

canteen and we found we could not get enough power to operate the equipment. I think that is a deplorable state of affairs.

There were a number of other minor details which were not attended to for some considerable time and, in fact, some of them are not yet finalised. Some of the supports for the fly screens were found to be inadequate and one fly screen has been leaning against a wall for the past six or seven months. I have asked the Education Department whether the matters could be attended to, but the Education Department—I regret to say—is one of the worst departments to get anything from. This applies particularly to buildings. One is sent from one person to another and back again. We have had some intolerable dealings with the department; and when I say “we,” I mean the local P. & C. and myself. No-one seems to know who gives the authority. I believe that department should be looked into and some better plan devised to deal with matters such as those I have mentioned.

My final remarks relate to the Kewdale high school. In answer to questions, we have been assured that this school, to which staff has been appointed and to which students have been allocated, will be ready by February of next year. That is for the start of the next school year, and I hope it will be ready. If it is not, I think the only thing I can promise to do is to lead a procession of the irate mothers to the office of the Minister for Education. There are a large number of people in the district who are very concerned that their children are scattered all over the metropolitan area. Some have to attend the Governor Stirling School at Midland Junction to obtain their schooling, and I do not think that is reasonable.

I understand that rooms will be provided at the new school to take first-year and second-year students and that in the following year the school will be able to take third-year students. I am warning the Government that there will be a great public outcry if the Kewdale high school is not ready for occupation at the start of the next school year. Possibly the Government is aware of the circumstances, but I repeat on behalf of myself and the member for Belmont, and the member for Beeloo—and indeed I am sure those members will have something to say before the end of the session—it is a matter of great concern. It is not fair to the students and staff and not fair to the parents of the students.

Those are the matters I wish to speak on. There is plenty which could be said. I must once again repeat that I believe the public who live south of the river, in the area about which I have spoken, feel let down by the statement of the Premier that the building of the bridge at Burswood Island has been delayed indefinitely.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Brady.

House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 12th October, 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1345
Com. ; Report	1346
Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—	
2r.	1333
Com.	1339
Report	1340
Dental Hygienists Registration Bill—2r.	1324
Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1324
Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1346
Com. ; Report	1346
Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1346
Com.	1349
Report	1355
Mental Health Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	1333
Milk Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1340
Com.	1344
Report	1345
Supply Bill (No. 2), £23,000,000—	
Receipt ; 1r.	1333
Traffic Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1324
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission Bill—	
2r.	1325
Com.	1331
Report	1333
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Kwinana Freeway Extensions : Route, and Tabling of Plans	1323
Roads—	
Cocklebidly to Rawlinna : Construction	1324
Coolgardie to Esperance—Centre Guide Lines : Marking	1323
Esperance Land and Development Company—	
Financial Contribution by Company	1323
Surveys and Work Undertaken	1323

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (4): ON NOTICE**ROADS: ESPERANCE LAND AND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY***Surveys and Work Undertaken*

1. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

Referring to the land being developed by the Esperance Land and Development Company, west and east of Esperance:—

- (a) How many miles of roads have been surveyed to service the area?
- (b) How much work has been done since 1959 on each separate road in—
- (i) clearing;
 - (ii) grading;
 - (iii) gravel sheeting; and
 - (iv) bitumen;
- and what is the value of same in the west side area and the east side area?

Financial Contribution by Company

- (c) How much finance has been provided by the Esperance Land and Development Company for the roads?
- (d) Was finance made available from any other source?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) 212 miles west
136 miles east
-
- 348 miles (total)

- (b) Due to lack of common identification it has not been possible to show the work done on each separate road. However, the following statement sets out the total improvements carried out by the Main Roads Department since 1959:—

	East miles	West miles	Total miles
(i) Clearing (including widening)	181	206	387
(ii) Forming	157	105	262
(iii) Graveling	71	23.8	94.8
(iv) Bitumen	Nil	Nil	Nil

Expenditure incurred on the above-mentioned works:—

East side — £83,735.

West side — £45,089.

The works detailed above and the expenditure incurred on those works refer only to roads directly connected with access to the Esperance Land and Development Company and do not include roads passing through other alienated land. In addition, £165,856 was spent on the Esperance end of the Esperance-Israelite Bay road.

- (c) No finance was provided by the Esperance Land and Development Company.

- (d) The work was financed entirely by the Main Roads Department.

KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSIONS*Route, and Tabling of Plans*

2. The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Town Planning:
- (1) Could the Minister inform the House whether the final route for the extensions to the Kwinana Freeway has been determined?
 - (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes," would he lay the final plan on the Table of the House.
 - (3) If the answer to (1) is "No," could he inform the House at what stage the plans have reached, and how long does he believe it will be before the final route is determined?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) No; the final route is not yet determined.
- (2) Answered by (1) above.
- (3) Final plans will be considered following studies now being carried out by the Public Works Department in conjunction with the Main Roads Department regarding river-bed conditions. No definite time can be given as to when the final route will be determined.

ROAD FROM COOLGARDIE TO ESPERANCE*Centre Guide Lines: Marking*

3. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

With reference to the Coolgardie-Esperance road, which is less than 18 feet in width, and bearing in mind:—

- (a) the great benefit of white guide lines in the centre of busy highways;
 - (b) the ever important task of preventing road accidents and thus saving lives;
 - (c) the constant threat of injuries to motorists; and
 - (d) the wishes and opinions of citizens and local authorities throughout the goldfields;
- will the Commissioner of Main Roads reconsider his decision of excluding white guide lines in the centre of this road?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No. The Coolgardie-Esperance road has only a 12 ft. wide seal and it is considered that a hazard would be created by white centre lines.

ROAD FROM COCKLEBIDDY TO RAWLINNA

Construction

4. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

To assist pastoralists and residents on the Eyre Highway, will the Main Roads Department survey and prepare the track from Cocklebiddy to Rawlinna, and thus make it into a serviceable road for motor vehicles?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Main Roads Department is considering a proposal for upgrading the road between Cocklebiddy and Rawlinna. No decision has been reached regarding the allocation of funds for this work.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee, and passed.

DENTAL HYGIENISTS REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [4.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to bring into being a type of auxiliary in the field of dentistry which will be new to Western Australia. In other parts of the world dental auxiliaries or dental hygienists have been accepted for many years.

The United Kingdom, the United States of America, and New Zealand all use dental hygienists. Their range of operations differs in each case, and it is not exactly comparable with the provisions of this Bill. Nevertheless the proposals reflect the ideas of responsible interests in the dental profession in this State as being appropriate to our needs.

It is believed that the use of trained dental hygienists will relieve the professional dentist of some time-consuming operations and thereby free him to pay more attention to the more obscure forms of dental disease. It will also enable the School Dental Service to undertake the planned topical application of fluoride solution to the teeth of children. This measure is regarded as a worth-while step to prevent dental caries.

The training and employment of dental nurses will not be disturbed by the aims of this Bill. Members should not confuse dental nurses with dental hygienists. Dental nurses have been, and will continue to be, trained at the dental hospital.

The Bill provides for the appointment of a seven member board to administer its provisions. The board would be responsible to the Minister. Of the seven members, two will be dental hygienists. Until graduates are available for registration, the Minister will nominate two suitable persons to represent dental hygienists. The remaining five members will be dentists. They will be nominated by the dental science faculty of the University, the Dental Board of Western Australia, the Perth Dental Hospital, and the Australian Dental Association.

The usual provisions regarding nominations, appointments, and vacancies are contained in the Bill. Members who have been here for a short period will recall several Bills—one last year—setting up different boards, and this one follows the usual lines to which we have become accustomed in such measures.

Registration will be available to females who have reached the prescribed minimum age and have passed the qualifying examination. The board will be able to recognise qualifications obtained overseas or in other States if it considers these equivalent to the standard to be set in this State. The board would have disciplinary powers to deal with misconduct by registered persons. An appeal to a magistrate against the board's decision is provided for.

The main source of revenue for the board will come from registration fees, but as these will not be forthcoming until after a school has been organised, and graduates present themselves, it will be necessary for some State assistance to be given in the first year or two. The financial accounts of the board will be subject to inspection by the Auditor-General.

Finally, the board is given power to make rules covering all necessary aspects of its field of operations. These aspects will cover the curriculum, the periods of study, and all other matters necessary in order that the course of training will be successful and in order that the trainees can be passed through the set curriculum. The Bill is similar in this and many other respects to the Physiotherapists Act, which has proved to be a workable piece of legislation.

Debate adjourned, until Tuesday the 19th October, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes amendments affecting seven different aspects of the administration of the Act regulating factories and shops.

The first of these is to extend the provisions of the Act to factories occupied by or on behalf of the Crown. It is proposed to add a new section 8A to replace paragraph (e) of subsection (2) of section 5. This new section will specify more particularly the intention of the Act to cover factories which are operated by the Government, or other Crown instrumentality, to leave no doubt as to the obligations of such undertakings to comply with the health, welfare, and safety provisions of the Act, and also in respect of fees which apply to private industry.

The next amendment will require that plans of a new building to be used as a factory; of alterations to a building already a factory; or in respect of an existing building to be adapted to such use must be submitted to the Chief Inspector of Factories before construction work commences.

The Act at present requires the submission of a plan of a factory, shop, or warehouse at the time only of an initial registration. This has led, on occasion, to a situation requiring alterations being made after the erection of a building to make it comply with the requirements of the Act. The amendment will provide an assurance that every opportunity be given to ensure that plans conform with all necessary conditions and, if not, that they be amended by the designer while the project is in the planning stage. An added benefit will be the saving in expense to builders and occupiers of factories.

The next amendment empowers the Minister to make certain exemptions or modifications in registration fees. On numbers of occasions, requests have been made for remissions of registration fees in respect of factories and shops conducted by charitable organisations. There is no provision in the Act at present for remission of these fees. It is considered that where the merits of a particular case warrant it, the Minister should be empowered to waive either the whole or part of the registration fee.

Another amendment will permit the chief inspector to modify the record procedures laid down rigidly in section 33, as regards time worked and wages paid.

While records of this nature are essential in the matter of inspection of the numbers of employees and overtime worked by juniors, some difficulty is being experienced in adhering to the letter of the record requirements as now laid down, because of the introduction of centralised accounting and mechanical methods of keeping staff and wage records.

The amendment will permit of a degree of flexibility necessary to accommodate the requirements of modern accounting methods while yet retaining the essential sources of information required in the course of inspection of premises. The introduction of new methods has particular application to branches of large firms where the main accounting procedure is centralised at the head office.

The specification of a minimum age at which a child can be employed has, in the past, led to some anomalies in regard to the employment of junior females. For instance, a girl may leave school prior to reaching the age of 15 years and become engaged in a number of avenues of employment; but should the work be covered by the Factories and Shops Act, she is precluded from such employment.

This is brought about through the definition of "child" in the Act as a person not of school-leaving age. It is proposed that this be amended to tie in with the minimum age of employment and the school-leaving requirements of the Education Act. Provision is also made for welfare officers, appointed under the Education Act, to be authorised to check employment of persons not of school-leaving age in factories, shops and warehouses.

Section 55 of the Act in its present form prohibits the working of overtime by women as well as by young persons. The amendment which is proposed will provide for senior females to work reasonable overtime while still protecting young persons.

The amendment to section 56 also tidies up the overtime provisions by providing a cover in regard to spread of hours and overtime payment for males from the age of 16 years instead of 18 years as it now stands.

The last amendment which I shall explain is in respect of section 95, and its purpose is to clarify the position in regard to privileged shops being permitted to open on public holidays in the same manner as small and exempt shops.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COASTAL SHIPPING COMMISSION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 6th October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [4.53 p.m.]: This is a Bill of considerable length and of great importance. Its passing will have a far-reaching effect, and will bring about many changes in the manner of operation of the State Shipping Service,

and, indeed, will have application to its future. The State Shipping Service, as such, will come under another form of control.

It is a long time since the need for the State Shipping Service was accepted in this State, and it came into being by proclamation under an Act known as the Government Trading Concerns Act of 1912. All the trading concerns which followed from that period were created by proclamation under the Government Trading Concerns Act, until it was repealed in 1917. The 1917 Act not only repealed the provisions of the Government Trading Concerns Act for the creation of State enterprises or undertakings by proclamation, but set out very specific requirements for the control of the operations of the many instrumentalities of that time, which included a wide variety of businesses—such as fish shops, State sawmills, quarries—and among them was the State Shipping Service.

The early ships which operated in this service were very small—only a few hundred tons. They plied between Geraldton and Bunbury and did not necessarily operate in the north-west. Following a little ship called the *Yuna*, were ships trading from Eucla back to Fremantle, which included one ship known as the *Eucla*. There was also the *West Australian* which was built for the service but was found to be much too fast and not quite suitable for the trade until the original *Kangaroo* was purchased, which vessel gave such remarkable service during the first world war. Indeed, the older members of this Chamber will recall, in Budget statements even up to the late 1940's, that provision was made for the repayment of loan funds which were borrowed for the purchase of the original *Kangaroo*. Yet, during the 1914-18 war, that vessel paid for itself many times over, including one cargo which paid for its original cost. However, all the profits made by the *Kangaroo* were paid into Consolidated Revenue and it was many years afterwards that the final payment was made to cover the original cost of that ship.

The next ship of note was the *Bambra*, well known, I am sure, in the memory of many members of this House. She was a war prize, a German ship, *Prince Zigmund*, seized in Brisbane, and was made available to the State Shipping Service under commission for many years until she was ordered to be broken up. The *Bambra* really opened up many of the activities of some of the outlying ports of north-west Australia. She made regular visits to such places as Napier Broome Bay, and paid regular calls at Shark Bay, Balla Balla, and Depuch Island to pick up wool.

The *Kybra* was the first post world war ship to be constructed for the State Shipping Service. She was a little vessel which gave a wonderful service from the port of Eucla back to Fremantle and as far north as Port Hedland for many years. She was

in the service for only a year or two when the *Koolinda* was built, which was the greatest prize of them all. She was constructed in 1927, and I would say that for north-west service and for a contribution to the State Shipping Service as a whole there has not been, before or since, a vessel of such great importance and value as the *Koolinda*.

During that period, of course, the Alfred Holt line, the Blue Funnel line, and the W.A.S.N. Company plied; and, when it was suitable, they picked up cargoes north bound. The ships of those companies loaded sheep and wool from north-west ports for carriage to Singapore, and also wool and other commodities to ports in the south. Those companies have gradually faded away from the coastal service in very recent years.

I repeat: The *Koolinda* gave very great service and has been sadly missed. As a service she has not as yet been replaced. Perhaps her best efforts were made during the war years when the Government of the day was able to use her for carrying cargoes which were of great value and importance—including depth charges—to north-west places. I shall not mention the destinations; but I was then the Minister in charge of the service. During the war years the *Koolinda* lifted cargoes from Broome, Derby, Wyndham, and Port Hedland. During one year she lifted 3,500 head of cattle on the hoof out of Broome. Of course, Derby was out of bounds, because of the 24-hours run down King Sound, where she would have made an excellent target for the enemy.

The first *Koolama*, built during the war years, was sunk in the war. She was also a very modern vessel, and had just entered into her stride when she met the dire effect of Japanese bombs off Cape Londonderry, and limped into Wyndham where she still rests under the water almost up against Wyndham jetty. At that time things were very desperate in the north-west as regards shipping.

Without introducing any personal aspect, members might know that I was the one who was responsible for the traffic in and out of the north during those years. I flew with General Gordon Bennett in Hudson bombers, and so on, in handling the requirements of the civilian population in the north-west of Australia. In that desperate period, when hundreds of vessels which had escaped from Singapore and Sourabaya were lined up from the tip of Rottnest to Fremantle Harbour, we were able to reach agreement to take over a small Chinese vessel named the *Chungking*—and what a relic she was!

The vessel was 30 years old then, and had a Chinese crew which walked off the ship at Fremantle after some shooting and stabbing. She was a coal burner and was

not equipped for Europeans, but she was the only vessel we could get to assist the north-west area. This vessel, which had a speed of six or seven knots—provided there was a sea running with her—carried very many of the things required by the war-time aeroplanes to, particularly, Pot Shot—which was the name of the airstrip at Exmouth Gulf.

I recall making a trip on the *Chungking* back from North West Cape to Fremantle. The journey took six days, and we were steaming at perhaps four knots against a southerly breeze. When the searchlight at Rottnest hit her, the late Honourable Frank Welsh who was a passenger on board said she stopped dead. The *Chungking* rendered a great service to the north-west of Australia during that very difficult period.

It is interesting to observe that the advent of the smaller ships on our coast commenced about that time, and the State Shipping Service constructed the *Dorrigo*, the *Dulberton*, and others—vessels of 2,000 to 2,400 tons. The port facilities, as well as the special needs of small ports in the north prompted the management of the State Shipping Service, with the Government's concurrence, to build the fleet which now exists. The small vessels of 2,000 to 2,400 tons—both cargo and passenger vessels—were used until the *Kangaroo* was built. Many members have been on board this vessel and many saw her prior to her maiden voyage. She is a vessel of about 4,000 tons.

The cost of shipping, which I shall refer to during the discussion on certain clauses in the Bill, has risen fantastically. The *Dorrigo* cost £190,000 to build post-war, but the *Kangaroo* of 4,000 tons, which was built more recently, cost £1,260,000. I deliberately mention those amounts because I wish to refer to comparative figures later on.

During that period the Government of the day made rather ambitious plans for port development in the north-west of Australia, and two Governments have had a hand in the progressive development of ports and harbours. A very important event is to take place on Thursday of this week at Derby—the opening by the Minister for Works of the Derby jetty. This is a land-based jetty, new in structure, with facilities on the jetty itself. I think the Wyndham jetty was opened in 1959 by the present Premier, and it was just concluded in the early days of his premiership. It is one of the finest structures in north Australian waters. It is new in type and design, and is somewhat similar to the one now being constructed at Broome. We should pay a very great tribute to the engineers in the Harbours and Rivers Department. The jetties which have been constructed in recent years, particularly in the Kimberley, are a great tribute to those men.

Lower down in Pilbara, preparations are being made to provide berths to accommodate not ships of 2,500 or 10,000 tons—as is the case in Wyndham where meat ships operate—but vessels of 40,000 to 80,000 tons. I think the Minister for Mines told us that vessels of up to 100,000 tons—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Ultimately.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: —will be used ultimately in the transport of iron ore from the new port of Dampier, and perhaps others out from Port Hedland. Port development in the north has progressed slowly, because of the many difficulties brought about by different thinking on shipping transport, in relation to facilities which are required in the north-west ports.

Another matter which has given very great concern to the State Shipping Service and to the Government is the almost entire disappearance of cargo availability at certain ports. I can recall when I first represented the Gascoyne electorate and 35,000 bales of wool was the production of the district; and 23,000 to 24,000 of those bales were transported from the Carnarvon jetty. At the present time, because of road access and other circumstances, 500 to 1,000 bales a year would be the figure transported by ship from Carnarvon. Onslow is another case in point. It used to despatch 30,000 to 40,000 live sheep a year to Singapore, but now it despatches none; it used to despatch 13,000 bales of wool, but now only a few hundred bales.

So the changing circumstances have given the management of the State Shipping Service very many headaches, and have brought about its present financial situation and its inability to have other than drifting finances throughout many years. It should be mentioned that in spite of the extraordinary service that has been given by the State Shipping Service—its management, staff, and operatives—very many selfish interests, which are not prepared to concede good service but which are prepared to take advantage of opportunities when cheaper resources are available, have become evident.

For example, last year wool was hauled from within 50 miles of Port Hedland overland to Meekatharra and railed to Fremantle at a cost of £5 per bale. This is a losing proposition, but in order to make inroads into northern transport the road hauliers were charging that rate, which could not be faced by ships—and ships are the cheapest form of transport.

In the introduction of this Bill the Minister mentioned the important report of Captain John Williams, which was made in 1962. I hope most members have read this important report, which sets out in detail not a summary of the conditions of the State Shipping Service as at 1961-62, but a clear indication of the difficulties associated with the operation and management of a service operating in such dangerous waters during certain times of the year, and under serious conditions in regard to port facilities, and so on.

The terms of reference which were presented to Captain Williams, and which were contained in a letter from the Minister for the North-West (Mr. Court), requested Captain Williams to make a very complete inquiry into the affairs of the State Shipping Service. The terms of reference, which were all-embracing—and not merely to investigate the present organisation, its methods, and its results—requested him to recommend a variation of responsibilities, if necessary. The terms were set down in great detail, and among other matters they included sailing and operational methods, the adequacy of the present fleet, the method of working northern ports, the freight and passenger rates, and overseas trade.

A very valuable report was presented to the Government not many months after Captain Williams began his inquiry, and this report was available in March, 1962. It is striking to note and worthy of emphasis that not at any stage nor in any portion of this report did Captain Williams level criticism at the management, the men, or the work, of the State Shipping Service. I think this is a great tribute to the way in which they have carried out their job under very great difficulties.

This is a most difficult service to operate. Some of the ports are tidal to the extent of 32 feet between rise and fall, others are tidal to the extent of 27 feet and 29 feet. One of the features which I have heard mentioned in regard to the deep-water jetty at Broome is that it is a pity we will no longer be able to see a ship sitting on its bottom at Broome at low tide after the jetty has been completed. But that is progress. Ships have been built to bear particular stresses in order that they may withstand cyclonic conditions, and also to be able to rest on their bottoms at two or three ports in the north; but their design is very largely different from the design of ships which have to sail the seven seas in normal conditions.

It is interesting to point out that the report of Captain Williams, upon which this Bill is based—it is also based on the recommendations of the Grants Commission, to which I shall allude later—was made before the iron ore developments were known or contemplated. It is quite a remarkable situation to find that following the strong recommendations of Captain Williams, contained in his report, the discoveries were made—discoveries which have given such a remarkable impetus to the north-west towns and their surroundings. I know that the Minister for Mines, if he had the time and opportunity to tell us—since his recent visit to the north—would mention the almost fantastic activity at both old places and new places occasioned by the possibility of selling thousands of millions of tons of iron ore.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is exciting.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I do not know what the right word is, but the activity is very important to Western Australia. We will not have much responsibility as a Government—nor will the State Shipping Service—at some of the ports, but it is remarkable that these things are subsequent to the report of such an authority as Captain Williams on the shipping needs of the north.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: One of the things I did notice was the air of confidence of the people engaged in the work, including the workmen, who wanted to get on with the task.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes; I think that is so. Perhaps it is superfluous for me to say that after listening to the Minister when he introduced this measure, I also made a study of the Bill.

The State Shipping Service is a very big business by Australian standards. Its contribution to the people of Western Australia, and their need, has been enormous. The losses of the service appear staggering. The total accumulated losses of the State Shipping Service, since its inception, exceed £14,800,000. The assets, of course, are the seven ships in the service, and the great service given by those ships.

One matter I would like to mention to the Minister in charge of this Bill is the great difficulty I experienced in locating recent reports and balance sheets of the State Shipping Service when inquiring into certain aspects of this Bill. The last report tabled in this Parliament was for the year ended the 31st December, 1962. Even that report was not tabled in the Legislative Assembly, and I think it would be appropriate for the Minister to make a note of that to see that Parliament is furnished with the reports and balance sheets of such an important instrumentality as the State Shipping Service.

I will quote from the final statement of the State Shipping Service for the year ended the 31st December, 1964, which, by the consent of the Minister, I was able to obtain from the Under-Treasurer. All that was obtainable other than this were references in the annual reports of the Auditor-General which, in this connection, of course, are very thorough indeed.

I mentioned the accumulated loss. The loss last year was £1,330,278—a very big figure for this instrumentality. The previous year, £1,217,000 was the loss; so it is something to take notice of, particularly when the Chairman of the Grants Commission said to the Under-Treasurer, "How long can this drift proceed, and what figure can we reasonably peg this loss at?" I heard the chairman pass that remark when I was present at the hearing—one of several I attended. I think it is to the great credit of the Chairman of

the Grants Commission that he was prepared to accept a very high pegged figure to be aimed at by the State and Federal shipping services.

I will not weary the House with too much reference to this balance sheet, but I think it is important to observe that even last year, included in that very heavy loss was a payment of £47,000 for the charter of an Eastern States ship to buttress the service being given. I think the attitude of the Commonwealth Grants Commission has been remarkable since the first case was made out, during the war years, for some contribution towards the losses on the State Shipping Service to be considered in a special grant. That request was made to Chairman Egglestone.

The view taken by Mr. P. D. Phillips, Q.C., is certainly not unrealistic; and he has been thorough in his examination, not only of the service and how it may be improved, but of the improvements projected in the future. He is certainly in the role of a strong man in his general analysis—not merely of this entity, but of all State undertakings in respect of which special grants are made. He has to come face to face with Commonwealth authorities with our representations. He is right in the middle of the road.

To digress for a moment, I think it is remarkable that the Commonwealth Government has not, so far, differed from the grants recommended by the Grants Commission, but I think we must face the prospect that a halt may be called to the mounting sums being granted to the State under special grants.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Not for a while, we hope.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I hope not. If members who are interested in State finance will look at the impact on the State Budget of grants which used to be finance reimbursement grants from taxation—and which are now financial assistance grants—and at their effect on the Budget of £100,000,000 this year, they will note the remarkable increase in the moneys available to Western Australia.

All the States, since the 1959 alteration in the method, have benefited by a 38 per cent. increase—that is, on the old taxation reimbursement scheme. However, Western Australia has gone up 150 per cent. since 1959 in special grants. We have gone from £4,000,000 to a likely £10,240,000 this year; and that is not merely because of a different attitude and a different approach to the subject by the members of the commission since the days of Sir Alex Fitzgerald. I think some credit is due to the officers of the State, who, in their various spheres, have so presented the case for the State that their opinions have been accepted.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is no doubt about that!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is true to say that the State is many millions of pounds better off per annum since the new alignments of figures based on the needs for the special operations in, and the interests of, Western Australia have been measured.

One does not know, and one cannot contemplate—as I mentioned earlier—what might be the ultimate attitude of the Commonwealth. Although the Commonwealth has not so far refused to accept the recommendations of the Grants Commission, the figures are becoming a very large proportion of State income—that is, the Commonwealth contribution to the States.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: No higher than they ought to be.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I agree with that; but I am simply illustrating the remarkable trend which is enjoyed by the Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Just as well it is not the other way.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I do not think there is any chance of it being the other way, but it could have been a different situation if we had ceased to be a claimant State when South Australia ceased to be one. The present Government would not have been as good as is represented to the people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't spoil a good speech.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If this State had ceased to be a claimant State in 1959, the circumstances would have been different. We could not state at this stage just where we are heading in regard to Commonwealth finance. In short, the Commonwealth Grants Commission has said to the State of Western Australia that the losses of the State Shipping Service should be realistically stopped at £1,200,000; and that places Captain Williams' report as one of the causes of this Bill.

The reasons for the Bill, quite apart from that cause, can be—as the Ministers have confirmed—that this change to a commission will bring about a much better result for the State and for the service. I have no quarrel with the appointment of the commission. I have taken the opportunity to consult an old friend of mine, Mr. T. E. Owen, who is the recently retired General Manager of the State Shipping Service, and a man I have known for 40 years, since he was the purser on the *Bambra* until, through his very good record of years of service, he became manager of the line. I think it is the firm belief and strong opinion of Mr. Owen that this Bill is a step in the right direction.

Among the changes proposed by the Bill is the authority to be given to the commission—which differs from the present management—to dispose of assets and to deal with special expenditure, without ministerial reference, up to £50,000. That is a very small sum in today's figures and does not mean too much.

There are many operational powers not very dissimilar to the present powers, but the commission is to be vested with borrowing powers. These will be the same as the powers of the State Electricity Commission and other instrumentalities. The accounts, as has been the case in the past, are to be kept in a special account at the Treasury, and I think that is a most interesting situation.

The Treasury will really be the banker for this instrumentality in that all receipts are to be paid into a special account, and when the amount of the deficit is known, the Treasurer will reimburse the account with that amount. So it will be, in effect, the same sort of operation as if the money was paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the deficit met by the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes; except that the accounts will be kept separately.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is so. They would be kept separately if paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I think it is important that they should be kept separately. The Government might one day, with ministerial direction, desire accounts to be kept at banks apart from the Treasury, in order to control the specific operation of an undertaking. However, that is a matter of conjecture; it might or might not be.

One of the greatest difficulties in this change about which I am concerned, and which was not mentioned at any length by the Minister, is the financial requirement of this new authority over the next five to ten years. It is clear it will require £5,000,000 to £7,000,000 to re-equip the fleet, plus financing the £1,200,000 anticipated deficit. There will need to be a change from a small fleet to larger vessels—large in our sense—of maybe 6,000 to 7,000 tons within the next three to five years. Such vessels will cost £5,000,000 to £7,000,000; and it is anticipated that a big sum of money will be required within the next few years.

That expenditure is unavoidable and there are only two sources from which the money can be obtained—either through the General Loan Fund allocation, or through borrowings under its own authority, such as are made by other governmental authorities.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Which are limited.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, they are both limited—they are very limited in both fields. The difficulties of obtaining money in such large quantities are very great.

As regards borrowings from the General Loan Fund, the State is in competition with other States for all of its needs. After convincing the five other State Premiers, plus the Commonwealth Treasurer, of the loan capacity of this State, the State has competition within its own boundaries in regard to its requirements for schools, hospitals, and the like where the capital expenditure is financed through loan funds. So, in addition to being initially in competition with the other States for this type of money, an internal stress will be placed on Governments for the spending of such large sums of money in one department.

In so far as semigovernmental borrowings are concerned, the field is limited indeed and it is highly competitive within the State. With these limited borrowing powers under its own charter, and a very restricted field in which to operate, all we can hope is that the investors within the State, and outside of it, will have sufficient confidence in Western Australia to support loans for enterprises such as this. However, as I said, that is the greatest worry I have about the changeover. It would be a continuing worry under the present system, but it will be a much greater worry with a commission advising the Government—realistically, we hope—and projecting into the future the anticipated needs of the service.

I am not one who shares the view I have heard expressed that this commission is simply to be a buffer for the Government, and that the Government is sort of getting out from under. I do not hold that view at all. I think this is an approach to enliven, and to make more economical, a great service that now exists and to make it possibly a greater service; and I hope that will continue to be the situation. While I am concerned with the financial aspect, and the ability to give the commission all that it needs, I wholeheartedly support the Bill in the hope that the commission will be able to obtain all the money it requires in the future.

All north-west members know that this service has been the lifeline of the north. Pressures on members and management to get an extra 100 tons of something, or an extra few motor vehicles transported to the north, have at times meant that the ships would need to have elastic sides. Last minute requirements of cargo have made the task of allocating the port-to-port requirements, and urgent needs, a difficult matter for management.

There is one matter referred to by Captain Williams which I would like to mention, although I do not wish to weary the House on this subject—I refer to handling organisations at Fremantle and other ports. I would like the Minister to inquire—not necessarily before the Bill is passed—and advise the House at some appropriate stage what is to happen regarding the control of stevedoring operations at different

ports. We know what will happen if the Fremantle terminal proposal is given effect to; but is it proposed to replace the operations of the Harbour and Light Department? The Harbour and Light Department makes a splendid profit at different ports out of its operations on State ships—I think it represents about 30s. a ton overall in handling charges. What I would like to know—and I think the people in the north would like to know—is whether the proposal which Captain Williams recommends is to be followed and the work is to be taken over by the shipping service itself.

I should also like to pay a great tribute to the present and past captains of this fleet. We have had men of tremendous stature in their profession: men like Captain Buckeridge, Captain Griffith, Captain John Airey, and Captain John Egglestone—one of the greatest—and the rest of the staff. The men on board, in spite of all criticisms, have given to this State, and the north in particular, very great service. I think I simply need say that I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.38 p.m.]: I am sure we all listened with very great interest to Mr. Wise in his examination of the speech I made on the second reading and his tracing of the history of the State Shipping Service. I do not think it is necessary for me to make much comment in reply except to say that when given an opportunity I will have a look at the two points raised by the honourable member.

I suppose it could be said truthfully that Western Australia's ultimate objective must be to stand on its own two feet in respect of its finances; but personally I would say that this is not the time for it to do that. I think there are certain great benefits that we get from the Grants Commission, and a great deal of financial assistance comes to Western Australia from that source. Sometimes I feel a little sorry when I hear undue criticism coming from certain sources about the treatment that Western Australia receives from the Grants Commission.

In regard to the appointment of this shipping commission, as Mr. Wise has said, it is not a question of the Government passing the buck—if I can use that expression—or trying to get away from its responsibilities; it is a question of following the recommendations that were made by Captain Williams some time ago, to effect an improvement in the operations of the State Shipping Service. As I said, I will check on the two points raised by Mr. Wise, but I was hoping that the honourable member would have told us what he thought should prevail in regard to the stevedoring arrangements, and

whether the present arrangements should be continued or whether the State Shipping Service should—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You have not consulted me on any other point, so why should I presume?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the honourable member had not sat down so quickly I might have asked him a question in that regard. However, he can still answer the question at a later date, if he chooses to do so, and I will inquire as to the intentions before the Bill is passed at the third reading stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Constitution of Commission—

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am wondering if the Minister could give the Committee any information as regards the type of personnel who will constitute the new commission. Are they to be retired ships' captains or are they to be personnel steeped in management of shipping companies? Are there any who could be mentioned as typical of those who may be appointed? In short, is there any information available to us?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not in a position, at this point of time, to say exactly who the members of the commission are likely to be; but I would like the Committee to accept an assurance that the Minister concerned will choose wisely in his recommendations to the Government when the appropriate time comes to get people to fill these positions. I am not in a position to give any further information at this stage.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Functions of Commission—

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Provision is made in this clause for the type of service to be given within the State, interstate, and outside the State. I wonder whether there is any particular idea in the mind of the Government in regard to extending the services outside of the State?

Those of us who have known this service for so long are concerned at what might happen. Ships like the *Kangaroo* and the *Koolinda* traded from Port Swettenham to Penang and Singapore; but as the traffic in the north increased those services were curtailed and, indeed, there has been considerable criticism from the north of the extension of the service to the round-Australia trip which takes place once or twice a year in the case of one or two vessels.

The people in the north feel they are being robbed of a service which belongs to them, and which should not be used for tourists when the needs of the north are so great. Could the Minister tell me whether there is anything in the mind of the Government in view of the wording of this clause?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: An examination of the clause indicates to me that this is the normal sort of wording that might be expected in the compilation of a clause setting out the functions of the commission. My understanding at the time in relation to ships going round Australia was that this was to improve the likelihood of the State Shipping Service picking up better cargoes, and to provide better financial benefits as a result of such turnaround.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You would anticipate that the primary objective would be a service to Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Unless and until I am told anything to the contrary, that is my understanding. Does the honourable member mean: Is it intended that the State ships should serve the Near East or the Far East? If so, I do not think this is the case. But I would like to be given an opportunity to make sure of this.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 to 24 put and passed.

Clause 25: Funds of Commission—

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: This clause deals with the finances of the commission. I am rather puzzled as to how the commission will turn a deficit into a profit within a few years, particularly when one looks at the losses incurred by the service over the past few years. I would refer the Committee to the report of the Grants Commission for the year 1963. Section 280 of that report reads—

The loss borne by the State budget of Western Australia in respect of the State Shipping Service was £857,000 which was £26,000 more than in 1960-61. The operations of this service have been the subject of discussion between the Commission, the Western Australian Treasury and the Commonwealth Treasury in recent years and the Commonwealth Treasury submitted that the Commission should consider making an unfavourable adjustment in respect of the heavy loss of this service.

In view of those facts and of the conditions of the clause under which moneys will be appropriated from time to time by Parliament for its purposes, could the Minister give us a rough estimate as to what the Government would propose in appropriating moneys from time to time for the functions of the commission, and for the purpose of defraying the cost

charge in expenses incurred by the commission in respect of money received by it for freights and other charges? The commission will have a gigantic task ahead of it if it is to deal with the position without getting into debt and without having to fall back on the Treasury when trying to repay the amounts it borrows from the banks.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I had a little difficulty in hearing the honourable member, but I understood him to say that he could not understand how the commission could be expected to change a loss into a profit; and how clause 25 will enable the commission to do this. Clause 25 will not enable the commission to do this at all; neither is it expected that the commission will be able to do this—certainly not straight away.

This clause deals with the functions of the commission. It is the financial clause in the Bill which says that the commission may receive and expend moneys. It foreshadows that moneys appropriated from time to time by Parliament will be added to the fund. As the honourable member indicated, losses from time to time are in fact those funds which Parliament will appropriate for the benefit of the commission. I cannot be expected to foreshadow what the losses are likely to be, or what funds Parliament may have to appropriate from time to time, but it is at least hoped that by the formation of this commission and the progress we anticipate the commission will make, the appropriations by Parliament from time to time will be less than they have been in the past. We must give the commission a chance to see whether it can bring about the improvements we hope will follow its appointment.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 to 33 put and passed.

Clause 34: Annual report of Commission—

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The Minister will recall that during my second reading speech I mentioned that the last annual report and profit and loss account tabled in this Parliament was for the year ended the 31st December, 1962. Subclause (4) provides that the Minister shall lay the report and the financial statements of the commission together with the report of the Auditor-General before each House of Parliament within 15 sitting days of that House after their receipt by the Minister.

That is specific and, of course, there is provision in the State Trading Concerns Act for something similar. I hope there will be an inquiry as to why these documents have not been tabled. I know this to be so, because the Clerks attempted to obtain these reports, but I had to fall back on the Auditor-General's account to get the figures I was seeking.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is a specific charge in the concluding subclause that the report shall be laid annually before each House of Parliament. I will check up on the question of the financial report for the year 1963-64. Mr. Wise quoted from the 1962 report and said the Under-Treasurer had given him some information in regard to 1964. I will ascertain what has happened to the other report, bearing in mind that the honourable member has the 1962 report.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Mr. Wise has it, but nobody else has a copy.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: From the time this Bill was introduced the honourable member had the same opportunity to pursue this aspect.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I did not intend my remark to be derogatory. Normally members can obtain a copy of a report from the Clerk, but in this case none was available.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not mean to hurt the honourable member.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I was not hurt.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Leader of the Opposition took the trouble to come to me and ask if I could arrange for him to talk to the Under-Treasurer. I did so, and he acknowledged this in his second reading speech. The Under-Treasurer is most helpful in matters like this, and will provide any information he can. I will find out what has happened to the 1963 report.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 35 to 39 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2), £23,000,000

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

Sitting suspended from 6.3 to 7.30 p.m.

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION BILL

Second Reading

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate, from the 7th October, on the following motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Personal Explanation

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health): On a personal explanation, in my introductory remarks I did say that under the proposed amalgamation of funds a single levy will be made of 1d. in the pound on all cattle sales by both dairy and beef cattle owners, similar to the levy made at present to the Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Fund. That should have read—

A single levy will be made of $\frac{1}{4}$ d. in the pound on all cattle sales . . .

Mr. McNeill brought the attention of the House to the matter and I had it checked. I ascertained that this correction had not been made in the notes with which I was supplied; and the Minister for Agriculture asked me to make this correction.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [7.34 p.m.]: This Bill provides for the repeal of the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Act of 1960 and the Beef Industry Compensation Act of 1963; and they will be consolidated under the one Act known as the Cattle Industry Compensation Act of 1965. Already in the last week or so amendments have been made to the Milk Act and those amendments have a little bearing on the fund being set up under this Bill.

The accounts of the compensation fund associated with the Acts being repealed by this legislation are to be closed and the money will be applied to the credit of the fund established under this Bill. In the Beef Industry Cattle Compensation Fund at the moment is an amount of £73,776 4s. 2d., and the amount in the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Fund is £60,293 6s. 5d. To the common fund will be added the sum of £10,000 taken from the Milk Act Compensation Fund. These will make a total of £144,069 10s. 7d. in the new fund.

This may look a big amount, but I can remember when I was a young fellow seeing the effects of an outbreak of rinderpest and the terrific compensation paid. If ever we have anything of that nature—which, heaven forbid!—this amount will be very small in comparison with the amount which will be required for compensation. I would like to stress that point. We do not want to delude ourselves into thinking that because we have £140,000 or £150,000 in this fund it should be used for any purpose whatever. There is always the danger that an outbreak of disease may require an enormous sum of money. I feel it would be wise to keep that sum always in reserve.

Only two diseases have been mentioned specifically in the Act and they are tuberculosis and actinomycosis—and I took the trouble to ascertain the pronunciation of

that word—which is referred to as lumpy jaw. When I first heard that name I thought it was a reference to a north-west native because very often they are referred to by names such as Lame-legged Joe, Lumpy Jaw, or something of that nature.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Have you been looking at my roll?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: This particular disease is a parasite infection which affects cattle and hogs and is communicable to humans. Tuberculosis and actinomycosis are the two mentioned specifically in the legislation, but provision has been made so that any other disease which cattle may contract will be covered also.

I was interested the other evening when Mr. Wise interjected and said that it is amazing how what appear to be small levies can multiply. When I mentioned those funds I did so in order to stress that very often, although a levy might appear to be very slight, in the long range, with many contributions, it becomes a big amount. Under the Milk Act the contributions were at the rate of .0036d. per gallon of milk. It almost sounds like nothing, but from that was built up a fund of over £38,000.

A few years ago the Dairy Cattle Compensation Fund reached £60,000 and a move was made at that time to do what is proposed today under this Bill. At that time the dairy farmers objected and, I think, rightly so, because they had built up this big fund and they did not see why they should put their fund into a common pool.

However, the situation has changed today because the Beef Cattle Compensation Fund has reached over £70,000. As the funds are at a common level I feel all parties associated with the industry are wise in conforming with the Government's proposals.

I noticed when reading through the debate on the Beef Cattle Compensation Fund that Mr. Watson cast some doubt on the method of collection by means of stamp duty and he questioned the possible legality of such an action. There is a similar move now, so evidently it must be all right because a mistake would not have been perpetuated.

The contributions to the fund will be matched pound for pound by the Treasury, and the proceeds from the sale of condemned beasts will also be added to it.

I repeat that it should be borne in mind that a good reserve fund should always be kept and that no matter how high it reaches, it should not be touched or interfered with in case the day comes when a particularly large sum will be needed. We hope, of course, that day does not come. We support the Bill.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (West) [7.42 p.m.]: In his contribution to this debate, Mr. Dolan raised some pretty interesting points. The introduction of exotic diseases into our cattle or stock industry is quite a serious possibility in the not-too-distant future because in New Guinea the area outside the Australian territories is pretty vulnerable.

I feel that the present fund to cover compensation for lumpy jaw and tuberculosis is probably quite sufficient because it has been demonstrated that we could expect an addition to the fund from the ½d. levy of something like £40,000 annually; and this is more than sufficient to cover the annual pay out.

The meat industry—covering pigs, sheep, and cattle in particular—could invite the Government to place a small levy on all types of stock slaughtered so that Western Australia might eventually establish a chair of veterinary science at our University. It becomes obvious that this is a pressing need, because there are far too few veterinarians in Western Australia. In my own case as a farmer, should I desire attention to stock, the nearest veterinary surgeon is about 62 miles away. This situation does not lead the average stock owner to seek advice unless the animal is very valuable.

I feel that if a small levy were placed on all stock slaughtered, and this was matched pound for pound by the Treasury, with a view to establishing a chair of veterinary science in Western Australia, it would be generally acceptable to the agricultural industry, and I hope that perhaps some time in the near future this will come about.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [7.44 p.m.]: I am quite sure that all members will support this Bill, which has been introduced to correct a situation in order to put the treatment of compensation for diseases of cattle on a uniform basis.

It has been explained that prior to this point of time various funds were in existence and it was thought best to leave those funds until some stage when they could be amalgamated. This time has been reached and they are to be amalgamated to deal with a common factor.

I have taken out some figures concerning the cattle industry in Western Australia, and I propose to mention them to add weight to the importance of the cattle industry of our State.

Before touching on the statistics of the cattle industry, however, I would like to pass comment on the rate: ½d. in the pound up to a maximum of 5s. per head. It has been said during the debate that this might prove to be inadequate for compensation if there is an increase in disease in cattle—existing diseases known to graziers—or if money is required to

combat the introduction of new diseases. I consider that the existing rate, as set out in the Bill, seems adequate. In fact, I venture to say it will prove to be, all things being equal, a little more than adequate, and we could find our sum of money building up quite steadily.

I hope this will be the case, because we do not want diseases in our cattle industry. However, I would hesitate to say that the rate should be any more than is suggested until, because of necessitous times, we find we have to combat new diseases and that more funds are required. We will then have to do something about increasing the rate. However, until that time is reached I suggest that the rate of 1d. in the pound will be quite sufficient to meet normal needs.

It was interesting to read in the Press this morning comments, worthy of commendation, which came from a man who is vitally interested in the beef industry. I rather feel that his comments echo the thoughts of many of us when we view the importance of the meat trade and the overseas markets; and I refer to the comments made by Mr. A. M. Borthwick, the Chairman of Thomas Borthwick (Australasia) Ltd., who has just returned from an overseas trip. He is reported in this morning's *The West Australian* as saying—

The long-term prospects for Australia's beef industries are bright. There is now enough world demand to take double the present volume of Australian beef being sold on overseas markets, and at good prices.

The report goes on—

The rising world population and improving living standards in many countries were creating demands for beef faster than supplies were able to satisfy them, Mr. Borthwick said.

The American trade had been the dominant market for Australia for several years, but on present indications of a sustained world demand other countries were also prepared to buy all available beef from Australia at good prices.

It is well to hear those comments from people in the trade who are constantly searching the world markets for an outlet for Australian products. These remarks, to me, speak volumes, because here in Western Australia we have an increasing cattle population, although in the last 12 months there has been a slight decrease in it.

I am about to quote figures for the last 10-year period, from 1955 to the present year, 1965. From the research I have undertaken I notice that in the last 10 years the cattle population of Western Australia has increased from 860,574 to 1,258,427, which is an increase of about 400,000 in 10 years. The sheep population

during the same 10-year period increased, in round figures, from 13,000,000 to something over 22,000,000.

Although the cattle population does appear to have decreased in some parts of the north-west, it was certainly illuminating to study the figures of the cattle population in the south-west and in the agricultural areas. Over the 10-year period to which I have referred the cattle numbers in the South-West Land Division increased from 234,000 in 1955 to 348,000 this year. It is also interesting to note that the sheep population over the same period increased from 458,000 to 1,088,000.

A moment ago I mentioned that the cattle population has shown a slight decrease overall in the last 12 months. There could be many reasons for this. One could be the result of graziers taking advantage of the existing markets; and I think one of the greatest factors in this decline over recent months has been due to the swing that has been brought about by the graziers who have gone in for running sheep instead of cattle; and I think that statement will be borne out by the figures I have quoted, which show an increase in the sheep population, particularly in the South-West Land Division.

It is well known that a scrawny calf can grow into a lot of bull. Here we have a situation where a popular expression can be turned to advantage, inasmuch as a grazier, through a lot of bull (cattle) can enjoy great prosperity, and this assists our national prosperity; so if we can increase our cattle numbers and improve quality—and the Bill aims to improve quality by the prevention of disease—we will be doing a lot for the economy of the country, particularly Western Australia.

Mr. Abbey referred to the carrying out of further research into the cattle industry, and of assisting it by having additional veterinary officers. I also consider a lot more should be done by all means possible—perhaps through the Agricultural Department, or by whatever other means we can employ to increase the numbers of our cattle.

Here I would mention rather a hobby of mine: the question of increased carrying capacity for cattle. A lot of work has been done in Western Australia in regard to the carrying capacity for sheep, but I feel we have a long way to go in regard to the carrying capacity for cattle. This question affects both the dairy section and the beef section of our cattle industry.

I have not individual figures of the respective totals of dairy cattle and beef cattle in the State, because under our amended system of statistics all cattle come under the one heading. It is rather difficult to discern just where dairy cows and beef cows start and finish, because we do have, as many members know, dual purpose cattle which are used both for the

dairying industry and for beef purposes. I feel a lot more research must be done in Western Australia in this regard.

I have pointed out the increase of our cattle population in the State; and this is good, and it will be even better. But I suggest it is not enough to say "This is fine"; we have to go still further and run more head per acre by all means possible.

Just to quote a few more figures, without wearying the House unduly, I point out that in the Murray district the cattle population in 1955 was 21,000, and in 1965 it is 37,000; in Manjimup the cattle population in 1955 was 24,000, and in 1965 it is 36,000; in Busselton in 1955 it was 30,000, and in 1965 it is 49,000.

I will not quote further figures, but I feel these statistics lend emphasis to the value of the cattle industry to Western Australia; and it is correct, as the Bill before us envisages, that we should, as far as possible, protect it by keeping disease out of it.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [7.57 p.m.]: I do not wish to delay the House for long, and I indicate immediately my support for the Bill. I am not going to attempt to go over the ground which has been fairly effectively covered by the previous speakers. I do, however, draw attention to the fact that the prime purpose of the consolidation of the funds is to avoid the necessity, which has been the case in recent years—particularly since the establishment of the beef cattle levy—of certain groups of farmers and other people having to contribute to more than one fund.

In actual fact the dairy cattle people and others have been contributing to two funds, firstly by their contribution to funds under the respective Acts; and, secondly, through their payments to the Beef Cattle Industry Fund as a result of their sales of cattle. So this is perfectly logical legislation, and it had to come; and I support it on that score.

I take this opportunity of placing on record my thoughts about the future utilisation of the fund. I agree with the suggestions that have been made that it should remain intact and be maintained against the possibility of an outbreak of some major disease in the future.

In this connection, and having expressed my views on a Bill associated with this one regarding the utilisation of a portion of this type of fund, let me say that I must express some doubts as to the wisdom of using, for some particular capital improvement, the money that has been collected. It would be fair enough, I would say, to use it for research and investigation into cattle disease, and livestock disease, generally—for its prevention and control; or, perhaps, as Mr. Abbey has indicated, the fund could be used, in conjunction with the funds of some other

body or organisation, for the establishment of a chair of veterinary science at the University.

I would agree with that sort of thing; but I am not sure, and I would need to be convinced, of the desirability of placing this fund under the control of some organisation so that the money could be used for capital investment; and I just wish to take this opportunity of making that particular point.

Mr. Ferry referred to some possible expansion of the beef cattle industry and I support and completely agree with that contention. It has long been my thought that there is a potential for the expansion of the beef cattle industry in Western Australia equal to, if not greater than, that which exists in most other States of Australia. In fact it would bear comparison with the potential which exists in the major beef cattle producing State of Australia; namely, Queensland; and there are a great many parts—perhaps the major portions—of our agricultural areas which have enormous potential for the expansion of the beef cattle industry, and I refer particularly to the type of land in the South-West Land Division.

I would like to think, therefore, that some means could be found—perhaps by the use of this type of fund—of carrying out research into this matter, together with research into the stocking of cattle in various parts of the State, similar to the research that has been carried out by the C.S.I.R.O. into set stocking for the sheep industry. I believe the beef cattle industry has suffered for many years due to the fact that there has been insufficient attention devoted to investigation for its promotion.

In recent times we have seen a certain amount of work carried out by the dairy branch—of all sections—of the Department of Agriculture into some beef production methods at the Wokalup research station. More recently we have seen the published work by Mr. Wilkie of the Department of Agriculture in a different branch altogether. This work has been purely exploratory. Mr. Davenport, also, has been making investigations into this particular problem, but all this work has been merely scratching the surface.

Mr. Ferry referred to the number of beef cattle in certain areas of the south-west, and I would point out to him—and certain other members—that whilst the surface of the beef cattle potential has barely been scratched—although the increase in the total numbers has been significant—if a real endeavour were made to increase the carrying capacity of pastures, in and beyond existing areas to, say, one-tenth of a beast to the acre, this would not be considered to be out of the question by any farmer in a beef cattle

producing area; and that is an exercise to which the honourable member could apply himself.

If we can carry the exercise a little further and suggest that we increase the carrying capacity to one-quarter of a beast to the acre, the increase in cattle numbers that would be obtained would be astronomical and would vastly overshadow our present cattle numbers. Such goals can be achieved in the future, but we must face up to the fact that there must be continued exploration and research into those problems because there is benefit to be obtained from it in Western Australia. This State could become a major State in Australia for the production of beef cattle in the same way as it is with cereals and wool production, because I believe that there exists a tremendous potential for us in the beef cattle industry.

I say that with some knowledge of the Queensland cattle industry. I would like to think that, in bringing the debate back to the utilisation of this fund, this bears some relation to this type of contribution to a fund by the industry itself. I would like the Government to keep in mind that there is a real need for this potential at some time in the future and I would think in the not-too-distant future. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.5 p.m.]: No-one in the House could object to this Bill. I think we could all applaud it. It has great merit and will be of great benefit to the State of Western Australia. I am not a cattle man, as all members know, but I have one of those types of interest in the industry that ferrets among various outlets.

The story I am about to tell I think I have told in the House before, but I will use it again to emphasise what I want to say later. Whilst staying at one of the expensive hotels in Philadelphia—it was not my choice but my innocence that got me there, because I did not realise how expensive it was—I was entertained most regally by some of my American friends. Whilst being entertained I was interested to hear the waiter whisper into the ear of one of my hosts that he had a very nice piece of lamb and he inquired if he would serve it to his guests. This host of mine agreed wholeheartedly, and when the lamb was served he enjoyed it. This is contrary to what I had been told; namely, that Americans do not eat lamb. Apparently many do.

At the same time I also realised that having discussed this question with quite a number of those whom I contacted it was clear that their desire was for beef and that they were looking to Australia to become a beef-producing country and, in particular, to this State. It has been said more than once or twice, not only by visitors to our State but also by Australians themselves, that we are committing

a wrongful act by filling our southern areas with sheep because these areas are actually beef-producing country.

This is the type of story that eventually will bring prominence to the beef cattle industry in Western Australia in the future. I was extremely interested in the suggestion made by Mr. Abbey—and also in the figures and facts quoted by Mr. Ferry—that a small portion of the compensation fund should be devoted to the foundation of a school of veterinary science. This suggestion appeals to me greatly, because the lack of such a school is the weak link in the medical history of our animal life.

It is probably not realised that the health of the animal is of major importance in the health of the human being. Yet there is no clear association between the research that is being done in these two factors of life. I do not want to speak for very long on this topic, but I want to emphasise that the time must now be very ripe when we should look towards the establishment of a veterinary school.

For the information of members I will give one of two examples of the subjects that are worrying a small group of us who have joined ourselves into what we call a group for the study of group ecology; ecology meaning a study of the man in relation to his disease and environment. There are many interesting aspects of this study. Briefly, it would appear that stones in the kidney are found in man in the warm climates, particularly north of Perth, but they are not found in animals in that warm climate. In the wet climate of the south-west, or the southern part of the south-east portion of the State, animals do get renal stones, but humans are not so liable to them in those parts.

This seems such a contradiction in terms that one wonders what the possibility is. This is a subject which could be examined with very great interest by those who handle stock; because it has been estimated by those in authority in this State that about five per cent. of the top rams are lost annually through renal stones, and quite a percentage of ewes are also lost as a result of this complaint. This problem, I think, can be handled only by those people who are dedicated to both sciences.

Some reason or some scientific explanation for this might be found if an investigation were made. It may go well beyond that point and may involve the super-phosphate that is put on the soil, the quantity that is applied, and whether the repetition of the same quantity year after year is the correct method of procedure. All of these factors could come into this question.

There are a number of such conditions which have not yet been touched upon in our investigation of the problem. For instance, it has been suggested to me by my veterinary and agricultural friends who are in this group that before the

introduction of superphosphate to the soil there was no such disease as lupinosis in this State, but since superphosphate has been applied to the soil in considerable quantities, on light lands in particular, lupinosis has appeared. Lupinosis seems to be a disease that requires an excessive amount of copper before, shall I say, its accomplishment in the animal. This is the view of those men who have looked at this problem from a scientific point of view.

However, in speaking to some of my colleagues they say that this is nonsense. They are of the view that it is because we do not put enough copper in the soil that the disease of lupinosis occurs. This is a disease which could cause considerable loss. I am not going to bore the House tonight by going through all the various degrees of complications which we, as a group, have been investigating; and we have been wondering at the same time how we can get together all those who are interested in scientific research; that is, those who are not only interested in medicine, but also in agriculture. In fact, archaeologists may be able to help in certain directions and many of the scientific groups could be used to elucidate some of our difficulties.

I believe that a school of veterinary science would be one of the greatest moves we could make in this State. I am certain that the commencement of such a school would not only be of scientific benefit to those who like science for the sake of science, but also to those whose living is dependent on the soil. I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (West) [8.13 p.m.]: I think the contents of the Bill have been fairly well covered by the various speakers. One or two views have been expressed on how the cattle industry in Western Australia could benefit in the future. Whilst I feel that we should give every encouragement in this direction, I do not know whether I would be prepared to support the proposal that was put forward by Mr. Abbey.

Whilst I feel that it is for us to strive to establish, perhaps, a chair of veterinary science at the University, I think that, first of all it should be the will of the producers of this State to pledge their financial support in obtaining the funds for the establishment of such a chair. This is another matter; something to be considered in the future.

I am pleased that under this measure all cattle will be brought under one category. As Mr. McNeill said, the dairy producers were paying in all directions, and it was very unfair that they should do so. To some extent the dairying section will be compensated through the ability to use some of the fund for a specific purpose; and this will benefit the dairying section to a greater extent than the other sections of the cattle industry.

I have no doubt at all that the cattle industry will grow at, perhaps, a greater pace than some of our other agricultural pursuits, because every day it is being revealed how good and how clean is our new country—country which was considered in the past to be useless, but which is now coming into production—for the raising of cattle. From my own experience of having developed a property in recent times from virgin, unwanted land to land in a very high state of production, I can say it has not yet reached its peak. There are many millions of acres of this type of country in Western Australia, so everything that we can do to foster this industry should be done.

The fund proposed in the Bill should be allowed to accumulate, and I would be loth even to suggest, if it became large, that contributions should be reduced to any extent; because if the cattle industry grows and disease in one form or another attacks it, then there will be a great need for a large fund. The fund would be in a healthy state if there were no outbreaks of diseases of any consequence. Should that happen it would become sufficiently adequate to enable a proposition to be put to the producers that a chair of veterinary science at the University be set up. This is a very good measure and deserves the support of the House, which I am sure it will get.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (Lower Central) [8.18 p.m.]: As one previous speaker said, this Bill deserves the support of every member. Other speakers have covered the field adequately, not only in regard to the beef industry but in regard to the cattle industry as a whole. However, there is one aspect I wish to deal with, and that is the expansion of the beef industry.

It was my privilege to attend a meeting a few weeks ago at which Mr. Muirhead, a meat board member who handles the overseas exports, gave an address. He stressed the fact, as Mr. Ferry pointed out from the article which appeared in *The West Australian*, that there was an unlimited market for our meat, particularly for beef, in many overseas countries, but that it must be remembered that the type of beef which those countries wanted was not necessarily the type which we are now producing.

It is important in any expansion of the beef industry to take heed of the views of that officer. The beef industry at this stage should make some effort to bring the breeding of cattle in this State into line with the demands of the overseas markets. In the views expressed by Mr. Muirhead those countries demand, and are getting, the lean type of beef. It must be lean and it must not contain any fat. The overseas markets have been obtaining this type of beef from many countries which

produce beef. The prime meat sold on the open market at Smithfield is Yugoslav bull meat, which is a very lean type of meat and which brings premium prices.

With those few remarks, I support the measure, and trust that beef producers will take heed of the remarks of Mr. Muirhead. It was unfortunate that a person with such outstanding qualifications should address a meeting with no representative of the Press or the A.B.C. covering it.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8.20 p.m.]: I thank members for their acceptance of this measure and Mr. Dolan for his analysis of the position and his assurance of the Bill's acceptance. It is as well for me to give a few additional figures to allay the worries of some members.

The income of this fund is expected to be about £35,000 a year. To start it there will be about £150,000, which is the total of the Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Fund and the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Fund, and £10,000 from the Milk Board Compensation Fund. Payments can be expected to range from as low as £12,000 to £23,000 in normal years. That was the pattern in recent years, because in 1963-64 the payments amounted to as low as £12,000 and in 1964-65 they amounted to £21,500.

There is need to keep a fairly sizeable sum. We should always bear in mind that in this age of jet transport there is need to insure against the disease contingency which members have referred to. I think it is as well to remember—as Mr. Abbey pointed out—the very serious cattle diseases which are rampant in Indonesia; and there is now reason to believe that these have spread to West Irian.

The Commonwealth Government has introduced very tight controls along the border in New Guinea, and excellent work is being done to ensure, as far as possible, that those diseases do not spread across the border. As members have pointed out in one way or another, nothing is designed to increase costs as much as the outbreak of diseases, particularly diseases which call for mass extermination as the only solution.

Members have obviously given close study to this Bill. Mr. Ferry gave some very interesting statistics and illustrated the excellent results which could be achieved through maintaining the health of stock, allied with good management. There is, of course, some worry in regard to one aspect, and this should be borne in mind. When we find the sort of expansion in land development which is taking place in Western Australia, as a necessary corollary an expansion in stock numbers can be expected. That being the case, we cannot at the same time increase the exports by a large percentage.

This trend has been fairly obvious in recent years in sheep raising where, despite the marked increase in sheep population, there has not been a comparable increase in the export of lamb and mutton. We cannot have it both ways;—we cannot hope to increase the stock numbers, and at the same time increase the exports. If we are to fill the empty areas with stock in the vicinity of the figures referred to, then we cannot show a very marked immediate increase in the export of beef as meat, because the breeding stock has to be retained.

Mr. McNeill mentioned that he doubted the wisdom of using the fund for capital improvements. I am not sure whether he intended that as a warning or whether he had something specific in mind. He might have been thinking of the other fund for the establishment of a laboratory.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I was using that as an illustration, and I forecast a warning.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This warning will be passed on to the Minister for Agriculture. The fund proposed in the Bill is a consolidated fund, which will be created to avoid the problem of producers having to pay levies under the butterfat, the whole milk, and the beef cattle sections. Under the Bill each producer will pay the levy only once.

As he so often does, Dr. Hislop on this occasion went into a philosophical discussion on the intricacies between man and beast, and he dealt with the field of medicine. If this field were not regarded as of importance we would not have meat inspectors and other officers appointed. His remarks also illustrated the need for a continued interest in such a fund.

I thank members for their interest in the Bill. In matters like this it is pleasing to the responsible Minister and to the one who handles the Bill in this House to know that members have considered it to be of sufficient importance to give it their very careful attention. I am pleased to see that has been done on this occasion.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery) in the Chair; The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 20 put and passed.

Clause 21: Cattle Industry Compensation Fund established—

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: Earlier in the discussion the Minister corrected a statement made during the second reading speech. The correction was that it was now intended to make the charge 1d. in

the pound. I take it this will mean that the maximum of 5s. will now be reduced to 2s. 6d.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, I would not take it as that. My interpretation is that the maximum will remain at 5s.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: I think that is unreal because where it was necessary for a 5s. maximum when the amount was 1d. in the pound, surely it is reasonable to reduce the maximum to 2s. 6d. if the charge is reduced from 1d. to $\frac{1}{4}$ d.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: It was $\frac{1}{4}$ d. originally; there was an error in the notes.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As was pointed out by Mr. McNeill, the notes used by the Minister when he originally introduced this Bill quoted the fee as being $\frac{1}{4}$ d. in the pound. The notes with which I was supplied showed the fee as 1d. The maximum quoted was 5s. in the pound, and I take it this would be subject to amendment or alteration if time showed that it was necessary. I feel that this is a reasonable proposition but if the honourable member wishes to object there is an obvious solution.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 46 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

MILK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 7th October, on the following motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.39 p.m.]: If what I have to say appears to be somewhat critical, it is not so meant because what I am seeking is information. The words which interest me most in the Bill—or probably not in the Bill—are those that were said to us by the Minister, during his introduction of the Bill, in which he mentioned the moneys which are now to be left to the Milk Board and retained by the board to be used in the interests of the liquid milk industry—to be used for the establishment of laboratories and other facilities. I cannot see how far £28,000 will go in a laboratory or in furthering the interests of the milk industry, unless it is used for a specific purpose. I take it that the word “research” has been left out because, in the main, research into this industry is in all probability the function of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, this money will not become a sum which will allow research to take place.

I was wondering what was to happen in the laboratories; whether the money is for the testing of milk under certain conditions, and simply limited to those who are trained in such work as testing butter fats and solids-not-fat. At the present time I cannot see that it is going to be of very much benefit to the milk industry. Therefore, I am rather left in the air as to what is really meant by the terms used by the Minister in his introduction of the Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Which terms?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The statement you made when you said that the cost for a scheme for milk improvement including the establishment of laboratories and other facilities would be provided out of those funds, and that the remaining balance would be retained by the board to be used in the interests of the liquid milk industry; and then the reference to the formation of a laboratory. That is what I have just been searching for, to some extent.

For a moment or two I would like to remind the House of the struggle which went on in the early days to obtain the pasteurisation of milk in the metropolitan area. I am glad to see that already pasteurisation is spreading to the country towns. I have not been to Albany during the last year but I was told that it would not be long before Albany had pasteurised milk, and I understand that Bunbury will be doing the same in the near future.

To me it has always been an interesting occurrence—the introduction of pasteurisation—because it was a real occasion in my life in this House when the members sided with me to remove the control of the Minister from the Bill 29 times, and then inserted a clause making pasteurisation necessary.

We had a very long conference afterwards; but the most amusing incident was on the following morning when, as I walked down St. George's Terrace, a very well known citizen of this State came up to me and said that until the previous night he had had a very high opinion of my ability in the Legislative Council. However, he said that he could never understand how anyone who made 30 amendments in a Bill was prepared to lose 29 and feel satisfied. That other amendment, of course, was the most important one which we needed for the introduction of pasteurisation. So it has been!

There are few in this House who will remember the torrid time before pasteurisation and the standard of some of the sheds where milking was being done; in particular in the metropolitan area. They were shambles of the first degree.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: In some cases there were no sheds at all.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: One or two people became very heated and I understand that one gentleman offered the use of a revolver to anybody who came on to his property. So we left that one alone. On going right through the milk producing country at that time we realised that something would have to be done and eventually the dairies would have to be moved outside the metropolitan area, if it were possible. Or, if that could not be done, they should be of a very high standard. Eventually, of course, pasteurisation took on and I do not suppose anybody in the city now—except some of the travellers in trains who drink milk, because as I have said before in this House, I have seen milk on trains in open barrels—would like to drink anything else but pasteurised milk.

That is just by the way, but it is one of the sections of the milk industry into which research has been undertaken and improvements have been effected. In 1961, when I came back from New Zealand, I gave a very long report to this House on the ability of the board to pay for milk from producers on the basis of butterfat content and the total solids-not-fat.

I also learned that it is just as impossible in New Zealand for some of the dairy farmers to maintain the total solids-not-fat ratio as it is here. It was interesting to see, in a place like Christchurch, where the grass grows at a tremendous rate, that they have the lowest of the total solids-not-fat content for milk in New Zealand. Due to the rapid growth of the grasses they contain practically little or no nourishment and that is the result.

I have been somewhat puzzled regarding the payment to the milk producer for his milk, and this is one aspect into which I think some research should be made, and any money that is left over in the fund could be used for this purpose. In one paragraph in the Act I have found it is possible for a person to get a license as a separator. This obviously means that someone has the authority of the board to separate milk in order to obtain cream.

In this, too, lies one of our difficulties in that there does not appear to be laid down a fixed percentage of fat that must be in the cream when it is sold. One can buy a three ounce bottle of cream from one storekeeper for 2s. 2d. or 2s. 4d. and it is just like top milk; but one can buy another bottle of a similar size from another firm and it has a much more creamy appearance and has a much greater cream content. Therefore one cannot gather from the measure just what is meant by "separation", and who has authority in regard to it. The license that is issued can be issued in one of four categories and the separatist is one of them.

The Act states that the board has the authority to fix the minimum price or prices per gallon to dairymen for milk supplied in any dairy area, and it goes on—

Provided, as regards—

- (a) milk, other than surplus milk, such price shall be fixed in accordance with—
 - (i) butter fat content and value; and
 - (ii) bacterial test; and
 - (iii) added value for services incidental to the production of milk; and
 - (iv) if necessary, a premium during periods of scarcity; and
- (b) surplus milk, such price shall be fixed in accordance with its butter fat content and at ruling butter fat rates, less a charge approved by the Board for separation or other treatment carried out by the milk vendor.

If this is so the milk vendor—the company—has the right to take the cream after paying for it. But in section 26(9)(a) it states—

The Board shall pay to each dairyman, at such times as the Board shall determine, an amount calculated at the rate of the minimum price or prices applicable to or in respect of the vested milk delivered to the Board by the dairyman.

So there the Act states that a minimum payment shall be made. It goes on in paragraph (b) to state—

Where, in respect of any period which the Board determines to adopt, the Board has, out of the proceeds of vested milk delivered by dairymen at any particular place—

- (i) made the payments referred to in the last preceding paragraph; and
- (ii) made such provision for the matters referred to in the last preceding subsection as the Board deems reasonably appropriate to and in respect of the vested milk so delivered,

the Board shall distribute, among those dairymen in proportion to the quantity of vested milk delivered by each of them at that place during that period, so much of any balance, of the proceeds as the Board determines is available for the purpose.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think that is dealing with the surplus above the quantity delivered to a treatment plant and which they have a license to deal with.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If the individual has a surplus it looks as though he does not get a payment for his extra

cream. As I have said in this House before, there is a method in use in New Zealand whereby the milk is dealt with on the basis of its butterfat content and its total solids-not-fat; and I believe the milk industry would be very much better cared for if research were made into the possibility of adopting the same procedure here as is adopted in New Zealand in this regard. I shall not burden the House with it because all the details appear in *Hansard* of 1961. I gave fairly complete information which I obtained from New Zealand.

I think this is a method of using the extra money in the fund to improve the quality of the milk and provide for a fair distribution of profit; and I think it should be laid down whether the depots can take the cream out of the milk. There does not seem to be anything laid down in this regard but it is obvious that it is being done because one can buy cream of varying quality throughout the city.

I am glad to see that steps are being taken to improve the industry, and particularly to try to overcome the problem with total solids-not-fat because I believe this is one of the greatest difficulties with milk. The total solids-not-fat depends so much on the climate, the speed of growth of the grasses and herbage which the cows eat, and so on. If we have money to spend I think it should be used in the interests of the dairyman and in an effort to improve the quality of the milk that is provided for the public.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) (8.54 p.m.): I thank members for their careful analysis of this Bill—Mr. Doan, Mr. McNeill, and Dr. Hislop—and perhaps I should start at the tail end and discuss Dr. Hislop's remarks while they are fresh in our minds.

I think the honourable member might be mixing up a little the duties of the Department of Agriculture and the Milk Board. When one talks in terms of research, in the way in which I rather imagine the honourable member talked, I would think it would be the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture rather than the Milk Board.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: That is so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would imagine that when we talk in terms of transferring £10,000 to the compensation fund to provide the necessary protection for the whole-milk industry, and that the remaining balance will be retained by the board to be used in the interests of the liquid milk industry that is fair enough. There was also some talk of a laboratory and its establishment coming within the scope of the Milk Board. It is true that at times there has been some difficulty in getting the necessary analyses which the board requires carried out, but this fund

is for the purpose of establishing the solids-not-fat and the butterfat content.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It would extend into the bacteriological field, too.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Only in so far as the quality of the milk was concerned.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It would.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think the honourable member is probably right, but in the bacteriological field only as it affected the quality of the milk used; because this is a matter which would not impinge on the work of the Department of Agriculture. It also would be the work one might expect the board to carry out.

I think Mr. McNeill had a very good point when he asked whether, in working out the duties of the board and the department, there was the degree of care and integration that there should be. I have already made sure that the remarks in this connection will go on to the department; because I must admit that when I was just the representative of my province this matter worried me to some extent. It is very easy for a board such as the Milk Board to become a little carried away and do something almost in competition with the department.

I think this should always be avoided and I am sure that steps will be taken to see that this does not in fact happen. However, as Mr. McNeill said, the worry about it is there and we must keep in mind the different requirements and the different duties of the board and the department.

Any research in a real sense would be the duty of the department and that would be financed from loan funds or general revenue; therefore, this sum of £28,000 could represent a reasonable amount in the hands of the board for the purposes of carrying out the work that it is expected to do, bearing in mind Mr. McNeill's warning of the real danger of overlapping.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: They would have to devote the finance if they were working on that basis.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Are you referring to Mr. McNeill's remarks that the board is gradually whittling away the rights of ownership?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No; I was saying we had to bear in mind the field of responsibility and that it must be carefully examined. For instance, if there is a laboratory in the Department of Agriculture, and the board wants a little bit of work done, it would seem unreasonable that it should not be able to have the work carried out in a laboratory which is built for that purpose.

One other matter mentioned by Dr. Hislop was pasteurisation and I think he may be a little confused in this regard. I am

sure that milk is pasteurised in Manjimup, as it is in Albany and Bunbury. But the point is that the sale of bulk milk has not yet been prohibited. The bulk of it is pasteurised, but there is a choice. I know some very intelligent people who are very conscious of the health of their families and who, from choice, take bulk milk in the certain knowledge that the herds from which it comes are TB free. This is something that happens very often.

We do a tremendous amount of research into something and finally come up with a solution. In fact, because of the amount of work done we finally come up with three solutions, and we put them into effect at one and the same time. We finish up with TB-free herds, with the knowledge of the necessity to boil the milk under the right conditions in order to ensure it is germ free; and then there is the question of pasteurisation. So we have the three solutions at the one and the same time, any two of which would be perfectly adequate. As I say, I know some very intelligent people who elect to buy bulk milk in the belief that they can get a better fat return from their milk; they get more cream. It is very often provable. People will buy bulk milk, scald it, and get more cream. I think there is perhaps some room for the belief that the minimum butterfat requirements in pasteurised milk could perhaps stand an increase if people desired this.

All these things are so easy of accomplishment these days. Dr. Hislop referred to the extraction of cream. Today any bulk treatment plant extracts cream. As a matter of fact they also extract water from milk, because they have a surplus over quota which is sold either as treatment milk to be dried out for ice cream, or for a variety of other reasons. If one wanted to transport milk for treatment purposes from Brunswick, it would be absurd to cart the water content of that milk all the way up. It is put into a tank, boiled, the water is taken off, and all we lose is the tail end of the volatile fats. The water can be drunk, and there is the concentrated milk which can be carted for the manufacture of ice cream and so on.

A milk treatment plant must have these rights. A milk treatment plant can produce milk of any strength: it can be concentrated, cream added, cream diluted, and so on. This is the way that milk must be handled if it is to be handled commercially. This is, in fact, done and I think there is a possibility that in time we will have milk tailor-made to the requirements and standards, whatever they may be.

I hasten to say that whilst this is far from the purpose of this Bill, the interest that has been evinced in the various aspects of the measure warrants some mention of these matters. I would like

to return to Mr. McNeill's detailed examination of the milk industry, and some of the problems that beset it. He gave us the history of the development of the milk industry and the improvement of milk supplies.

It is obvious, of course, from the comments of Dr. Hislop, and from the interjections made by Mr. Wise, that these things are still fresh in the memories of many members. They still recall the days when one literally took one's life in one's hands when one had a drink of milk. That is true enough. Milk is an excellent base for the growth of bacteria. The wonderful thing about it today is that one can drink milk with complete assurance, and to no small degree this is to the credit of the Western Australian Parliament and, of course, of the Milk Board, and its original Chairman, Mr. Stannard. It is also to the credit of Mr. Wright who is continuing the good work.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Mr. Wilson was the first chairman.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As Mr. McNeill says, there is a very real need for integration of the various aspects of the entire milk industry: in the research-extension work, and particularly in regard to policing. There is, of course, a need to police the standards of milk. One must give very great consideration to the matter of cleanliness, and so on. These aspects have been upgraded, as was indicated by Dr. Hislop when he mentioned certain dairies.

It might interest members to know that it is only in the last couple of years that the butterfat dairies have had applied to them much the same standards. Mr. Willmott will recall some of the difficulties of a few of the south-west members in the last few years when a move was made to upgrade the standard of butterfat dairies, many of which were almost identical with the dairies that were recalled tonight, and were at one time considered adequate for the production of whole milk.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Do they manufacture cheese down your way?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Cheese manufacturing is mostly done at Coolup. There was some done at Brunswick, but I think it is now discontinued.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: It is done at Balingup and Manjimup.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I thought Lock's place had stopped, but apparently cheese-making is continued there. Mr. McNeill mentioned a very real need for liaison between the Milk Board and the appropriate branches of the department. This was highlighted by Dr. Hislop in the problems associated with the solids-not-fat, butterfat, and total solids.

We know the Milk Board lays down standards which are acceptable in order to ensure that the public has a commodity

in which it can have complete confidence. This, of course, demands that the Department of Agriculture should be able to show the farmer how he can reach this standard.

I must say that at times the department has not been altogether successful in this. But again, as Dr. Hislop pointed out, the department is no orphan in this regard, because similar departments in New Zealand, England, and Holland, and indeed in every milk-producing area in the world, have not been able to show how we can ensure the production of milk with a guaranteed minimum solids-not-fat content.

The various matters that have been raised will be passed on to the Minister in question in order that they might be examined and kept in mind. It is obvious that members have given a great deal of time and thought to this matter and that milk has been very near to their hearts. I thank them for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Section 57 repealed and section substituted—

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Could the Minister give any more information regarding paragraph (b) of proposed new section 57, regarding the payment of the balance of this money? The provision in the Bill refers to the distribution of the money in the ordinary administration of the board. As an explanation we are told it will be used for administration, for laboratories, and for similar purposes. Under administration it could be used for the payment of staff, etc.

I wonder how the question was put to the representatives of the industry when they gave their approval to this. Were they asked whether they approved of the utilisation of the money they had contributed for the purpose of buildings, laboratories, and so on; or were they asked in what way could the money be best applied for the improvement of the milk industry? One could get two different answers. I do not think it is the desire of the contributors that the funds should be used for the ordinary operations of the board.

If this money is to be used for the payment of inspectors, for example, we must appreciate that inspectors not only inspect areas to maintain certain standards, but they also have power and authority to indicate whether a property shall carry a license; or whether portions of a property can, in their opinion, carry a certain number of stock in order to provide a certain quota of milk. These are some

of the questions that arise out of this clause, and I would be glad if the Minister could give us some more information.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am not in a position to give any detail except perhaps to draw the attention of members to the fact that when the scheme was originally established the sum of £34,800 was loaned by the board for this purpose. So it is fair enough that now the fund is being wound up the money should go into the general administration fund, plus the £42,500 which was paid from administration funds for costs of TB testing. This money is being paid to the general administrative costs of the fund with complete justification on these two counts alone.

Leaving that out of it, I feel we can have complete faith in the members of the board in that they will not allow this money to be used unless there is good justification for it. I hope the honourable member is satisfied. However, I will obtain more information for him which I can provide at the third reading.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the wording of section 22 (2) and section 23 (2) might be looked at. I would like to mention here that there must have been some laboratory work done as there must be some way of ascertaining the butterfat content.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The treatment plants do this.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If it is done by the treatment plants, why does the board want to enter into this field?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to the two sections in the Act. With regard to the analysis of milk, the treatment plants go further than ascertaining the butterfat content. For instance, at Brunswick the treatment plant can supply an analysis of solids-not-fat. This is a little costly and difficult to do, but it is very simple to ascertain the butterfat content. However, the people there are endeavouring to obtain more accurate tests for solids-not-fat and undoubtedly they will succeed. I know that farmers in the Brunswick area every night and morning have a solids-not-fat and butterfat analysis carried out.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Some produce up to eight per cent. butterfat.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Ascertaining the solids-not-fat is the logical method and it would appear that some day it will be the reasonable solution. I understand the butterfat content of the milk is the portion of the milk we could easily do without in a fat-rich country. It is the solids-not-fat that are valuable to us. Therefore if we are going to buy by quality we want to buy on a total

solids quality. This presents some difficulties at the moment, but I think it may come about in time to come.

The Milk Board has to ensure that the quality of milk is up to the minimum standard. The board has been engaged in policing duties rather than in research. The board wants to be in a position so that it can check on a farmer and then perhaps assist him. That is why it considers it needs a separate laboratory.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would like to end my comments with a suggestion which might be of use to the milk industry. I am sure there is no fixed amount of fat content laid down at the present moment in regard to the sale of cream, because it varies considerably.

The second thing is that it is quite clear to everyone the butterfat content in milk can be reduced to three per cent.; and if all the butterfat over three per cent. were taken out of the milk the community would be better off. The industry would then be in a position to do as is done in other countries that have a hot climate. I refer to such places as America, Hong Kong, and even Manila, where I saw 12 per cent. butterfat milk supplied as coffee cream, and there was a big demand for it. I am quite sure if the industry were stabilised on that basis in Western Australia there would also be a lucrative market.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 7th October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (Lower Central) [9.25 p.m.]: The Bill before us contains two amendments to the Agricultural Products Act. As the Minister in his explanation of the measure pointed out, the Act was amended in 1963 to provide that all packages and bales of wool should be branded with the identification of the property from which they came. That measure has not been entirely successful. I have noticed on several visits I have made to the stores of various wool companies in my district that quite a considerable amount of wool is sold in unbranded bags.

In the first place, the purpose of passing this legislation was to try to prevent the unauthorised person from selling this

wool. As many of our farming friends will know, a pretty thorough search of our properties is carried out for the collection of dead wool; and sometimes the wool is not so really dead before it is plucked off the sheep!

However, the measure which is now introduced will make sure that the Act will be thoroughly enforced in future and that buyers will be penalised if they have wool in unbranded containers. This will ensure that in future only an authorised owner or his agent will be able to trade in wool.

The second amendment extends the life of the Apple Sales Advisory Committee. This committee was set up to ensure that the public would be given a better grade of apple. The committee has been functioning now for several years. When this amendment was being discussed in another place there were some critical observations made, and I have not gone to the length of bringing along some apples to prove we can buy good apples in the stores.

Today I made an examination of the apples in various shops in the metropolitan area and some good varieties were on sale, admittedly at a price.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: There are some poor ones, too.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: Some are poor, but there are also good apples for sale at a price. I assume these apples have been in cold storage; and I find that the cost for four weeks is 2s. 2½d.; 12 weeks, 5s.; and 24 weeks, 8s. 7d. If my information is correct, there is an additional surcharge of 10 per cent. as from the 1st October. So members will see that the storage of apples is quite an expensive business and I cannot see too many really low-grade apples being placed in cold storage.

I am not quite happy with the apple position, because I feel too many good apples which a lot of people would be anxious to use are being condemned. It would help if we could overcome the problems of distribution associated with this product. I am not criticising the committee because I feel, in some measure, it has achieved what it was appointed for—the upgrading of apples on our local market. I do admit that on many occasions in the country we are offered apples that have not been dealt with by the committee. Trucks go around selling apples—again at a price—and these apples quite possibly have never passed through the committee. There again, we are not forced to buy those particular apples. We can go along and buy better-grade apples which are available from shops. Therefore I think at this stage it is a very good idea to extend the life of this committee for another 12 months rather than make it a permanent fixture. This industry will

have a little more time in which to determine its policy. I am quite confident that the apple growers, though they are being forced to discard quite a proportion of the crop, would be very unhappy to see the committee go at this stage.

With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

FRUIT CASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 7th October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (Lower Central) [9.33 p.m.]: As this Bill is entirely complementary legislation, I do not think it needs any remarks from me, so I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

MARKETING OF ONIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 7th October, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [9.35 p.m.]: I only wish to make a few general observations about this Bill and I will start by saying that it affects the most efficient onion growers in Australia; and I will give a few figures to demonstrate that what I have said is absolute truth.

So far as the quantity of onions grown and the area under onions are concerned, we are outstripped by the two States of Victoria and Queensland. For example, in the year 1962-63, which I will take as a base, Victoria had 4,634 acres under onions; Queensland had 3,796 acres; and Western Australia had only 509 acres. The production in tons for the same year was: Victoria, 26,175; Queensland, 21,184; and Western Australia, 6,625 tons.

The yield per acre—and this is a point I want to emphasise—was: in Victoria 5.65 tons; in Queensland, 5.58 tons; and

in Western Australia, 13.01 tons. If that does not emphasise the fact that the onion growers in Western Australia are easily the best growers in the Commonwealth, then figures do not mean anything.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: They could be pressure-cookers.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I will have a few comments to make about the pressures they use or the forced tactics they employ to get those results.

The onion growers are not over-happy. It seems peculiar to say that onion growers who produce the yields I have outlined, are unhappy. I can just imagine what the men in the same industry in the other States must feel like when they can produce only about a third of the quantity per acre produced in Western Australia.

I listened to the comments of previous members and they estimated that so far as late onions were concerned, production costs here were between £26 and £36 a ton, and yet the top price obtained for their products this year was £24 a ton. Evidently, therefore, they are producing those onions at a loss, and it is no wonder they are unhappy and dissatisfied with the present state of the industry.

This Bill provides that the Onion Marketing Board will also control the early onions, and it is about early onions and their production I wish to make my remarks.

In order to make anything out of producing early onions, the growers must receive at least £80 a ton. This year they have obtained as high as £190 a ton, and the present market price is, I understand, about £97 a ton. So far as those prices are concerned, therefore, they would be very satisfied. However, in view of the prices they have been obtaining through the board for their late onions, they are not too happy with the result this Bill might achieve.

It seems perfectly obvious, as I said earlier, that they certainly know their onions and certainly know how to grow them. If members discuss this problem with any of the growers in the Spearwood area, they will find the growers are most secretive about the methods and seed they employ to get the yields they do. They regard their methods as something almost sacred and do not want them employed by those in the industry elsewhere. They have to force the growth at certain periods, then they leave the onions dormant a little, and this is followed by more forcing until eventually they obtain the yield I have outlined.

It seems obvious to me that a lot of these onion growers are faced with two propositions—either they will have to deal on the black market or they will have to go out of production. I feel that to a certain extent we may be forcing them to

black-market their product and it would be a pity if this should happen. It would also be a pity if the other alternative was taken—to go out of business.

As I said before, everything is not well in the industry and close investigation of these problems will have to be made because we must make these people satisfied. We must make them satisfied to grow their product and get a return commensurate with their ability and the time they put into their production. Having made those few remarks, I will await the Committee stage to make further comments. I support the second reading.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [9.42 p.m.]: This Bill has undoubtedly engendered quite a lot of discussion, but to my mind it has revolved around possibly one or two things and mainly around the proposed amendment dealing with the clause inserted in 1956.

The Hon. R. Thompson: In 1953.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, 1953; I am sorry. No. In 1956. Because of representations made, it was, as I said earlier, intended to induce the onion growers in York, Kalgoorlie, and Carnarvon, to grow onions at the particular time of the year when it was thought they could be grown to supply the market down here, which was not being supplied from anywhere else. The grower in Spearwood—and I do not blame him—saw possibilities in this and jumped into it. As I said, I do not blame him; but it has created some problems for the board. If we are to have orderly marketing, we have to have it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is what I want to know—what are the problems it is creating?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The board has stated it has not control—and it has not, when it has no control over onions grown in at least three months of the year.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you think the board has control during the other months?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It has been stated in a letter to the Press recently that black-marketing is rife. But these are the things the board wants to clear up. It has been said that if the onions are to come under the control of the board, the growers will be forced out of production. I do not see why they should be. Surely the board is there to help the growers!

The Hon. R. Thompson: This is the only time of the year when there is no black-marketing.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No; it is still going on. This was told to us the other day.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not in the free period.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes. There is still black-marketing going on.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You have it wrong.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am only stating what was said in the Press, and that is that it is still going on.

The Hon. R. Thompson: All these onions are sold by auction.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know a lot are; but some are not.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If they are sold by auction how can you say they are sold by black-marketing?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is the purpose behind the amendments to the Act; and it is only because of this, and because of the board's lack of control, that the request has been made to have the 1956 amendment deleted; and I think this is fair enough.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If you were an onion grower—

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order! Will the Minister please address the Chair?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, Mr. President. Mr. Jones made one or two observations the other night—unfortunately he is not present at the moment—when he asked whether the definition of onion grower should not go back to the acreage quota. The present definition of grower is that a grower is one who grows a quarter of an acre of onions. He can grow an eighth of an acre here and an eighth of an acre there, or he can grow onions in three or four different lots; and the difficulty of determining, by measurement, who is a grower is very great, and so also is the difficulty of finding someone to do the measuring.

If the amendments are carried, all onions will go through the board and it will be quite easy to determine who is a person who has produced three tons of onions a year. From the board's point of view that will be an easier method of finding out who is a grower.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Do you mean to say these onions will go through the board if they are not going through it now?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The board must know, if the onions go through the board, the growers who produce 300 tons of onions in a year.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I do not think you know much about Spearwood.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Do not forget there are penalties here if the growers do not comply with the Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There have always been penalties.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They are getting heavier now. Everyone must agree that if all the onions go through the board, it will be much easier for the board to

determine who is an onion grower, on the basis of those who have grown three tons, rather than to decide on an acreage basis.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Why can an exemption be given under section 11 (d)?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There are certain exemptions in regard to interstate trade and so on. Mr. Jones also thought there were about 100 onion growers who were disfranchised and deprived of a vote. That is not so. I venture to say there is not more than one of those onion growers who did not grow onions at other times of the year, and they are liable to be registered as onion growers. This is obvious from the fact that the Electoral Department sent out 420 notices of the plebiscite to the growers.

It has been said that these people were deprived of the vote because they were not naturalised. When we study the Act we find they had to be naturalised in order to vote when the original poll setting up the Onion Board was held, and that they have to be naturalised so that they may vote whenever an election is held. This was not an election, but just an expression of opinion by a referendum. So those people were not deprived of a vote; in fact they were given an opportunity to vote by having a *how-to-vote* notice sent to them.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: When this plebiscite was held why was not the onion marketing association notified?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I will come to that directly. It is estimated that 85 per cent. of our onions are grown in the Spearwood district. Mr. Baxter got somewhat confused with his figures when he started talking of one period of 12 months and then of a period of five years and grouped them together. That is why he had a discrepancy. If he looks at the figures he will appreciate what he did.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: He compared annual figures with quinquennial figures?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; and that is how he got so out of balance in regard to the position. In 1941 the production in tons was 1,046. In 1945-46, we had 2,046 tons produced. There were 3,785 tons in 1946-47; 3,071 tons in 1947-48; 5,825 tons in 1960-61; and 6,671 tons in 1963-64. I am sure if Mr. Baxter looks again he will realise his mistake.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What figures did he quote?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He was talking in pounds shillings and pence, I think.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Apparently he did not know his onions.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know he joined the five years together, and I just make that correction. Mr. Lavery, and I think Mr. Ron Thompson, too, raised the question of the 1953 amendment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I did not speak to the second reading, you know.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No, but you mentioned it. I do not know very much about this matter, either, but I do know that some portions of the 1953 amendment were never referred to the Onion Marketing Board. When the board members found that the Act had been amended, they discovered it would not assist them in any way, but would put a certain amount of work and onus on them which they were not prepared to carry.

I think it is pertinent to say that this amendment was put through in 1953 when Mr. Hoar was the Minister for Agriculture; but the amendment was never proclaimed during his term of office nor was it proclaimed when there was another Minister after a change of Government. Therefore it is obvious there was some fault in the 1953 Act, and that is why it was assented to but never proclaimed.

In effect I think the 1953 amendment gave the purchasers of onions the right to deal directly with the growers in rejecting onions. This is not a normal procedure and does not conform with orderly marketing.

Mr. Ron Thompson and Mr. Lavery went to a great deal of trouble when dealing with the Market Gardeners' Association and with letters written by Mr. Cruickshank and Mr. Brindal. I received copies of the letters from both those gentlemen. Mr. Brindal, of course, is a public accountant living at Joondanna Heights and he is, I believe, chairman—

The Hon. R. Thompson: He is secretary of the Spearwood Fruit Growers' Association.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He is manager of the United Fruit and Vegetable Growers Co-op. Ltd., and Mr. Cruickshank is secretary of the Market Gardeners' Association and he edits one of the association's papers. He is also managing director of the United Fruit and Vegetable Growers Co-op.

Members have asked why the Onion Board did not consult these people. Well, I will tell them why. In 1961 at a meeting between the Onion Marketing Board and these two gentlemen, in association with Mr. Zrinski and Mr. Marcon, a discussion took place in regard to the marketing of onions and these members of the Market Gardeners' Association expressed their view in favour of the survival of the fittest and the law of supply and demand.

It is obvious those two gentlemen are not concerned with regard to orderly marketing. They do not want the Onion Marketing Board, because, if they can get it out of the way, they hope all the onions will flow through their organisation. Would members, therefore, expect the

Onion Marketing Board to go to those people as being the mouthpiece of the onion growers? Of course not.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The onions go through their floors now.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: These people, in their own words, do not want the Onion Marketing Board.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What piffle is this!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not piffle; it is there in black and white. Would members expect the Onion Marketing Board to go to those people to get the opinion of the onion growers?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Be fair and quote—

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am fair. How many Spearwood onion growers are members of the Market Gardeners' Association?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Mr. Brindal is secretary of the Spearwood Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know. I read the letter.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He represents the Spearwood growers.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order! The Minister has the floor. Will you address the Chair, please?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not think I have any more to say. I just wanted to clear up one or two matters that had been raised and to give the answers as far as I am concerned, and as far as the department and the Onion Board are concerned.

We either have an Onion Board operating efficiently, or we do not have one at all. We can go back to the Royal Commissioner who, in his report, said we did not need an Onion Board, but if we did have one we should give it full powers to operate. It is impossible to have true orderly marketing unless we have complete control.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair: The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Repeal of Act No. 39 of 1953—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We have listened to what I consider to be complete piffle.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I said that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister says that even the Royal Commissioner, in his findings in 1955, suggested that if the board remained in existence it should be given complete powers to police the industry. What does the 1953 legislation do?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It gives it bits and pieces.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It gives it the right to license growers. That would have meant the control of acreages and production, and would have meant an economic return to the growers, as Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Jones found out for themselves. They found that the cost of production is about £26 to £30 a ton. Some growers have sold their onions and have received £12 a ton, and others have been paid £24 a ton. I think we are doing a disservice in respect of the marketing of onions if we repeal the 1953 legislation.

Mr. Jones, Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Clive Griffiths have all said that the board has not functioned in the interests of the grower; that it needs teeth, or some meat in the sandwich, so that it can exercise control.

The official report on the table states that 6,200 tons of Spearwood onions went through the board last year. Other members have already said that at least one-third of the onions produced in Spearwood are sold on the black market. So that means that approximately 8,500 tons of onions are produced annually at Spearwood. More than 2,000 tons are sold on the black market; and why is this so?

It is clear that growers who sell onions through the board at, say, the top price of £24 a ton, as was paid last year, are fully aware that the board offers them to the public for £45 or £50 a ton. This encourages the black market to continue. Despite the fact that the board has been in existence since 1953 it has made no attempt to police the operations of the growers.

A grower knows full well that he can get much more for his onions on the black market than he can from selling them to the board. I will illustrate my point by saying that during the Christmas period from January to June a grower had bought 15 tons of onions every week from the board when they were plentiful on the black market. However, as soon as the supply on the black market started to dry up, he increased his orders with the board to 20 tons a week. Surely the board is aware that something is wrong when instances such as this occur and when it knows that legislation to overcome such problems was passed in 1953.

The legislation controlling the marketing of potatoes places restrictions on acreage. I admit that the Potato Marketing Board does not completely stamp out black-marketing, but at least the board knows approximately how many tons of potatoes are needed during a certain period and how many tons will be produced, and the same should happen with the production of onions. How could a black market exist when there is no set price for onions? Prices of up to £190

a ton have been received by onion growers. The price at present is a little below £100 a ton.

In Spearwood the growers have developed a certain type of onion and one grower, who protested after the circular had been sent out to those engaged in the industry, still has 20 tons of onions in his garden; and the type of onion is so large that it resembles a football.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They might be too big.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, they are not. The top price for onions in the market last week was £117 a ton on the floor, and whilst I was there on Saturday morning this grower showed me that he had received from the markets £128 a ton for his onions. Therefore, it will be seen that this grower will go out of production, because if the marketing is controlled by a board and a pool is established, how will the price be determined? For a grower to produce onions in the middle of September—he would have to be a good grower to do that—he would have to receive £80 a ton, because his cost of production could be as high as £60 or £70 a ton. Would the pool be conducted over a period of 12 months? How would the price be determined? These are the questions that have to be answered before the Committee votes on this clause.

Members can be assured that I am in favour of the board and orderly marketing, but it is my duty, on behalf of the growers—who through their own initiative are supplying onions to the people of Western Australia and even exporting some at present—to present their views. I want the Minister to explain to the Committee how the board will be established, how it will operate, and how it will apply to the grower who produces onions in September as against the grower who produces onions in October when the price could vary by any amount up to £100.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: At the moment we are dealing with the repeal of the 1953 amendment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is applicable to this, too.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The 1953 amendment established a licensing system which the Onion Marketing Board did not want because it would have created more work and would have meant the appointment of inspectors. The method suggested today will give the board all the control it needs without going through a lot of rigmarole. I do not think the grower himself wants to be licensed every year. This is one of the reasons why the board did not go on with the 1953 amendment.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Parliament promulgated the Act but the board told Parliament to go to the devil.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The board realised that the Act would give control to the board, but it was not in favour of the system of licensing that was provided under it. More restrictions would be imposed and greater administration would be needed.

If I had the wisdom of Solomon I could perhaps foresee what the prices of onions would be from day to day and I could possibly pass the information on to Mr. Ron Thompson. I am not the board; and it has not been in the position to be able to supply that information, because the onions have not been under the control of the board before delivery, so how can I answer that question?

There must have been a very strong reason why, for the past nine years, Ministers for Agriculture have not seen fit to proclaim the Act. This situation applied whilst the Labor Party was in office and also since this Government has been in office. Apparently there was something wrong with the Act. Parts of the 1953 amending legislation were passed by Parliament without any reference being made to the board. The board wanted to consolidate its regulations and because of the 1953 legislation it asked for that Act to be repealed so that it could achieve its object. I ask the Committee to accept the clause as it stands.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: What the Minister has said about the 1953 Act is quite true; it has never been proclaimed. There is scant reference to this matter. In 1960, the Minister for Agriculture (The Hon. C. D. Nalder) asked the Director of Agriculture for some comments on the matter and this is what he said—

Although I am prepared to submit this matter to Cabinet, I am not quite clear about the proposal for repealing the Amendment Act, No. 39 of 1953.

Apparently this has never been proclaimed and I would therefore appreciate information as to why it was introduced and then never enforced.

This particular amendment drew a fair amount of debate and some minor amendments in Parliament in 1953.

Mr. Powell replied—

When the Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Act, 1953, was referred to the W. A. Onion Marketing Board with reference to its mooted proclamation the Board considered that the licensing of all onion growers was too great a burden in relation to its resources. The policing of licenses and the checking of areas of onions of the very many individual holdings involved would require field and office staff out of proportion to any benefits that licensing might have to the industry.

Members can see the reasons that Mr. Powell gave and the reason why Mr. Wilson did not want it. That is the point we are driving at. Further on we are asked to give control of onions to the board for the full twelve months, and yet in this section it admits it cannot police the areas at present and could not police them under this legislation. Further on in this file, the Minister for Agriculture states—

When studying this Bill prior to introduction, I find that in addition to the provisions for licensing, the unproclaimed 1953 Amendment Act contained a provision for an additional grower member to be appointed to the Onion Marketing Board on the nomination of the Minister after selection from a panel of names submitted by growers.

Although this was no doubt bound up with the licensing proposal, I feel it will be necessary for me to have some fairly sound arguments for doing away with the decision for the increased grower on the Board. It seems to have been overlooked officially and forgotten by the growers.

Will you kindly furnish some details in this regard as this is an aspect that could provoke opposition and comment.

Quite a lengthy reply was made giving the reasons why it should be opposed, and why the 1953 amendment should be repealed. I shall vote against this clause, although in many respects I support the action of the board. It should be placed in such a position after the Act is proclaimed that those parts of the Act which it is necessary to police should be put into operation. After this session of Parliament the legislation can come back to us with the necessary recommendations to bring it into line with the other marketing boards which have control of their industries. At present the board is opposed to certain aspects, including an extra representative of the growers. Either Mr. Jones or Mr. Baxter suggested that a Select Committee be appointed to ensure that the board was given the necessary powers.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The onions to which the Minister made reference go through the floor of the board, which charges the growers about £5 a ton. That, together with the administration and other expenses, totals £22 a ton, whereas the Potato Marketing Board charges the growers £4 6s. a ton.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister for Agriculture queried why the 1953 amendment had not been proclaimed. After all the evidence had been obtained he was prepared to go ahead with the provision in this clause to repeal the 1953 amendment. In going through the files I find what the present Minister for Agriculture did was more than what two other Ministers did over the six-year period, in order to ascertain the position.

In reply to Mr. Lavery, I would ask him this: If some particular produce is controlled some of the time, then when there is over-production what will the grower receive if there is no control? There is over-production of onions at certain times of the year, and they have to be exported out of the State.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you think the Onion Marketing Board is controlling orderly marketing?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, if it is given the opportunity.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It has had the authority since 1938.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the board is given the powers proposed in the Bill, and it does not carry out its job, then we will rectify the position.

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

Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. H. R. Robinson

(Teller)

Noes—8

Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	Hon. J. Dolan

(Teller)

Pairs

Hon. T. O. Perry	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. J. J. Garrigan

Majority for—8.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 4 amended—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The proposed new subsection (4) will take away the free marketing period which the growers now enjoy. In the circular sent by the Onion Marketing Board to the growers it is stated that at present the provisions of this section do not apply to onions harvested and marketed by a grower during the period between the 31st July and the 1st November in each and every year; and that the reason for the proposed deletion is that the object has failed, and that an exemption can be given under section 11 (d) of the principal Act, which states—

The Board may, in such cases and on such terms as the Board may think fit exempt (either generally or in any particular case) from the operation of this section—

(a) Such small growers as the Board may think fit.

When we refer to the definition of a grower we find it means any person by whom or on whose behalf onions are grown for sale, and includes any party to a share-farming agreement through which

onions are grown for sale. I would like to ask what is the definition of a small grower who is referred to in section 11? A grower, irrespective of the quantity of onions produced, is a grower, yet in the principal Act reference is made to small growers who may be exempt as the board thinks fit.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This will be taken out of the principal Act under clause 6 (d).

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: These questions must be answered before I can agree to proposed new subsection (4). Does the Minister for Agriculture realise that these growers will not produce onions next year? They have indicated that they will not do so, because it will not be profitable. It is all very well to say that they may be exempt, but I want to know: will all early onions, up to 20 tons, be exempt under the provisions of the Bill, or will Western Australia have to buy onions from other States next year? That is what I want the Minister to answer.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Once again, all I can say is I am not Solomon and I cannot answer a question on behalf of the board without knowing what the situation is going to be. At the moment this alters the definition of a small grower who can be exempted by the board. The honourable member is getting away from the clause with which we are dealing.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Why am I getting away from it?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Because those who grow three tons will be classified as small growers.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They will be allowed to free market theirs.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Not necessarily.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If they are to be exempt, they can free market the onions.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Not necessarily. I do not know what the board will do and I do not think the honourable member knows what the board will do, because we do not know what the situation will be; but the idea of this amendment is that the small grower can be exempted.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I feel that this should be left purely to the board to determine. I feel as certain as I can be that if the board does not do the right thing by the growers, then the growers will not grow the onions and therefore the onions will not be available this time next year. Surely if the board has asked for this provision to be amended in order to do certain things, it will do those things! The board should be given the opportunity. I feel sure that the board will either give permission to these people to sell on any market they can find, or it will create another pool for this time of the year.

It was proved to me conclusively in my talk with some of the growers that they must get £10 or £20 a ton more than £60 in order to make a profit; and if the board cannot ensure that profit, the onions will not be grown. If that stage is reached, an inquiry must be made to put the industry on a proper basis.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister said the board may exempt the growers who produce up to three tons. The majority of growers of these early onions produce up to three tons. Some produce a little more, and the major growers produce 20 and 30 tons. This figure might be exceeded this year. What is going to be the position—and this is the sort of question we must face seriously—if 25 growers approach the board for exemption because they claim they will grow a smaller amount than three tons, and the board exempts them? Then we strike a chap like Bassan who is a major grower. He produces 30 tons as do some from York, Osborne Park, and other growers.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And Manjimup.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Other growers in Spearwood produce eight and 10 tons. All those who produce more than three tons will not be exempted. We must remember that these onions are in short supply when they bring in £90 a ton. So we have 25 growers who are exempted and therefore put their onions on the auction floor and get the highest price. The board will control the rest and will set a price.

Therefore we have the situation of two prices ruling. Does the Minister think these major growers are going to accept less than what is being offered through the auction floor? The price of these onions varies from market to market.

It is not a practical suggestion at all and I am going to vote against this clause. It is the only one about which I am concerned, but I definitely want to see it deleted until these questions can be answered. I will go as far as to say that I will wager with anyone that, if the Committee agrees to this clause, the provision will not be put into operation. It will become one of the slaughtered innocents, as was the 1953 Bill.

Mr. Griffiths and Mr. Jones can tell members we discussed this matter with some of those on the board and we asked them how it would be put into operation; and they did not know. They could not tell us how they would set a price. It is not realistic and the Minister should be able to convince members how this can work. Will there be a continuity of onion supplies during this period, and what method will the board use to ensure that onions are grown with an economic return to the growers at this time?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member has asked me a question which I think on this occasion I can answer.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I hope so.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If there are 15 or 20 small growers who want to be exempt at the one time, and the amount of onions they grow could upset the market of those producing more than three tons, the board would not exempt them. If it did, it should not be there. Surely it is obvious that those on the board have some brains and ability!

The Hon. R. Thompson: It would not upset the market because there are not enough to supply the demand.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member said that some growers would be selling at one price and other growers would be selling at another price. Surely the board has enough ability—and I have faith in it—to see what the situation is and know how to handle it! Members must think the members of the board are a lot of nincompoops if they cannot handle this. They have not been given a chance to handle it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They will not have a big problem because they will not have many onions to operate with, will they?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If they do their job properly they will cultivate these people the same as the onion growers cultivate the onions. They will make sure the onions are available because unless they get the onions grown at this time, onions will have to be imported, and we do not want that. If the board operated against that principle, as far as I am concerned it could be disbanded. It is the responsibility of the board to induce the onion grower to grow at a profit in the period of shortage; and it should be the responsibility of all of us.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Mr. Ron Thompson has raised a doubt in my mind and the Minister has not erased it. It appears that there will be two laws governing the growers. If that is so, it is wrong. If a grower who produces less than three tons is to be treated differently from a grower who produces, say, 30 tons, that is wrong. I would like the Minister to clear up that point.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This has been in the Act all the time.

The R. Thompson: But they have had a free period.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; but this will apply all the year round and it has been in the Act all the time. All we are changing is the definition of a small grower.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This is dishonesty complete on the part of the Onion Marketing Board. It gave as its reason for the deletion of this provision

that when people registered a vote they said the object failed; but in its place it is stated that exemption could be given under section 11D. Is that not deceit? Did not the board mislead growers, even if they could understand every word of it?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I do not think so.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister said it has been in the Act all the time, which is correct. He also said the small growers would not be exempt if they would upset the market. Someone is being completely dishonest here when it is stated that the small growers could be exempt under section 11D—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I said they could be; not they would be.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —and then the Minister tells us they would not be exempt if they upset the market. I am going to ask the Committee to vote against this clause or postpone it until we have obtained something tangible from the board as to how this is going to work. I am considering the interests of the growers, the public, and the board. The fate of the board could rest on this clause, because today I had sent to me a petition with 75 names, and I was asked to present it to the Minister.

It was a request for a plebiscite vote to be taken under section 10 of the Act to disband the board. I presented that to the Minister at 4.30 this afternoon, on behalf of the Market Gardeners' Association. I had no knowledge of it until it was delivered to me today. The signatures I understand were collected yesterday and came mainly from Spearwood and Osborne Park.

The fate of the board could rest on this clause when this plebiscite vote is taken, because under section 10 (1) of the Act any 50 growers can petition the Minister for a plebiscite vote to be held of all onion growers as to whether or not the board will be disbanded. I ask the Committee at least to postpone the clause until we have got something tangible from the board, otherwise the fate of the board could well rest on this.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Well, so be it.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I think there is some confusion between this clause and a later one in the Bill where discretionary powers are given to the board in respect of onions grown at this period of the year. Clause 5 repeals the 1956 amendment and substitutes other subsections which give growers the right to do something which was not included in the principal Act. If the honourable member waits until we reach clause 6 he can then discuss the discretionary powers given to the board to see if they protect the growers sufficiently. As I said on the second reading, this matter will need careful handling by the board.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The threat of the onion growers of having a poll to see whether the board should remain in existence does not worry me.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There was no threat; I did not suggest it as a threat.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That was threatened the other night in this Chamber.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I did not threaten. I gave advice as to what would happen, and it has happened.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It amounted to the same thing.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It was not a threat.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If some of the onion growers, through the machinations of the few who are growing onions in the off period, are prepared to throw all the other onion growers into chaos, that is their business. That is what will happen, and in that event they will be in real trouble.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am in favour of the board.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member says he is in favour of orderly marketing.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: But immediately he wants to take away from the board the right to handle onions at a certain period of the year.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said, "Let us see something tangible from the board."

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It has never operated at this period.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You do not know what you are talking about in this regard.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The board has never operated in this period.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It has given no thought to it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is why the board has asked for the amendment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It has not given you any advice as to how it will operate.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is the crux of the Bill. If this clause goes we might as well throw the whole Bill out of the window. Irrespective of what the growers do afterwards, and if they want to throw their industry into chaos for the sake of a few, that is up to them. I hope the Committee will vote in favour of the clause.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I issued a warning the other night that if Mr. R. Thompson's reasoned amendment were not carried before today's sitting a move would be made to dispense with the board. It was not a threat; it was something I knew would happen. I was told it would happen and it did happen. Mr. R. Thompson was presented with a list of

names today. I resent the statement that what I said was a threat. I specifically used the words that it was not a threat. Tonight we have the Minister telling us that for nine years—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Twelve years.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: —the board has not seen fit to proclaim an Act that was passed by Parliament, and the reason is that it was felt exemption could be given under section 11.

I do not often make derogatory statements in this Chamber, but I wish to make one now. The growers are afraid that those who have raised opposition in the past will receive the same kind of treatment as has been received by many growers previously when they have aroused the ire of the board. When it came to the issuing of orders the growers concerned received the last orders issued. That is what the growers are afraid of and I say that under the present administration that sort of thing could still take place.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am sure Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Jones would agree with me that one-third of the onions sold in Western Australia at the present time are sold openly under black-market arrangements. How will the board police the early onions which will be in keen demand if there is a fixed price or a pool price? Let us assume that a price of £80 is put on these onions and they are offered to the public for £100. In that event few onions will go to the pool because they will be sold for £90 a ton. I think the Minister should tell us how the board is going to control the sale of onions during a glut period and what it will do when they are in short supply.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: When there is a glut and we have an export market the position can be controlled. If there is a scarcity of onions there is no trouble at all. A lot has been said about the plebiscite. To my knowledge this is the first time any organisation has been given an opportunity of saying something about a few machinery amendments which are being made to an Act. In my opinion, they should never have been sent out.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I agree. It might have been better if they had not been sent out because it is no good telling lies to people, and that is what happened.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The amendments could have been brought to Parliament and been thrashed out here. The 140 growers who attended the meeting in May were told what the situation was by the members of the Onion Marketing Board. They did not have to rely on a piece of paper.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Let us get it clear. They were attempting to explain it when the brawl broke out.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It was given to them in languages other than English.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The meeting was over by ten to nine and it did not start until eight o'clock.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I apologise to Mr. Lavery for using the word "threat." I probably used the word in the wrong context.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It was not a threat.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Then I apologise to the honourable member.

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

Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. A. F. Griffiths	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hilelop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. H. R. Robinson

(Teller)

Noes—8

Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	Hon. J. Dolan

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. T. O. Perry	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. J. J. Garrigan

Majority for—8.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 6: Section 11 amended—

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: This clause gives a discretionary power to the board. It refers to the sales of onions by any grower whose total crop does not exceed three tons. The intention of the amendment, which deals with onions at this time of the year, was to give the board discretionary power when the main crop of onions had been sold, and when the lighter crop of onions came in. The board could say, "Give us notice of the quantity that will be available," after which the board could give permission for the onions to be marketed on a free market instead of being put through the board. The board will have to act very judiciously in handling the sale of onions. If it does not use its discretionary powers, it will have to use two pools, otherwise the growers will not get a fair deal.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 12th October, 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1965-66—	
Committee of Supply : General Debate—	
Speaker on Financial Policy—	
Mr. Hawke	1367
BILLS—	
Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
2r.	1378
Com. ; Report	1378
Government Railways Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1361
Jennacubbine Sports Council (Incorporated) Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1361
Mental Health Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1362
State Housing Death Benefit Scheme Bill—	
2r.	1362
Com.	1367
Street Photographers Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1379
Com. ; Report	1380
Supply Bill (No. 2), £23,000,000—	
Standing Orders Suspension	1361
Message : Appropriations	1361
Committee of Supply	1361
Committee of Ways and Means	1362
Intro. ; 1r. ; 2r.	1362
Com. ; Report ; 3r.	1362
Taxi-cars (Co-ordination and Control) Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1361
The City Club (Private) Bill—	
2r.	1378
Com. ; Report	1378
Traffic Act Amendment Bill—Returned	1367
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
2r.	1380
Com.	1394
Report	1399
Vermin Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1378
Com. ; Report	1379
LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1361
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Crayfishing—Convicted Fisherman : Retention of License	1360
Fire Brigade at Albany—Staff : Adequacy	1357
Forrest Street—East Street Intersection, Fremantle—Crosswalks : Installation	1356
Gas Supplies : Monthly Service Charge—Fremantle Gas and Coke Co Ltd. : Imposition	1357
Land Subdivisions : Inclusion of Recreation Reserves—Town Planning Board's Requirements	1359
Northcliffe Primary School—	
Generating Plant : Installation	1357
Teachers' Quarters : Wiring and Financial Arrangements with State Housing Commission	1357
Parliaments of Western Australia—	
Members : Changes in Number	1357
Terms : Number not Completed	1357