well able to afford it—for after all, though butter may not be cheaper as far as the monetary value is concerned, I think it is a better purchase because I believe that butter at 4s. 2d. a lb. is better from the point of view of nutrition, particularly for children, than is margarine at a price considerably less.

The Minister for Lands: At 2s. 6d. a lb.

Mr. STYANTS: So we have margarine at 2s. 6d. a lb. as against butter at 4s. 2d. a lb. I believe there are very few parents who would buy margarine and use it as a bread spread instead of butter, despite the great difference in price.

Mr. Bovell: What would be the price of margarine if the butter producers were put out of production?

Mr. STYANTS: I suppose it would go up in price. I do not think the hon. member need worry at all about butter producers being affected to any material extent by this increase.

Mr. Bovell: But I am worried.

Mr. STYANTS: I think the hon. member is unduly alarmed because I do not believe there will be sufficient demand for margarine. Though it may be that the increased permissible amount has risen considerably under the provisions of this Bill—or I should say the maximum is to be raised from 364 tons to 800 tons—bearing in mind the increased population of the State, I do not believe there will be a demand in this State for 800 tons. Despite the increased price of butter, I feel that the people will still continue to

buy it in preference to margarine, except of course for cooking purposes, where it is too expensive to take the place of margarine. Butter at 4s. 2d. lb. is much too expensive for the wife of the average worker to use for cooking purposes.

Mr. Griffith: Do you not think it will reach 800 tons a year?

Mr. STYANTS: Not in this State.

The Minister for Education: The Minister's discretion will govern the alternative for that figure.

Mr. Graham: I think the demand would be 800 tons now.

Mr. STYANTS: We have had many stabilisation schemes in Australia for various primary products. I can well remember the Paterson Scheme for the stabilisation of butter, and due to the greater amount of butter exported overseas a higher price was paid by the local consumer.

Mr. Hoar: Threepence a pound to subsidise export!

Mr. STYANTS: The Minister for Lands in introducing the Bill mentioned the Egg Board and egg export; I think that had the same effect. The greater the number of eggs exported from Western Australia overseas, the higher the price paid by the local consumer. We cannot get anywhere near the price for our exported eggs that we do for those sold on the local market.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Does the hon. member wish to continue with his speech?

Mr. STYANTS: No, Mr. Speaker, I only want to say, in conclusion, that I support the provisions of the Bill, and I assure the member for Vasse that if ever conditions are re-created that were in existence when the present Act was before this House, he can rest assured that the interests of the dairying industry will have my sympathetic consideration, and will always get my vote to see that they are not jeopardised to any great extent.

On motion by Mr. Manning, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 23rd September, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Question : Town planning, as to introduction of legislation	1000
Motion : Traffic Act, to disallow heavy traffic bylaw	1000
Address-in-reply, thirteenth day	1003
Speakers on Address—	
Hon. J. Murray	1003
Hon. J. McI. Thomson	1009

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

QUESTION.

TOWN PLANNING.

As to Introduction of Legislation.

Hon. H. HEARN asked the Minister for Transport:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session dealing with town planning?

The MINISTER replied:

It is considered desirable to give the new Town Planning Commissioner—after his arrival here—an opportunity of consultation on this matter.

MOTION—TRAFFIC ACT.

To Disallow Heavy Traffic Bylaw.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [4.35]: I move—

That heavy traffic bylaw made by the Shark Bay Road Board under Section 49 of the Traffic Act, 1919-1951, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 1st August, 1952, and laid on the Table of the House on the 12th August, 1952, be and is hereby disallowed.

In moving for the disallowance of this bylaw, which was gazetted on the 1st August, 1952, I do so with a knowledge of the facts and with the realisation that if it is allowed to go through and become law, the operations of the company using the road will be stultified to such an extent that it will probably have to go out of business.

For 13 years this company has been operating and has been serving a very useful purpose in what we can call an outback area. In that 13 years the company has used four different types of trucks. The first type was the Commer truck with a five-ton capacity—that is the weight of the truck plus the insulated icebox was five tons. The next type was an ex-army truck the weight of which,