

However, it was easy to come to that decision just then. I hope the House will agree to pass the vote. The position in question is necessary.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.8 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 19th October, 1922.

	PAGE
Resignation—Hon. A. Sanderson ...	1124
Questions: Federation and the State ...	1124
Parliamentary Hand Book ...	1124
Bills: Married Women's Protection ...	1124
Companies Act Amendment, 2r. ...	1125
Licensing Act Amendment, 1r. ...	1126
Attorney General (Vacancy in Office), 2r. ...	1126

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

RESIGNATION—HON. A. SANDERSON.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to have to announce that I have received from one of our most esteemed members a letter of resignation, as follows:—

To the Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom, President of the Legislative Council, Sir, I beg to resign my seat in the Legislative Council as a member for the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. Your obedient servant, A. Sanderson.

I should like to add to this my regret that we are losing from our midst one of our most esteemed members, one who, I think, has made himself popular with all in the House, and has on every possible occasion tried to uphold the best traditions of the State and of this Chamber. In these circumstances I receive his resignation with the very greatest regret.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I give notice that at the next sitting of the House I will move that the Hon. A. Sanderson's seat be declared vacant.

QUESTION—FEDERATION AND THE STATE.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it a fact that the members of the Royal Commission on Federation were first appointed as a joint select committee of both Houses of Parliament? 2, If so, upon what dates were the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly members respectively of

such committee appointed? 3, How many witnesses have the Commission, as a Commission and as a joint select committee, examined?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, The Legislative Council members were appointed on the 27th September, 1921, and the Legislative Assembly members on the 5th October, 1921. 3, One witness as a Royal Commission; none as a select committee.

QUESTION—PARLIAMENTARY HANDBOOK.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Who is responsible for the compilation of a book called the "W.A. Parliamentary Hand-book"? 2, What was the cost of compiling and printing the book, and by whom has the cost been defrayed? 3, Seeing that it deals mainly with one branch of the Legislature only, is not the title misleading?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, 2, and 3, Useful information was collected by the Clerk-Assistant of the Assembly, which the Hon. the Speaker considered should be made available to members. In order to do this, the printing of 200 copies at an approximate cost of £33 (the only cost) was authorised by him. No doubt if information of a biographical nature dealing with members and ex-members of the Council, which is the only matter not dealing with both Houses, is supplied by the officers of the Council, the information can be embodied in any future edition which is considered necessary.

BILL—MARRIED WOMEN'S PROTECTION.

Second reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.38] in moving the second reading said: It will be noticed that Clause 30 of the Bill repeals the old Act of 1896, and the 1902 amendment. The Bill was intended to effect one or two simple purposes, but when the matter was under consideration by the Crown Law authorities, it was deemed desirable, instead of making those one or two amendments, to put the whole matter in a concise form. With that purpose, as mentioned in the memorandum covering the Bill, the Act of South Australia, introduced by the then Attorney General, the late Hon. C. C. Kingston, was adopted as the basis for this small Bill. It retains the bulk of the old provisions which afforded summary protection for married women against cruelty, desertion, or failure to provide maintenance for wife and children. But those protections under the existing Act are subject always to the conviction of the husband for assault, or to the wife having left her home through persistent cruelty and neglect to provide for the children. That is really the main object of the Bill, to alter the existing conditions of affairs, under which the

wife cannot take those proceedings until she has first prosecuted and secured a conviction against her husband for assault, or else through his persistent neglect and cruelty has left her home. The Bill also adds adultery as a cause. It does away with the necessity for conviction for assault. Under the Bill it will not be necessary for a woman to prosecute her husband to conviction, or to leave her home without provision for maintenance having previously been made. The necessity for the Bill arises out of practical experience. Many cases have occurred wherein a woman has been unable to take proceedings against her husband for maintenance until she has actually left her home. Under Clause 4 provision is made that cases of this nature must be taken before a police magistrate or a resident magistrate with a justice of the peace. The court so constituted has power to make orders allowing the cessation of cohabitation, granting the custody of the children to the mother—and in this connection the Bill increases the age of the children from 16 years to 18 years—and may direct the payment of maintenance, and take such steps as are necessary to secure that payment. Another slight amendment is in regard to the amount of maintenance. Under the existing Act a limit of £3 is provided, but now that limit is removed and it is at the discretion of the court, according to the circumstances of the defendant and the requirements of the case, the number of children and that sort of thing, to make such order as it desires. Under the old Act two justices of the peace might act in cases of this kind but, as I have already pointed out, no case of the sort could be produced until one or the other of the conditions had been fulfilled, namely, the prosecution of the husband to conviction for cruelty, or else that the wife had actually left her home. Because of giving this larger protection, permitting a woman to proceed for maintenance without either of those two things happening, it is deemed desirable that the court shall be constituted of a resident magistrate or a police magistrate, with a justice of the peace in each instance. I have already said that adultery is one of the causes added by the Bill. But it is not a cause in cases where it has been condoned, or if the applicant is of drunken habits or has committed adultery. Under Clause 8 the superior court's jurisdiction is not affected. Clause 9 provides that there shall be no dissolution of the marriage by virtue of this Act; it does not in any way affect the law relating to divorce. Clause 12 provides that orders may be varied or discharged on application. Clause 15 makes provision that application for protection may be heard immediately after conviction for cruelty. That is an important provision, because under existing circumstances the wife may sue her husband for cruelty, he may be convicted, and then she has to start a further case before an order for maintenance or any of the measures of relief provided in the Act can be obtained. If the

Bill passes, immediately on conviction of cruelty the proceedings may continue and she may be afforded at once the protection which is undoubtedly necessary in a case of that sort. Clause 16 makes provision in the case of non-observance of orders of the court. Clause 17 retains the existing right of appeal to the Supreme Court. There is nothing in any way complicated or involved about the Bill. It is a very simple provision, and practically its whole object is to do away with the existing necessity for obtaining conviction for cruelty or for leaving home before the wife can justify proceedings against her husband for any matters mentioned in the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. F. E. S. Willmott, debate adjourned.

BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: This Bill has been introduced at the request of the Co-operative Federation of Western Australia, a federation which I believe includes practically the whole of the co-operative companies operating throughout this State. The articles of association of co-operative companies usually contain a provision whereby the board of management is empowered to divide amongst the shareholders, pro rata to the business done by each shareholder, the surplus profits, after setting aside such reserve fund as the company may think fit, and after payment to the shareholders generally of a dividend limited to a fixed percentage—7 per cent. in, I think, the usual percentage—on the paid-up capital. The effect of such a provision in the articles of association is that the profits exceeding a fixed percentage to be distributed as dividend are payable to the shareholders in ratio to the business done by the shareholders with the company, and are of course payable in cash. The object of the Bill is to enable a co-operative company in lieu of distributing those surplus profits on a cash basis, to issue to shareholders bonus debentures or bonus shares equivalent to the amount of profit which otherwise would be distributed to them in cash in accordance with the terms of the articles of association, and also to authorise the issue of such bonus debentures or bonus shares to amounts not exceeding the surplus profits available from time to time for distribution. As a matter of fact, this practice has been followed by certain co-operative companies in the past without legal sanction; and the Bill, in addition to making it legal for such distributions to be made in the future, sanctions those distributions which have been made in the past.

Hon. J. Cornell: Strictly speaking, these are not co-operative companies.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: They are at any rate registered as co-operative companies. It is, of course, very questionable whether at the present time the issue of those bonus shares or bonus debentures is valid, in view of the terms of the articles of association; and for that reason this Bill, if passed, validates those acts, as well as making it a legal course to adopt in the future. That is the sole object of the measure, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.50]: I fear that the wrong procedure is being adopted. The position into which the co-operative societies have been forced is due to the fact that while we have a Co-operative and Provident Societies Act, the limitation of capital under that Act has compelled co-operative societies to register as co-operative companies under the Companies Act. The limitation is, I think, to 1,000 shares of £1 each. Very few of these co-operative companies would have registered under the Companies Act if we had an up-to-date Co-operative and Provident Societies Act in this State. An instance in point is the Returned Soldiers' Co-operative Trading Society, which is purely a concern of the returned soldiers and confined to them. About 18 months ago I went into the question with Major T. A. L. Davey, who is a lawyer of this city. Although the soldiers were desirous of availing themselves of the provisions of the Co-operative and Provident Societies Act, the limitation of capital under that Act prevented them from doing so. Therefore there was only one course, to register under the Companies Act. To-day the company in question is to all intents and purposes a no-liability company, the only difference being that it is termed a co-operative company. The time is long overdue, having regard to the advance in co-operative methods for amending and bringing up to date our law relating to co-operative societies.

The Minister for Education: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: People who were desirous of launching out as a co-operative society had no alternative but to register under the Companies Act.

Hon. J. Duffell: This is a Bill to give the shareholders chits instead of cash.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Undoubtedly there has been an evasion of the strict letter of the law by these co-operative companies. However, I see no way out but to do what is proposed by this Bill. I commend to the Leader of the House, and to the Government, and also to the members of the Country Party, who are so interested in co-operative trading, the suggestion that a reasonable Co-operative and Provident Societies Act is long overdue in this State.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.53]: I have had only a few minutes to peruse the Bill. Certainly there is not much of it, but the last paragraph of Clause 2 concerns me—

and the issue of any bonus debenture or bonus share to any shareholder for any such amount before the passing of this Act is hereby declared valid and binding on any company that may have issued the same, and on any shareholder of such company who may have received the same.

I have in mind a certain company handling wheat in a large way, which arranged to give the wheatgrowers bonus shares in the company proportionately to the wheat handled by the company on his account. It fell to my lot to provide wheat in the usual way, and in due course I was notified that I was entitled to bonus shares in the company proportionately to the value of the wheat I had provided. I never took up the shares, and never became a shareholder in the company, but under this Bill I shall be forced into the company as a shareholder. I was quite satisfied for my wheat to be handled in a certain way, but I was not prepared to become a shareholder in the company. If I read Clause 2 of this Bill correctly, I shall be compelled to become a shareholder in the company. I do not think it is a fair thing that people should be compelled to take shares in a company when they do not want to do so. For that reason I oppose the Bill.

On motion by Hon. J. W. Kirwan, debate adjourned.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly, and read a first time.

BILL—ATTORNEY GENERAL (VACANCY IN OFFICE).

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.56] in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to enable the Minister for Justice to exercise the statutory powers imposed upon the Attorney General, when there is no Attorney General.

Hon. J. Cornell: How have you been getting on for the last 18 months?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is hardly practicable, at all events it would not be convenient, to amend the whole of the Statutes, and therefore this one Bill covers the whole ground. It is made retrospective in its action in order to cover the point as to whether the Minister for Justice is acting within his authority in exercising the statutory powers of the Attorney General. The Attorney General is named as the executive Minister in quite a number of Acts—Transfer of Land Act, Declaration Act, Justices

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 19th October, 1922.

Act, Arbitration Act, Jury Act, Companies Act, Criminal Code, and so forth. The necessity for this Bill was first brought under notice in connection with the Act passed three or four sessions ago under which commissioners for oaths were appointed. In order to save the necessity of appointing justices of the peace these commissioners were appointed. It was held by the Crown Law Department that the power to appoint the commissioners rested with the Attorney General, and the Attorney General only, and could not be exercised by anybody else. Although it has been desirable to appoint a number of commissioners, it has not been possible to take action in that direction. That raised the point in regard to a number of other Acts. During the past 12 months I have in many cases as Minister for Justice been signing documents in connection with these different Acts as "Minister for Justice for the Attorney General." It is a question of some interest whether one can sign a document for a person who does not exist.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Premier brought this trouble on himself.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The position has arisen in the past when there has been no Attorney General, and only a Minister for Justice; but I think in most cases that situation has extended over a very limited period, and perhaps the difficulties which have arisen in the present case have therefore not been noticed—it would not matter for a few months. But now the difficulties are more apparent. It is not intended to give the Minister for Justice special powers. For instance, it is specifically provided that the Bill shall not give the Minister for Justice the right of audience in any court of law. All the Minister for Justice can do under this Bill is to discharge the statutory functions of the Attorney General, when no Attorney General exists. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5 p.m.

	PAGE
Select Committee, Industries Assistance Board, extension of time	1127
Bills: Hospitals, 1A.	1127
Licensing Act Amendment, 3A.	1127
Dog Act Amendment, 2A.	1127
Dairy Industry, 2A., Com.	1128
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 2A.	1143

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

SELECT COMMITTEE—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE BOARD.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, the time for bringing up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the operations of the Industries Assistance Board was extended until 16th November.

BILL—HOSPITALS.

Introduced by the Colonial Secretary and read a first time.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Dog Act of 1903.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is this the best they can give you now?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that I will give him an opportunity of moving a motion dealing with thoroughbred dogs.

Hon. P. Collier: But why put it up on a day like this, when you are suffering so much?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I suppose I can answer a question like that without notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister had better move the second reading of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It does not fall to my lot as a rule to have many humorous incidents in my life, and though it is my duty to move the second reading of this Bill, I assure members that it contains provisions which are of considerable importance to the State. Members will, therefore, find that there is little cause for amusement in connection with this measure. In one

clause provision is made for the deletion from the Act of the words "within a period of 21 days." There are also several misprints in the parent Act which are being put right. Arrangements have been made in the Bill to supply the police with lists of registered dogs and also dogs kept by aborigines. Then follow a number of a consequential amendments to the parent Act. Various road board conferences and individual road boards have drawn the attention of the department to the necessity for providing these extra powers. They find great difficulty in carrying out the duties which the Dog Act imposes upon them. In this view they are confirmed by the police. One of the principal faults in connection with the present Act is that before a person can be summoned for non-registration of a dog, the onus of proof rests upon the local authorities to show that he has kept that dog unregistered for 21 days. When cases have been taken up on these grounds, it has often been found, before the 21 days have expired, that the dog has parted company with the then owner. The animal may be in the possession of someone else by that time, and consequently the chances of getting a conviction are gone. When an inspector sights a dog that is not wearing a disc, he knows it is unregistered. He may wait for 21 days to see if registration is effected, but in the meantime the dog may have disappeared. There has also been trouble in connection with the licensing of sheep and cattle dogs. The fact has been kept in view that the man whose living depends upon his dog has as much right to expect freedom in connection with it as does the artisan in connection with his kit of tools. Notwithstanding this, it is desirable that dogs of this type should be registered. Provision has therefore been made in the Bill for the registration of such dogs, but at a reduced fee.

Mr. Davies: All dogs should be registered.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Act provides for the registration of all dogs except sheep and cattle dogs, but we now propose to have them registered at a lower fee. If stray dogs are seized under the Act they must be kept for three days in case the owner turns up to claim them. In country districts this can seldom occur. In the towns the local police take up all stray dogs. They are kept in some place, so that if a person has lost his dog he can look at all those that are being detained and pick out his own animal. The Bill provides that in the country districts, where it may be impossible to capture a dog, the police may shoot at it, or cause it to be shot. In the country, especially in the South-West, stray dogs are apt to become a great nuisance, and have even been known to enter a farmer's paddock and destroy his sheep. Such an incident occurred on my property recently, where 40 ewes and all their lambs were killed by stray dogs. If the amendment contemplated by the Bill had been in force, a policeman could have shot the dogs. Without such an amendment, we cannot deal with the difficulty that confronts us to-day. The pres-

ent Act does not contain a penal clause respecting breaches, and the Bill deals with that aspect as well by enabling penalties to be imposed. The existing Act provides that aborigines may keep dogs without the necessity for the animals being registered. A difficulty arises when unregistered dogs are found with aborigines and it is hard to determine whether such animals belong to the aborigines or are merely stray dogs attracted to the camp. In keeping with the policy of registering all cattle and sheep dogs, and, in fact, in order that all dogs shall be registered, it is provided that the dogs belonging to aborigines shall in future be registered, but without charge. The appearance of a dog with aborigines is now taken as *prima facie* evidence that it is unregistered, but under the Bill such dogs must conform to the conditions as to registration. The existing Act provides that dogs shall be registered not later than three months after birth. This provision is regarded as somewhat of a hardship and the Bill proposes to extend the time for registration up to six months. The reason for the extension is that it is well known that up to that age, a dog is most susceptible to those diseases which may carry him off. The extension of the age to six months will cover the period of weaning and rearing and bring them to that age at which they are usually sold. The Bill is a small one, but it is considered it will prove to be a boon to local authorities by giving them the necessary machinery to carry out the Act. When in Committee I propose to insert another clause which has been omitted by the draftsman, but which hon. members will readily understand. It is desirable that all the financial arrangements of the State as far as possible shall terminate on the 30th June, and it is necessary to include in the Bill a clause which will deal with registration and financial matters with that object in view. Members will recognise the undoubted merits that a Bill of this kind must contain. Believing it is unnecessary to expound the matter at greater length, I commend the Bill to the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

BILL—DAIRY INDUSTRY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th August.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [4.50]: This Bill is undoubtedly one that is essential to the dairying industry of Western Australia. Whether or not it is a bit early in the history of the advancement of the industry here to bring forward such a measure, is a matter of opinion. If we desire to attain that position at which we can export our products in competition with the Eastern States and New Zealand, it is necessary that legislation embracing the principles underlying the Bill shall become law. It is well known that efforts have been made for a considerable time past by those interested in the dairying

industry to induce the Minister to introduce a measure of this nature. I presume it has not been brought forward without considerable deliberation, and I commend the Minister for bringing it before Parliament so early in his career as Minister for Agriculture. The Bill is more or less revolutionary.

Mr. O'Loghlen: And you support it!

Mr. McCallum: Don't use that word! It is shocking!

Mr. PICKERING: I do not use the word "revolutionary" in the sense hon. members would suggest. The Bill contemplates radical changes in an important industry, and it is essential that the utmost discretion should be used in the enforcement of its provisions, and that encouragement should be extended to those who come within the scope of its operations to adopt the principles laid down as speedily as possible. A good many of the factories we have are doubtless very primitive. They are not fitted with those necessary appurtenances that will turn out the best quality of butter, but it must not be lost sight of that our factories are turning out a quantity of butter almost adequate for home consumption. If we are to enforce the conditions contemplated in the Bill without giving sufficient time to enable the factories to be firmly established on a good working basis, they will be handicapped considerably. I refer particularly to the question of pasteurisation. If we desire to produce the best quality of butter, so that it will keep and be suitable for export, it must be so treated. The operation of that part of the Bill will affect butter production in two ways; it will increase the cost and decrease the overflow. By increasing the cost, it may so happen that it will be difficult for our local butter to be sold in competition with the South Australian article. I have been given figures regarding the price likely to be necessary under the proposal and it works out at about $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. It will also entail additional expense in connection with labour, inasmuch as it will probably mean that an extra shift will have to be worked. If we remember that the butter held by a factory may be in the neighbourhood of three or four tons, the amount at issue will be somewhat considerable, and I am rather doubtful whether at this stage it is wise to enforce the provisions of the Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture interjected.

Mr. PICKERING: They are turning out that quantity and disposing of it, and the difference in costs will be considerable. I have the figures here, and if I can rely upon them, they demonstrate that this will be so. In the statement furnished to me, it is stated:—

Objection must be taken to this, because our butter is made to-day and consumed to-morrow. Therefore, there is no need for pasteurisation. It is a well known fact that you cannot obtain the same over-run from pasteurised butter, as from butter made in the ordinary way. In addition to this, if our factory were to begin pasteur-

ising now, it would be necessary to work two shifts—

The Minister for Agriculture: What factory is that?

Mr. PICKERING: I think it is the Bunbury factory. The statement continues:—

—and one man's time would be fully occupied in attending to pasteurisation alone. In my opinion it would cost us easily $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. to pasteurise our choice butter. A halfpenny per lb. on a turnover of, say, nine tons a week would be a big loss to us. On the other hand, if we were to pasteurise, would we receive an extra price for that butter? It must be remembered that the price we receive for our butter is regulated by the landed cost of South Australian butter during spring time, and no matter how good the local butter is, if local factories asked 1d. per lb. more than the butter above referred to, our merchants would go immediately over to the imported article. Why go to this trouble and expense when there is nothing to gain? Our butter is preferred to anything coming into the State, but one cannot compel the merchant to purchase an article at a higher price than the choicest landed article.

Mr. Mann: What about the merchants?

Mr. PICKERING: I have been dealing with the butter factories; I am not concerned about the merchants.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think you have been misinformed.

Mr. PICKERING: That information has been given to me by a man who is regarded as an authority in connection with butter, and I give it to the House for what it is worth, believing it to be accurate. There is another important phase which will require careful consideration. It is a very serious matter to the industry. I refer to the question of the payment on butter. I may explain to the House that "butter fat" means the butter fat of milk. A reference to the Bill will show that the payment suggested is to be on what is known as the "commercial basis" as opposed to the basis that has been in vogue for the past 14 years in Western Australia, namely, the butter fat basis. At any rate, the Bill leads one to infer that such is the case. When one sells butter on the butter fat principle, one is paid for the butter fat and that ends the transaction. The Bill, however, suggests that a rebate shall be made on the over-run of the butter, which means that one will not only be paid on the butter fat, but on the over-run as well. This would mean that should it be necessary to hold a considerable quantity of butter for some time, so long as the price of butter was up, it would be possible to pay the amount involved. Should there be a fall in price, however, there is no provision to make it possible to secure the rebate on it. This can be overcome only by a system of bonus payments. That affects the butter fat proposition. Seeing that the butter fat

principle which has been in vogue for so many years here has proved so satisfactory, I suggest that the time is not ripe for a change in the direction indicated in the Bill. I have had from those contributing to butter factories no complaints as to the system of payment. Sometimes they complain of the amount paid for butter fat, but never against the system. This will seriously interfere with the arrangement which has been in existence for a considerable time. This company says:—

Under no circumstances can we allow the dairy expert to dictate the method of estimation of butter fat results to us. Ever since this factory was established the same method of testing and payment for cream has been in existence. Taking into consideration the increased output of butter from year to year, it should suffice to prove that our method of purchasing cream has given complete satisfaction to our dairymen. In addition to this, the records which appear in our books are ample proof that our system is beyond doubt. Therefore, unless some very strong facts are placed before us showing that we can improve on that method, we could not submit to any alteration.

I have endeavoured to point out that there is a great danger in the introduction of this measure, with such drastic changes, without giving some period during which the factories can adjust their systems. It must be borne in mind that many of our butter factories are subsidised by the Government, and that each of those factories, except perhaps the State factories at Busselton and at Denmark, is compelled to fulfil certain obligations in respect of interest and sinking fund which they owe to the Government. They have, I take it, considered well the methods of their factories, and have decided that the system in vogue is the best upon which they can operate with a profit sufficient to enable them to meet their obligations to the Government. Presumably, it is not the desire of the Minister or of the House that any difficulties should be placed in the way of the companies meeting their obligations. The Act, I take it, must be administered with the desire of gaining the confidence of those whom it seeks to govern. There is a clause which deals with the health inspector, and there are certain clauses dealing with premises. It is not clearly set forth whether the word "premises" covers farm factories. Many of our dairy farms are manufacturing butter. I do not know whether it is sought by the Bill to control those farm factories. In any case, it would be impossible for them to carry on under such strict conditions as would be imposed by the health authorities. If it is sought to impose certain conditions under the Health Act, officers of the Agricultural Department should be made honorary health inspectors with a view to administering that portion of the measure for the Health Department. It might then be hoped that those officers would not be so dogmatic, would be more alive to the conditions of a farm, and so would not carry out the law to the very letter. An important question

is that of butter boxes. In Clause 12, Sub-clause 3, it is provided that the butter shall be put into certain packages. The inference is that the factories must put their butter into new boxes.

The Minister for Agriculture: No, merely that they must be properly branded.

Mr. PICKERING: It is not set forth with sufficient clearness. As showing how expensive a item it might prove to be, the company which I have already quoted says:—

According to the wording of this section, we are debarred from using second hand boxes. I contend that as long as a box is sweet and clean and treated to a strong solution of caustic soda, and afterwards steamed out thoroughly, it is equal to any new box. Second hand boxes cost us approximately 1s. 1d. landed. We have just ordered 1,000 new ones to keep in reserve. These will cost us approximately from 2s. 9½d. to 2s. 10d. landed. Take for instance our output for November, say, ten tons per week: the difference in the expenditure on new and second hand boxes would be £35 per week, in favour of second hand ones.

The Minister for Agriculture: The clause relates only to brands.

Mr. PICKERING: I am glad of the assurance of the Minister, and I hope it will be clearly expressed in the Bill rather than, as at present, being left open to the company's construction. It must be remembered that in this State we are in the unfortunate position of not having a native timber suitable for the construction of butter boxes. I believe an experiment is about to be tried with tuart; but in the meantime it is evident that the cost which will be thrust on the factories if they are compelled to use new boxes will be very considerable. Then there is the question of margarine. Representing a dairying district as I do, it is to me evident that if we are to develop our dairying industry we must be scrupulously careful to encourage it in every reasonable way. In view of the important development forecasted, it is unwise that we should place any spurious substitute for butter in a position where it will be able to compete with the real article. It is possible to so colour margarine as to make it almost indistinguishable from butter. Hon. members will realise that we must do our very utmost to safeguard the interests of the dairying industry.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is the competition you are afraid of.

Mr. PICKERING: Not if margarine is put on the market as margarine, and without the colouring.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It has to be labelled "margarine."

Mr. PICKERING: I do not desire that it should have the appearance of butter. Those who produce margarine wish to put it on the market as a substitute for butter. The development of the South-West must lie mainly in the direction of dairying, and it would be criminal to encourage the production of margarine in competition with butter. I trust hon. mem-

bers will realise the importance of conserving the butter industry. Then there are certain regulations with which I am not altogether in accord. However, they can be dealt with in Committee.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is only giving the power to make regulations.

Mr. PICKERING: But the directions in which those regulations can be exercised are indicated in Clause 25. On that question probably, in Committee I shall have to cross swords with the Minister. I have pleasure in agreeing generally with the objects which the Bill sets out to achieve, and I trust it will be so amended in Committee as to make it less of a burden on the industry.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [5.14]: I congratulate the Minister for Agriculture on having brought forward a measure by which it is proposed to control and assist the dairying industry. I am satisfied this State offers better opportunities than does any other State to those who wish to embark in dairying. I regret that, so far, it has been very difficult to get our own people to realise the value of the local product. Repeatedly we hear people say they will not use the local butter, because it does not keep. The reason for that is that in the past the Agricultural Department has neglected to watch carefully the progress of this industry.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not at all.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes it has. I agree that it is impossible for the Agricultural Department alone to entirely control and regulate the dairying industry, but I think the Railway Department could assist in fostering the industry which we are about to develop. I notice particularly that very few of our farmers, who to-day are sending cream to the factories, understand how they should mix their creams to make a marketable product. Frequently I have noticed warm cream is put on top of cold cream. That is due to want of education. Then again they have to wait long periods for trains to arrive, and that is where the Railway Department can assist the Agricultural Department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is where the Closer Settlement Bill will come in.

Mr. LATHAM: That will do more than this particular measure in the direction of assisting the agricultural industry. Having a knowledge of the dairying industry of New South Wales, I can speak with authority when I say that the land along the Great Southern railway is just as suitable for dairying purposes as is the land along the northern rivers of New South Wales.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The New South Wales Act is a very different measure from this Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: This Bill is a step in the right direction, even though it may not be a perfect piece of machinery. I notice that the Bill is to some extent original, and on that score I commend the Minister for Agriculture. It is about time we started to create our own legislation for the conduct of our own businesses. Of course it may be possible

to make minor amendments, which will have the effect of improving the machinery clauses, but, generally speaking, the department can be commended for proceeding in the right direction. I hope, too, that the Bill will be the means of educating those people who are entering upon this great industry so that they may, in the future, supply a marketable product, a product which our people will appreciate more than they do to-day. Not much education is required, but up to the present time there does not appear to have been anyone to advise those engaged in the industry as to the best methods of producing a marketable article.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not so.

Mr. LATHAM: It is so. A considerable quantity of cream that has never been inspected finds its way to the Narrogin factory. When the cream has to be kept for two or three days, especially in the warm weather, we cannot expect to get the best article from that cream. I also know that people have no knowledge as to the manner in which they should mix their cream.

Mr. Davies: Is that why we get bad butter?

Mr. LATHAM: That is why we get butter which will not keep. People get cream which is high in flavour due to the pastures eaten by the stock. Mustard weed and turnip, for instance, give cream an objectionable flavour. All that could be remedied if we had a dairy expert, whose duty it would be to offer advice. The people engaged in dairying would be only too willing to accept the advice of an expert. The Bill will be a means by which that advice will become available, and we may also learn that a considerable area of the land, which is now used for growing wheat, can be much more profitably used for dairying purposes.

Mr. Harrison: When we get a water supply.

Mr. LATHAM: I am speaking of those parts of the State where there is an adequate water supply. We have only to look back to see what the dairying industry has done for Victoria and New Zealand, and what has taken place in those parts can happen in Western Australia. It is my desire that dairying should be encouraged in this State, even though it may be considered a laborious and tiresome work. But with the machinery which is provided to-day for milking, etc., we should be able to encourage people to go out of the cities and take up land, particularly in the closer settlement areas, and engage in the industry. I commend the Minister for bringing forward the Bill and I trust that from time to time, after it has become an Act, it will be amended so as to meet requirements.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.22]: One would have thought, almost at the commencement of the dairying industry in Western Australia, that the Government, in introducing a measure of this kind, would have dealt with every phase of

the industry. The Bill is bound to cause confusion. The member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering), to some extent, dealt with the difficulties which will be likely to arise. We find that the Health Department has one function to perform in connection with the industry, while the Agricultural Department has another. It is clear that we shall have dual inspection. In Victoria and in other parts of Australia the dairying industry is controlled under one Act, and provision is contained in the statutes existing elsewhere for the inspection not only of the factories but the dairy farms. Here these are under the administration of the Health Department. Dairying legislation should cover everything connected with the industry, the stock, the purity of the milk, the cleanliness of the yards, etc.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is the function of the Health Department now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But in Victoria one Act covers everything in connection with dairying, and the administration is by one department. The Bill before the House—or I should call it an apology for a Bill—in comparison with the legislation in existence in the other States, suffers considerably. If hon. members will look through it carefully they will find that it is not proposed that Parliament shall legislate but that the officers of the department shall do this by regulation.

The Minister for Agriculture: All the provisions of the Victorian Act are contained in our Health Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know that many of them are. Hon. members are aware, however, that there have been many complaints regarding our factories. We find that the health inspectors say that a certain thing must be done, and that then the factory inspectors will come along and declare that something else must be done, and then nothing but confusion results. The Government have been appealed to for the purpose of putting the supervision of these factories under one department, so that the owners should know, when observing the regulations, that they were carrying out what was the desire of the Government officials. The Bill before the House will add to the existing confusion so far as the dairying industry is concerned. There is another matter to which I wish to draw attention. I do not think that ever before legislation has been introduced in which the Government have shoved in its nose in connection with private undertakings to the same extent as it is proposed to do in the Bill. I know that in the Roads Act there is a provision which compels the road boards to follow a set system in connection with the writing up of the rates. But did anyone ever hear of legislation whereby, by regulation it was made possible to compel a man, engaged in an industry, to keep his books in a certain way, to be told what class of books he was to keep, and generally to prescribe the manner of keeping them.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not in regard to details.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under the Bill it will be possible to make regulations instructing a person how he is to carry on his business.

The Minister for Agriculture: No, only to keep a record of his operations.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The clause dealing with regulations sets out that regulations may be made "prescribing the keeping of books for recording the quantity of cream received daily. . . . regulating the keeping of any books which by this Act or the regulations are directed to be kept." That is very wide. The regulations will also "prescribe the furnishing of advice dockets to suppliers of cream . . . prescribing the books to be kept in any dairy produce factory showing the results of tests."

The Minister for Agriculture: The hon. member knows that those regulations may never be made. We only want the power to make them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no necessity for such power to be given. Surely a man who is conducting his own business knows more about it than a Government official who, perhaps, has never been in that line of business. We frequently find, in legislation introduced in this House, provision for the making of regulations to cover a wide field. I had hoped that members would have taken some note of warning given to them by the late member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington), a gentleman of high standing in the legal profession, who told us that we were treading on dangerous ground when we attempted to legislate by regulation instead of by Act of Parliament. He declared that the time would come soon when the people of the State would realise the danger from adopting such a course, and he pointed out that there was no other country where so much was done by regulation as in Western Australia, and, in fact, in Australia as a whole. He told us, too that such a thing would not be countenanced in England. The Minister knows well that in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, there is provision in the legislation of those States which sets out in detail what the butter factory owner has to do. A person who starts a factory of this kind is in a better position to know the details of his work than anyone else. I hope the Minister will withdraw the Bill, and bring in legislation more in keeping with that existing in the other States. We should endeavour to copy those States where the legislation has been successful. The Minister has said the Bill is necessary because of the Commonwealth law. The Commonwealth law is subject is embodied in regulations. There is no Commonwealth Act dealing with the dairying industry; there is power only to make regulations governing it. Everyone knows that the Commonwealth regulations have during the last few years been such that no Parliament would have given them five minutes consideration, and the representatives of the people would never have agreed to them.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are poking their noses into all our domestic affairs.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And the Minister for Agriculture is following suit. He is now endeavouring to make it possible for officers of the department to poke their noses into private enterprise.

The Minister for Agriculture: And it is warranted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Before we do a thing like that we should make all the dairies, State dairies. The Bill proves conclusively that private enterprise cannot be trusted to carry on factories in conjunction with the dairying industry. They must be told in what manner they should carry on their industry, how the factories are to be built, according to the requirements of the department, and instructions are to be given as to how the books are to be kept. The next thing we shall have will be a provision saying how a man shall spend his money. There is a reference in the Bill in regard to the expenditure of money in the purchase of cream, but I am referring to a man's private funds.

The Minister for Agriculture: We do not go as far as that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill goes very close to it. Margarine is very little used in Western Australia unless butter is dear.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is almost a black labour production.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Every packet of margarine has to be labelled, and if any person buys it as butter he must be unable to read.

Mr. Latham: Suppose it is put on a restaurant table as butter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When I was in England a year or two ago every restaurant had its menu cards endorsed "No butter; margarine to-day."

Mr. Latham: I have had it at home thinking I was eating butter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Lyons Company, who control the most important eating places in London, had notices, not only on the meal cards, but on the walls of their establishments.

Mr. Pickering: In what year was that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In 1920.

Mr. Latham: You could not tell the difference between the two.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I only knew it was margarine because it was stated on the cards to be margarine. In the hotels there was only margarine put on the table. A few weeks ago butter was being sold at Boans at 2s. 4d. a lb., and margarine was available at 1s. 6d.

Mr. Latham: That was dear enough.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have seen it offered for sale in the shops at Fremantle at 1s. per lb.

Mr. Latham: And 10½d.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Margarine is of great assistance to people when the cost of living is high.

Mr. Brown: Especially to the poor.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. If it had been put up as lard people would not have purchased it.

The Minister for Agriculture: Does the colouring of margarine add anything to its food value?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, but it gives it a better appearance.

The Minister for Agriculture: What the eye does not see the heart does not grieve for.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There can be no charge of fraud in the case of margarine, because since 1907 every bit of margarine that is either manufactured in the State or is imported has to be labelled margarine.

The Minister for Agriculture: A black labour product.

Mr. Pickering: Notices should be put up in every restaurant as you say was done in England.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Every pound of margarine has to be put up in a special cover and labelled as such. I had hoped that the Minister would have shown what danger there has been to the people in this State through the sale of margarine.

Mr. Pickering: We do not want the danger to arise.

The Minister for Agriculture: It has arisen.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a section of the people who always buy margarine when they can get it.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is sheer hypocrisy to want it coloured.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Has the colouring matter done anyone any damage or caused an injury to anyone?

Mr. Brown: Butter is often coloured.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I admit that. During the war margarine that was half butter was sold in this State, and the butter was used to colour the margarine. Under this Bill people cannot do that owing to the limitation of butter in margarine to 10 per cent.

The Minister for Agriculture: Five per cent.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: According to Clause 18 it must be limited to 10 per cent.

The Minister for Agriculture: I have an amendment on the Notice Paper to make it 5 per cent.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no artificial colouring when butter is added to margarine, although the colouring would be lighter than in the case of ordinary margarine. There is an industry in Perth in which over £3,000 has been spent.

Mr. Pickering: What about Fremantle?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is none in Fremantle.

The Minister for Agriculture: There is Allen's factory.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That factory does not make up margarine from coconut oil.

The Minister for Agriculture: Animal fat is used there.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fat comes from Wyndham, and it is practically the same colour as butter. That should be all

right as it is without any colouring. I should like to see all margarine made of animal fat. I am sure it would be better than some of the butter we get.

Hon. T. Walker: You cannot beat pure butter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I said some of it would be better than the butter we eat. I am told that there is no better food than is made from the fat that comes from the Wyndham Freezing Works.

Mr. Pickering: What does the Wyndham fat cost at Fremantle?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I cannot say. I am told it is unprocurable now at Fremantle, and that it all goes to London. I understand there is a ring controlling these fats. If we pass this Bill as it is, we may be doing an injury to people who cannot afford to buy butter when it is dear. When butter is at a reasonable price the sale of margarine generally goes down to about one half. This shows that people prefer butter.

The Minister for Agriculture: When the price of butter goes up, the price of margarine increases accordingly.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No doubt it does go up, but there is still a big difference between the two prices. The margarine looks like butter and gives every satisfaction. No fraud is committed upon the public because it is labelled under the Health Act.

Mr. Underwood: It contains many food properties.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Many people cannot tell the difference between the two. The Minister might well leave margarine alone for the present. I do not object to the clauses of the Bill dealing with inspection and with the proper labelling of the article. I do not see why colouring matter should not be added so long as an injury is not done to the public. The Bill requires careful consideration. It is evidently designed to assist the Commonwealth Government in the carrying out of their regulations. There are as many paragraphs in it providing for legislation by regulation as there are clauses. It should be withdrawn and another Bill introduced dealing with the dairying industry in the same way as is done in Victoria and some of the other States. The whole of the supervision of the industry should be placed under one department. Under the system of dual control proposed by the Bill much dissatisfaction and inconvenience will be caused to people carrying on the trade. We should have an administration that will assist rather than disturb the building up of the industry in Western Australia.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [5.43]: I agree that this is an important Bill, and I also agree with the remarks of the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) with respect to dual control. It would be an advantage if the Act were administered by one department instead of by the Health Department in conjunction with the Agricultural Department. The member for

North-East Fremantle states there would be no harm in adding colouring matter to margarine, which enters into direct competition with the butter industry. I disagree with that view. We hope the dairying industry will become an important one in the State. The colouring matter does not affect the flavour, nor does it add to the food value of the margarine.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It makes it appear more palatable and makes it look more like butter.

Mr. HARRISON: It does not make it more palatable. The chemist can do that by mixing the various fats in order to get the required flavour. Colouring matter is not required for that purpose. It is a matter of the colour that pleases the eye of the consumer of this particular commodity, fat. All who have been connected with the manufacture of butter, or with the dairying industry, know that during the season when the cattle have an abundance of green food, the butter has a very high colour. Sometimes the green food is so luscious that the butter becomes over-coloured, which is a detriment to its value. When the green fodder diminishes and the grasses get drier, the colour becomes lighter. It has been and is the practice not only in Australia, but also in other parts of the world, to use a chemical in order to bring both butter and cheese to that colour which is most agreeable to the eye of the consuming public. The colour of butter and cheese is a point of which judges at agricultural shows take particular notice. Indeed colour is one of the most important factors in the dairying industry. Therefore it is quite right that our law should provide against another industry using colouring matter so as to imitate butter, so as to make that industry's product such that when placed on the table it may be taken for butter. We should protect the dairying industry, which this State wishes to encourage. Another point with regard to which I cannot agree with the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) is his objection to the departmental officers directing the manner in which the books of butter factories shall be kept. The books will show the amount of each farmer's cream, the time when it was received, the condition in which it was received, the quality, and also whether there was any fault in it, and whether that fault could be traced. When we have co-operative butter factories dealing with so many producers, and since the dairying industry of this State is dependent upon numbers of producers being situated near the factories, it is essential that every protection should be afforded. Only recently I was in a butter factory and saw 40 or 50 cans of cream sent down from the country districts. They varied from a thin cream to a cream so thick that it could hardly be got out of the vessel. Our inspectors should educate the farmers who supply the cream from day to day, so that we may get that quality of butter which

would enable us to export in competition with the Eastern States when we have reached the stage of supplying our own requirements.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I suppose you would prohibit the putting of colouring matter into the butter?

Mr. HARRISON: No. We want to keep an even standard of colour.

The Minister for Agriculture: It may be news to the hon. member, but butter is not coloured in factories to-day.

Mr. HARRISON: There is no need for it if they get cream from various centres.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The colouring does no harm, then?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: I have not been connected with butter factories in Australia, but I know that in the Old Country we used to colour not only our butter but also our cheese, in order to get them uniform throughout the season. To meet the wishes of the consuming public it is necessary to have a standardised article. This alone can assure continuity of trade. The same thing applies to any industry that one is trying to establish. It is essential that the books should be kept on a certain system, so that details can be traced, and so that the dairy farmer supplying graded cream will get the value of the cream he supplies. I am rather surprised at the reference which the member for North-East Fremantle made to that matter, seeing that the existence of the Arbitration Court involves the keeping of records by practically all businesses of the men they employ, thus enabling the inspector representing the workers in a particular line of industry to see what they are engaged on.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the Arbitration Court does not prescribe how the books shall be kept.

Mr. HARRISON: If that is done in so many industries, surely it can be done in the dairying industry, for the protection of farmers disseminated throughout a large district. Then, if anything is found to be unsatisfactory, it can be set right. If the regulations are not made too stringent, the operation of this measure must do good in Western Australia. The departmental officers can do a good deal in the way of instructing dairy farmers before this Bill comes into full force as a measure of law. The main thing as regards an even grade of butter and keeping up a good standard of quality is cleanliness from the cow to the finished article. One of the essentials in all manufactures is cleanliness. I am satisfied that if this measure is judiciously administered and the people are educated up to the value of conformity with the contents of the Bill, we shall at a very early period attain a higher standard of butter, one equal to the world's markets when our own local requirements have been met.

The Minister for Mines: Our butter to-day is good enough for anyone.

Mr. HARRISON: The factory butters could be of much higher grade than the butters made by various dairies. We have not yet reached a standard which cannot be improved upon. We have not yet attained to the standard of Eastern States butter. We have still to get higher. We have factory butters of even quality during certain months of the year; but what about their keeping quality?

The Minister for Mines: The Eastern States send us butter of a grade which they do not send to the London market.

Mr. HARRISON: If cleanliness is observed, and the contents of this measure are conformed with, and the men in our butter factories know their business, we shall be able to develop our dairying industry to a great extent, and shall be able to compete in the export market before long.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Mr. PICKERING: The definition of "butter fat" has a considerable influence on the question of payment by butter factories. Has the Minister in view the desirability of making perfectly clear the system on which he intends butter factories to pay for butter fat? The definition of "butter fat" in this clause does not mean very much, and if the dairy farmers have to fall back on it considerable difficulty may arise. I do not know that the Committee would be safe in passing that interpretation unless the Minister gives us an assurance that when Clause 11, dealing with payment for cream, is reached, he will specifically define what is intended in this particular connection.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We can take our fences when we come to them. If the hon. member wants a better definition of "butter fat" than "the pure fat of milk," I cannot give it to him. When we come to the question of the over-run, I shall be prepared to explain that matter to him.

Mr. PICKERING: Many farmers in different parts of the State turn their cream into butter and dispose of it. Is it intended that under the definition of a dairy produce factory, a farmer's premises will be included?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the Notice Paper. He will see that I have an amendment dealing with farmers' premises.

Mr. Pickering: These amendments are quite new to the Notice Paper.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They have been on the Notice Paper almost

ever since the Bill was before the House. I move an amendment—

That after the interpretation of “inspector,” the following new paragraph be inserted:—“Manager means the owner or occupier of a dairy produce factory, or the person for the time being in control thereof on behalf of the owner or occupier.”

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

Clause 3—Registration of Premises:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That a new paragraph be added as follows: “The premises of a farmer used by him for the preparation or storage of dairy produce shall not be deemed a dairy produce factory or store within the meaning of this Act, unless such farmer is notified in writing by the Minister that such premises are deemed by him to be a dairy produce factory or store within the meaning of this Act.”

The amendment will have the effect of excluding farmers who make butter and sell it, but in order to avoid an abuse of that privilege it sets out that, should it be considered that a farmer is disposing of a sufficient quantity of butter to warrant his premises being registered, the Minister will inform him in writing that his premises are considered a factory within the meaning of the Act.

Mr. PICKERING: There is a certain amount of danger in the amendment. The discretionary power rests entirely in the hands of the Minister, and there is nothing to indicate at what stage a farmer shall come under the operations of the measure. Too wide a range of discretion is given to the Minister controlling the industry. I think farmers should have a free hand and not come within the scope of the Bill. Some standard quantity of output should be provided.

Mr. Davies: Would it not be safer to leave that to be dealt with in the regulations?

Mr. PICKERING: I do not think so. We do not know at what stage the Minister would see fit to step in and make a farmer's premises a factory. I do not think many farmers will come within the scope of the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: If that is so, why do you want the point dealt with?

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know what the Minister has in view.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister might inform the Committee why any farmer should be exempted. If it is necessary that the manufacture of butter should be supervised in a factory, why is it not necessary to supervise it on the farm?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I propose to move an amendment later on to provide that all butter made and sold as farm butter shall be branded as such. Householders in Perth know that at certain periods of the year it is almost impossible to procure local butter from retailers in the city,

although it should be available. The reason given by the big retailers is that it will not keep and that if they stocked the local butter, they would not retain their trade. Shops in the suburban areas cannot get supplies as well. If that argument is legitimate some control must be secured over the position. If it is that inferior lines have prompted the retailers to adopt that attitude regarding local butter, we must get some control. Farm butter has not the appearance of the best factory butter, but very often it is sold over the counter as “Best W.A. factory butter.” It is for these reasons that we want to get hold of the industry thoroughly. We want power to deal with the position where margarine is substituted or second-grade farm butter is retailed as best factory butter. We want to stop that sort of business.

Mr. HARRISON: Will a farmer who has a cow and is making a little more butter than can be consumed by his own family, and who sells the balance to the storekeeper, be brought under the Bill?

The Minister for Agriculture: Not until his output is such that he should be registered.

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

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Application for registration:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In Victoria a dairy farmer has to pay up to 6d. per cow in the municipal area; a dairy or a factory has to pay such sum as may be prescribed, not exceeding £2; and for each creamery attached to a factory, a sum not exceeding 5s. has to be paid. The administration of the Bill will cost something and the prescribed fee of £1 will not cover that cost.

The Minister for Agriculture: We do not expect it to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have got to that stage now—

Mr. Pickering: Every industry should pay the cost of its supervision. Is that what you mean?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We should see that some provision is made to cover the cost of administration.

The Minister for Agriculture: We would get only £8 if we registered the eight factories we have in Western Australia. We do not want to get revenue in that way.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There may be some very large factories some day, in which case it will cost the State something for inspection. Certainly it will cost more to inspect a butter factory away down the country than to inspect an industrial factory in the city. A maximum fee of a £1 is prescribed. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 “one” be struck out and “two” inserted in lieu.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: While I would be glad to obtain additional revenue, still the amendment means but little to the Treasury—there are only eight butter factories in the State—whereas it may mean an impost on a small factory. The inspection will not represent any increased cost to the department.

MR. PICKERING: The Bill is not a revenue-collecting measure. Moreover, the inspection is devised, not in the interests of the butter factories, but for the benefit of the general community. Why, then, should the cost be borne by the factories? It is not sound to seek to raise revenue by the imposition of inspection fees. The object of the clause is to bring the factories under the control of the department. We should not penalise so important an industry.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: I can understand the explanation of the Minister, but not the contention of the member for Sussex, who says the inspection is not for the benefit of the factory. In point of fact, nobody else will benefit as much as the factory, because the inspection means a guarantee to the overseas market that the butter is up to standard, which, of course, will help the sale of the butter. Frequently do we hear members contend that some of the cost of administering a Bill should be borne by those benefiting from it. The fee is not a fixed one, but is merely the maximum. As a maximum, £2 is altogether too little. It is nonsense for the Minister to suggest that the inspection will not mean increased cost to the department. At present we have only eight factories, but we all hope to see a very largely increased number ere long.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. PICKERING: Subclause 3 provides that nothing in the Bill shall affect the provisions of the Health Act. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle that all inspection should be under one department. Why could not the inspectors of the Agricultural Department act in the dual capacity of agricultural and health inspectors?

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Health Department inspectors exercise inspection under all the departments. For these butter factories we require experts trained in the dairying industry. That principle is perfectly sound, because not only will they understand their inspectorial work, but they will be able to see exactly what improvements are being made in the butter factory. I cannot accept the hon. member's suggestion.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Inspector may order remedial measures:

MR. PICKERING: Paragraph (iii) provides that factories, stores, ships and vehicles shall be made fit for the prescribed purposes to the satisfaction of the inspector. How-

ever, I think that to assure control over a ship it is necessary that we should insert the words "or the agent of a ship."

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11—Payment for cream:

MR. PICKERING: The system which has been in vogue is the system which should be continued. I sent a copy of the Bill to the Busselton Agricultural Society who are intimately associated with the dairying industry, and it was returned to me without any request for a change in the method of payment. Therefore, I think we should continue the system which has been in vogue. I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "estimated in the prescribed manner" be struck out.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member apparently has not studied the Bill nor has he read the amendment on the Notice Paper.

HON. P. COLLIER: Look at the multifarious nature of his duties.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member will read the amendment on the Notice Paper, he will see that the factories will have sufficient protection. The clause is the backbone of the Bill, and if the hon. member desires to wreck the Bill, he is going the right way to do it. The department are doing all they can to promote a better standard of butter and to gain a fuller return to the actual producer of the cream.

MR. PICKERING: The representations which have been made to me have been that the existing method of payment has been satisfactory. A lot of the butter factories are under a responsibility to the Government by having to provide interest and sinking fund, and if the Minister is going to take away the basis upon which they operate, that is the over-run, what is he going to put in its place? If he does that, the price of butter fat will fall in proportion. If the clause is passed, he must accept the responsibility for it.

MR. LATHAM: There is a good deal in what the Minister has said. It is only a question of re-arranging the price paid for the butter fat. In my opinion the proviso is necessary.

MR. PICKERING: What about losses?

MR. LATHAM: They will be covered by the price paid for the butter fat. We must consider the interests of the producer, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: I am inclined to agree with the member for Sussex. Not many years ago there was a butter ramp in this State. Through the action of the Government, in returning to the Eastern States a quantity of butter imported from there with the object of keeping up the price of local butter, the country had to pay between £20,000 to £30,000. If the Government are now to be allowed to prescribe the price to be paid for butter fat there is a possibility of this sort of thing occurring again.

The Minister for Mines: This only provides the basis upon which the price shall be fixed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is possible that the people may be obliged to pay a higher price for local butter.

The Minister for Mines: Did you see the butter that was sent back? I would not use it to grease the axles of my car.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government may be able to prescribe such prices for cream that the butter factory may have to put up the price of butter to the consumer. We should have one thing or the other, Government enterprise or private enterprise.

The Minister for Mines: The industry must be controlled.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It need not be controlled to the extent that it is proposed to control private enterprise under this Bill. We should protect the consumer as well as the producer. I am afraid that this Bill will detrimentally affect the industry. I hope the amendment will be agreed to, so that greater freedom may be given to private enterprise with the object of insuring keener competition with the Government. I certainly do not want the Government to have any advantage over private enterprise in this matter.

Amendment put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the following words be added to the proviso, "Less the charges to be stated and levied by the manager."

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 12—Grading cream:

Mr. PICKERING: I should like to see Subclause 3 amended to the effect that new boxes need not be used for the packing of butter. In the case of one factory it would mean an expenditure of an additional £35 a month if the butter had to be put into new boxes. The clause should be definite on the point.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I would agree to such an amendment in the case of butter used for local consumption, but in the case of butter that is to be exported, the boxes must be new in order to fulfil the requirements of the Commonwealth regulations.

Mr. O'Loghlen: When are we likely to be exporting butter?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That may not occur for two years or so, but it will certainly come soon if we progress at the rate we are going to do.

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 3 after the word "butter" in line 4, the following words be added, "Insofar as butter for local consumption is concerned, this shall not necessarily mean the use of new boxes."

Hon. P. Collier: That is a ridiculous amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would not cost a factory much to buy a plane for planing brands off. If a brand is necessary for export, however, it is also necessary for local sale. Further, the clause does not provide for new boxes at all.

Mr. PICKERING: If the Bunbury Butter Factory are not allowed to use second-hand boxes, it means an extra cost of £35 per week to them. In the case of the Busselton factory the extra weekly cost would be £20. However, since I am informed that the clause does not stipulate new boxes, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subclause 4:—"Butter made by a farmer otherwise than in a registered dairy produce factory, under the exemption under the second paragraph of Section 3 of this Act, shall not be sold or kept for sale otherwise than in packages with the words 'Farm Butter' thereon; and in any proceedings for a breach of this subsection an averment in the complaint that the butter so sold or kept for sale was farm butter within the meaning of this subsection shall be deemed to be proved in the absence of proof to the contrary."

Mr. LATHAM: This amendment would inflict hardship on persons supplying two or three pounds of butter weekly to outback storekeepers.

The Minister for Agriculture: What is going to be the cost involved?

Mr. LATHAM: A considerable amount, in view of the high railway freights. The Minister should include in his amendment an exemption for the benefit of womenfolk turning out a few pounds of butter weekly.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The inspectors will not chase all round the State to every farm to see whether a few pounds of butter are being made there and put up in papers marked "Farm Butter." The object of the amendment is to prevent retail storekeepers from selling possibly very bad farm butter as first grade factory butter.

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

Clauses 13, 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Statement of quantity and grade of butter manufactured:

Mr. LATHAM: What is the object of requiring monthly returns to be sent to the Agricultural Department in this connection? If every little detail is to be furnished to the department, an army of civil servants will be needed there. I can understand the information being sent monthly to the suppliers of cream as a check.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: These returns are required by the department in order to check the operations of the factories as regards the over-run.

Mr. Latham: Why not half-yearly returns?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The accounts of the factories are made up monthly.

Mr. PICKERING: Suppliers of cream should get their individual returns, but there is no need for the factory to furnish each supplier with a complete return of the month's business.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Butter and margarine must not be manufactured in the same premises:

Mr. DAVIES: What is the reason for introducing the question of margarine into the manufacture of butter? It is true that margarine is said to be the biggest competitor butter has in this State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is not borne out by the figures.

Hon. P. Collier: Dripping is the greatest competitor of butter.

Mr. DAVIES: Jam is a serious competitor of butter, and yet no objection is made to the manufacture of jam on the same premises as butter.

Hon. P. Collier: Margarine is akin to butter, and jam is not.

Mr. DAVIES: Margarine does not smell or taste like butter.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You cannot tell the difference by the taste.

Mr. DAVIES: Margarine only looks like butter. There are other things which compete with butter.

Hon. P. Collier: But they are easily distinguishable from it.

Mr. DAVIES: That is a fact.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is so apparent that I do not think it requires any explanation. Margarine can have a percentage of butter added to it and it would take an analyst to find out the difference.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Do you think a factory would come at that?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Certainly. The clause will avoid the necessity for inspectors being engaged all the time in inspecting margarine factories.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 18—Margarine not to contain more than 10 per cent. of butter fat:

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the clause will be struck out. We should encourage people to manufacture a good article. If margarine is to be manufactured, what objection can there be to adding a fair percentage of butter? There are sufficient safeguards already.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1, "ten" be struck out with a view to inserting another word.

I intend later to move that "five" be inserted, so that the clause will provide that margarine containing more than 5 per cent. of butter fat shall not be manufactured or sold. Western Australian butter contains a

higher colouration than butter from New South Wales or Queensland. The addition of 5 per cent. of butter fat will not leave the article with that white colouration to which the member for North-East Fremantle has drawn attention.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. During the war period margarine was manufactured at Fremantle that contained 50 per cent. of butter. Butter was almost unobtainable at the time except at about 3s. a lb. and the margarine substitute was so acceptable that one could hardly tell the difference between it and butter. That article was sold at 2s. a lb.

The Minister for Agriculture: You surely would not allow the manufacturer to do that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This commodity met the requirements of the consumer. I think the appearance of butter makes it palatable or otherwise to many people. I hope the 10 per cent. will be left in the clause. It assists the dairy farmer by enabling him to sell his butter fat for the manufacture of margarine. Objection has been taken to Western Australian butter on account of its dark yellow colour, but it is only since people got used to the pale yellow of the imported article that they have objected to the local line.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The objection to a margarine manufacturer adding butter is that it is really practising deceit.

Mr. Latham: Not necessarily. That is unfair.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Margarine should be sold as such and it should not be sold in any other guise so as to delude those purchasing it. Let margarine stand on its own merit.

Mr. DAVIES: I object strongly to any alteration in the clause. I would like to see the Committee strike out all references to the manufacture of margarine. The time may come again when butter is scarce and I think we should safeguard that position. I could understand the provision regarding margarine if it were deleterious to health. I understand that it is a serious competitor to the sale of butter, hence the attempt to prevent its manufacture.

Mr. Heron: When the ring got hold of butter, it was margarine that brought the prices down.

Mr. DAVIES: I would like to see butter at 6d. a lb.

Mr. Heron: Hear, hear!

Mr. Latham: It is evident you do not desire to sweat the industry at all!

Mr. DAVIES: I want it at a reasonable price.

Mr. Pickering: Butter could not be produced at that price.

Mr. DAVIES: It is unfair to legislate in this way against the manufacture of margarine, which was a necessity for many families, particularly of the working classes, during the war period.

Mr. Latham: We should require a good class of margarine.

Mr. DAVIES: If 50 per cent. of butter is added to margarine, why should there be any objection? It seems to me that it must be the fact that margarine has been a serious competitor against the sale of butter that has caused this provision to be inserted in the Bill.

The Colonial Secretary: Why not let margarine be sold as margarine?

Capt. Carter: How many Country Party members can tell the difference between margarine and butter?

Mr. HARRISON: If it is intended to protect the dairying industry, this is one way in which it can be done. If we are to permit a high percentage of pure butter to be used in the manufacture of margarine, the chances are that margarine will become even a stronger competitor against the butter factories.

Mr. Chesson: What does it matter so long as it brings the price down?

Mr. HARRISON: We want to prevent £100,000, or more, going to the Eastern States annually for pure butter supplies. Other articles are protected by patents and so forth, and if people want pure butter, safeguards should be provided so that they can get the pure article. Margarine is a manufactured commodity made up of different qualities of fat and vegetables. If we are to protect margarine, let us have a Bill for that purpose; but that is not the object of this Bill.

Capt. CARTER: Whilst we are sending to the Eastern States hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum for butter, it is foolish to legislate out of the market another commodity which in many homes takes the place of butter. I remember when in England, after the Armistice, margarine was the only form of butter procurable. It is a wholesome, clean food. Clause 21 provides that no margarine shall be sold unless prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, and the package branded or marked as prescribed. The chief objection to margarine is the fear that it will serve to restrict the sale of butter. There is no real danger, because we are still all too short in our butter supply.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Margarine is a wholesome food up to a point. Butter is added to margarine to improve the article, and perhaps to obtain an unduly high price for margarine, because it then carries the appearance of butter. If no colouring matter be added to margarine to deceive the public, there can be no danger in permitting its sale. For the protection of butter, it is only necessary to see to it that margarine is sold as margarine, and not as butter. According to the percentage of butter added to margarine, the colour of the margarine is altered until that commodity takes on all the appearance of butter. We are not seeking to prohibit the manufacture of margarine; our object is to provide that margarine shall not be made to appear to be equal to butter.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill aims at restricting the manufacture of margarine in the State; it has no relation to imported margarine. In 1921 there was imported into

Western Australia 4,790,664 lbs. of margarine, while 2,658,153 lbs. of the commodity was locally produced. The Bill proposes to stop the manufacture of margarine in this State.

The Minister for Agriculture: No.

[Mr. Munsie took the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It means nothing else.

The Minister for Mines: This clause prohibits its sale in certain conditions, no matter where it be manufactured.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But you cannot interfere with the imported article. The Queensland Act gives power to the Governor-in-Council to make regulations governing the manufacture and colouring of margarine. Section 173 of our own Health Act is very explicit in prescribing that no person shall offer margarine for sale except it bears a conspicuous and legible brand or mark. That destroys the argument used by the Colonial Secretary. In all the produce stores of Perth and Fremantle the smallest package of margarine bears a distinctive label. Under the Health Act that is compulsory. Therefore, the public is fully protected. I admit there is a possibility of margarine getting into restaurants and boarding houses.

The Minister for Agriculture: It gets into the Parliament House dining room.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It does not!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Even if the restaurant proprietor puts it on the table, he is compelled by the Act to label it "margarine." We all know that cocoanut oil is used in connection with the manufacture of margarine, and the Minister told us that it was produced with the aid of black labour. Yet at the Claremont Show he provided a corner of the space allotted to the Agricultural Department to show that it is possible to grow the cocoanut in the northern part of the State. This was done, I suppose, to induce people to go there. We all know that when butter is cheap the quantity of margarine sold is very small. When butter is dear margarine is in bigger demand. When the price of butter was 2s. 11d., margarine sold at 2s., and when butter was 1s. 9d. the price of margarine was 1s. 4d. In January last year the price of butter was 2s. 11d. and one firm alone sold margarine to the extent of £8,648 16s. 7d., and when butter dropped to 1s. 9d. in December of that year the same firm in that month sold it to the extent of £1,178 14s. 7d. In January of that year shipping freights were dearer than they were at the end of the year.

The Minister for Mines: At the time when butter was scarce margarine brought a better price.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We could buy margarine at 2s. when we could not buy butter at 3s. or 3s. 6d.

The Minister for Mines: That was a famine price.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The factory to which I have been referring has spent on

its installation £2,100, and it is proposed to spend an additional £3,000 on plant. This shows that it is intended to do something to stop the importation of butter. There is a factory at North Fremantle which does not make margarine from cocoanut oil. Animal fat, the product of the State, is used there. This factory claims that the margarine made there is a superior article to some of the inferior butter which is sold in the State. Some of our locally made butter is not fit to go on the table.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is why we want the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no doubt that commercial morality in this State is bad, and the sooner we get control of the products of the State as well as the products of the other States, the better it will be for the people. If we cannot trust commercial people to sell an article at only 2s., how are we going to trust them to sell anything that may be worth £200 or £300? If people will steal a couple of shillings they will just as readily steal £200. It would appear that some members who believe entirely in private enterprise, and in its being beneficial to the State, are afraid to trust it in a matter of this kind. They say that the commercial morality of these people is so bad that for the sake of an extra twopence they will run in margarine as butter.

Mr. Pickering: Is not that true?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No. Margarine must be labelled as such, and therefore cannot be run in as butter. Last year the people of this State consumed about 7,000,000 lbs. of margarine. This shows that there is a considerable local market for the product. People are compelled to use it because they cannot afford to pay the price asked for butter.

The Minister for Mines: And they are paying more for it than they ought to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Unfortunately under present conditions we cannot regulate the price.

The Minister for Mines: It is because it is made to look like butter that a good price can be asked for it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The profiteering instinct has become so deeply rooted in the community since the war that it will be some time before we get rid of it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have nothing to say against margarine as an article of diet, but I do hold that the butter industry is of greater importance than the margarine industry, which in this State does not employ more than a dozen or 15 hands. The capital value of the five margarine factories in Western Australia is £7,062, and the total value of the eight butter factories is £41,641, in addition to which there is half a million pounds invested in the dairying industry in the State. The principal ingredient of margarine, as used by vegetarians in this State, is copra, imported from the plantations in the South Sea Islands. It is landed here at the factory at approximately 1s. 1d. per lb.

Margarine is being sold in some of the timber districts for 1s. 10d. per lb.

Hon. P. Collier: How many pounds of margarine would a pound of copra make?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: With the addition of butter fat and other ingredients it makes seven or eight pounds of margarine. In no other State in Australia is margarine allowed to be coloured. It is regarded as a menace to the dairying industry in Victoria. It is the height of hypocrisy for vegetarians to say that they cannot eat margarine unless it is coloured to appear like animal fat. They say that its pale colour turns them off it.

Mr. PICKERING: I support the amendment. The percentage of butter that can be mixed with margarine should be reduced as far as possible. Everything should be done to build up the dairying industry.

Mr. MONEY: The object of the Bill is to protect those people who probably work harder than any other class of individuals in the State. I refer to those engaged in the dairying industry. It is necessary that that industry should be protected against the sale of any product that may look like butter and be taken for it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the commercial morality of manufacturers would not stoop to that.

Mr. MONEY: If cotton is sold for wool it is a fraud, and the same thing should apply to margarine. But it is very difficult to trace margarine through its various channels until it reaches the consumer. No doubt it is often sold as butter. It is coloured in the same way that butter is, and frequently finds its way on to the tables of boarding-houses in the guise of butter. Why is margarine made to look like butter? In order that it may be palmed off as butter. It is not fair to the dairying industry of Western Australia to let that continue.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move a further amendment—

That "five" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Mr. DAVIES: I move an amendment on the further amendment—

That "fifteen" be inserted.

The main reason for the inclusion of this clause is that margarine represents a serious competitor of butter.

The Minister for Mines: An unfair competitor.

Mr. Pickering: A fraudulent competitor.

Mr. DAVIES: An attempt is now being made to advance the dairying industry and to damn the margarine industry. I will not be a party to compelling people to pay 2s. per lb. for butter when they can get a substitute much cheaper.

Hon. P. Collier: Is margarine with 15 per cent. of butter better?

Mr. DAVIES: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: Well, is not 100 per cent. of butter better still?

Mr. DAVIES: That is not the point. Let us have the margarine marked "This article is not butter, but contains 15 per cent. of butter." The more butter is added to margarine, the better the margarine becomes. I am willing to go to 20 per cent. of butter.

The Minister for Mines: Why do you want any butter in the margarine at all?

Mr. DAVIES: Because margarine is hard without an admixture of butter. I am willing to concede that margarine is a serious competitor of the dairying industry. However, one could see on the tables of any number of restaurants during war time such an announcement as "This article is not butter, but a substitute." It could be seen on all Albany Bell's tables. Moreover, a man in this city is allowed to sell something he describes as, "95 per cent. milk."

Amendment on the further amendment put and negatived.

Further amendment (to insert "five") put and passed.

Clause as amended put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	20
Noes	6

Majority for .. 14

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Harrison	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Hickmett	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Money	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Pickering	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Davies
Mr. Carter	Mr. Lutley
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Heron

(Teller.)

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Clause 19—Colouring of margarine:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I ask hon. members to vote against this clause. The member for Avon put up a strong argument in that direction when he pointed out that it was necessary to colour butter in order to keep it uniform. Does the hon. member think the colouring is injurious? It seems not to be injurious in the case of butter. Colouring is put into butter in order to please the eye. People will not then regard it as an inferior class of butter.

Hon. P. Collier: They might regard it as the vegetarian article!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It has been stated that colouring of margarine is not allowed

elsewhere in Australia. In Queensland the Government have power to deal with the use of preservatives and colouring matter in margarine. If margarine is not coloured there, why the necessity for power to deal with it? Margarine must be coloured in the Eastern States because it is coloured when it comes here, so that if we agree to the clause, we will allow coloured margarine to be imported from the Eastern States while preventing our own locally manufactured margarine from being coloured. The Health Act already provides sufficient protection to the public against fraud in connection with margarine, because it must be labelled. There is a butter factory at Bunbury where very good butter is manufactured. Is there a store in Bunbury where margarine would be sold as butter? The appearance of food makes it palatable, and if butter looks like lard, people will not eat it.

Hon. P. Collier: Does not the colour affect the digestion as well?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If margarine looks like butter, it will be more palatable to the people who have to buy it.

The Minister for Mines: And it will mean that the retailer will be able to get a bigger price for the margarine than he is entitled to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some people in Western Australia eat margarine because their conscience dictates to them in that direction.

Mr. Money: If people eat margarine because of their conscience, it will make no difference to them what the colour of it is.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: While we want to encourage the production of butter, if our local article were sold at a reasonable price, there would not be so much margarine sold. The figures I have quoted regarding the sale of butter and margarine, respectively, in 1921, show that when butter is cheap, people prefer to eat butter, but they will eat margarine when the price of butter is so high that they cannot afford to purchase it. We have heard a lot about boardinghouse-keepers, and according to the statements of some members, it would appear as though boardinghouse-keepers were the only dishonest people in the State.

Mr. Harrison: But the label does not reach the table.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Damn the table. According to those members, no shop-keeper would sell margarine as butter, but only boardinghouse-keepers put margarine on the table without any label! The Minister has not mentioned a single occasion where fraud has been committed in the sale of this article; and as the manufacturers have dealt justly with the public, we should assist the industry.

Mr. PIESSE: The member for North-East Fremantle made a good point when he referred to the colouring of food making it more palatable. The clause is not so much to encourage the manufacture of butter as to protect the consumer. If margarine is coloured, its selling price is enhanced, but if it looks like

lard, a matter of false pride prevents us from regarding it as palatable. The clause protects the consumer against the fraudulent sale of margarine as butter.

Mr. CHESON: I will support the deletion of the clause. I do not see that the clause can make any difference, for margarine will still be imported into the State. If we cannot stop the importation of coloured margarine, how are we to protect the consumer? There must be a demand for it or we would not have the large importation. Therefore we should not interfere.

Clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	18
Noes	5
Majority for	13	—

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Harrison	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Money	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Pickering	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Carter
Mr. Heron	

(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 20 to 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—Regulations:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

Undoubtedly books should be kept, but surely we can leave them to be kept in the form desired by the man carrying on the butter factory. Presumably he will have a competent clerk, accountant or secretary. It should not be for the Government officials to say in what form the books shall be kept, so long as they afford the information required.

The Minister for Mines: Suppose they do not give the necessary information.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Of course they will. Do we issue instructions to every business man in Western Australia how to keep his books so as to show his taxable income?

The Colonial Secretary: Yes, the taxation officials will open a set of books for him if he does not know how to do it.

The Minister for Mines: So, too, under the Factories Act the form of books to be kept is prescribed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the proprietor of a butter factory is to be regulated in his every move.

The Minister for Mines: We can only regulate the keeping of those books required under the Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The regulations can provide for every blessed thing under the sun. The privately owned factory is to be entirely Government-managed. That is what this clause means. Presently we shall be telling the factory owner where he is to purchase his books.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The books and returns that will be required to be dealt with will only be those specified in the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in the proviso the letter “(h)” be struck out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why is it necessary to regulate the size of cream and milk cans?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: For the purpose of ensuring that the cans shall be of a regulation size.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. S. Sampson—Swan) [10.22]: In moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Nurses Registration Act passed last session. Its principal object is to eliminate the possibility of injustice being done to nurses seeking registration. The Act provided that applications for registration should be made by June 30th of this year. Unexpected delay was encountered, first in printing the Bill, and secondly, in the appointment of members of the board to examine candidates for admission. The first meeting of the board was held on the 14th June. It was felt that with so short a period persons living at a distance would not have sufficient time to apply before the date for the closing of applications. The Bill as originally drafted proposed to extend the time by six months, but another place decided to extend it until June 30th, 1923. The Bill rectifies another difficulty met with, as to the interpretation of the word “authority” as appearing in Subsection 4 of Section 5 of the Act. That subsection provides for the recognition in Western Australia of the certificates of training issued by an authority outside the State. The intention of the Act was that the authority to be recognised should be one or other of the recognised trained nurses’ associations of the Eastern States and the old Country. The board desired to recognise the Australian Trained Nurses’ Association, the Royal Victorian Trained Nurses’ As-

sociation, and the Royal British Nurses' Association. The Crown Law Department, however, advised the board that "authority" as it appears in the Act means some department or body which derives its functions from some Statute. The Bill, therefore, omits the words "authority outside the State," and inserts in lieu the names of the nurses' associations I have mentioned. Lest there should still be a danger of an injustice arising by the limitation of the recognised certificates of these associations the Bill provides that the certificates of any other association or authority recognised by the board may also be accepted. The amendments to the Act are not of a serious nature, and I think will commend themselves to the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 21th October, 1922.

	PAGE
Question: Geraldton Boat Slip	1144
Resignation: Mr. A. Sanderson, Seat declared vacant	1144
Motion: Machinery Inspection, Regulations, to disallow	1145
Bills: Pensioners' (Rates Exemption), 2s.	1147
Licensing Act Amendment, 2s.	1147
Wyalcatchem-Mt. Marshall Railway, (Extension No. 2)	1168
Administration Act Amendment, 2s.	1164
Companies' Act Amendment, 2s.	1164
Married Women's Protection, 2s.	1165

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

QUESTION—GERALDTON BOAT SLIP.

Hon. J. MILLS asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it true that the boat slip at Geraldton is unsafe for use? 2, If so, will the Government repair and strengthen the same at once, so that fishing and other small boats may recondition there as usual during the summer months?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No. It has been recently and successfully used to slip one of the largest boats at the port. 2, Some repairs are desirable, but the users of the slip have not yet complied with the conditions considered to be necessary in regard to finances.

RESIGNATION—MR. A. SANDERSON.

Seat declared vacant.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.34]: I move—

That in consequence of the resignation of the Hon. A. Sanderson as a member of the Legislative Council for the Metropolitan Suburban Province, his seat is hereby declared vacant.

In submitting this motion I should like to echo the sentiments to which you, Sir, gave expression on Thursday in announcing to the House the receipt of the resignation of Mr. Sanderson. I do not think that during the period I have been in the House any member has left whose leaving has created a greater gap than will be left by the departure of Mr. Sanderson. Certainly no member has enjoyed in higher degree the esteem of all other members of the Chamber. His brilliant speeches, always full of well-reasoned argument and ornate with classical allusions, have been features of our debates. Personally, I have found myself in opposition to the hon. member more frequently than with him. I have endured his vigorous criticism, but all this has tended to cement rather than impair the close personal friendship which has existed between us for over a quarter of a century. Looking back, I remember when I was associated with the hon. member in the Federal fight. I now find myself amazed, after the lapse of all these years, at the wonderful foresight the hon. member showed at that time. During his 10 years as a member of this House he has done exceedingly good work, both for his constituency and for the country, and I am sure he carries with him the heartiest good wishes of every member of the House.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [4.35]: It is with the deepest regret that I second the motion. All that has been said of Mr. Sanderson by the Leader of the House and by you, Sir, is quite right and fair. I have known Mr. Sanderson only since I have been in this House, but I have learned to recognise in him a splendid friend, an able debater and a man of first class ability. Whether or not he be successful in the coming campaign, we shall always regret that he is no longer a member of the House. I am quite sure he carries the good wishes of all of us.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [4.36]: I hope it will not be out of place for me to add a few words to what has been said by way of appreciation of one who has been associated with some of us for the last 10 years as a member of the House. I do not know of any other member who has left us whose absence will be more keenly felt than will that of Mr. Sanderson. Nor do I know any other member whose speeches have so charmed us all. There was about Mr. Sanderson's observations a choice of diction and grace of delivery which all of us would like to emulate. We sincerely hope that, in the larger sphere of Federal politics into which