

those circumstances, effect some saving as far as they are concerned; and it would perhaps bring the training within the reach of many who could not reach it now. Secondly, it will have the effect of enabling us to increase our veterinary staffs in Western Australia. That is a very considerable problem in this State, and likely to be so for some years to come unless something of this kind is done. But I think, if we succeed in getting veterinary students trained in Western Australia, we shall have to make some fairly attractive arrangements to keep them here—far more attractive than some of those under which others have been employed in the past; because they have been employed at a remuneration much higher elsewhere.

The inclination, when an offer is made to one which is more attractive than the job one has, is—unless there is some sound reason why one should not take it—to accept it. Western Australia has thus lost one or two good men; and the more we do for them, and the more opportunities we accord them for training, the more we will lose them unless conditions here are made attractive. If we are going to the expense of having these people trained to be of service to the State, there is no question that we shall have to make the position here a little more attractive to them than it has been in the past, if we are to retain them. I will content myself this evening with what I have said. There are a number of matters to which I propose to make reference on the Departmental Estimates after they have been introduced by the respective Ministers. I prefer to save my remarks on those subjects until I hear what the Ministers have to say, because in some cases they may answer my queries in advance.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 18th September, 1946.

	PAGE
Bills: Road Districts Act, 1910-1942, Amendment, 3R., passed	898
Marketing of Barley, (No. 2), 2R.	898
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, as to reconv., 3R., passed	902
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 1R.	905
Legislative Council Referendum, 2R.	905
Milk, 2R.	906
Business Names Act Amendment, 2R. Com., report	912
Adjournment, special	913

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

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT, 1910-1942, AMENDMENT.

Bill read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [4.36]: I am always more than anxious to support any measure that will improve the lot of the primary producer, or any section of primary producers, but I cannot bring myself, for two reasons, to vote for the second reading of this measure. My first reason is that I think the time has come when we should aim at getting away from control by boards instead of intensifying the control they have exercised during wartime, and instead of seeking, as this Bill seems to do, to make it a more or less permanent feature. My second and strongest objection to the Bill is that it would hand over the barley grower, bound hand and foot, to the Minister. The proposed board is to consist of six members, four of whom are to be direct nominees of the Minister.

Previous speakers have raised some objection to the Minister's nominating one of the three representatives of the producers, but I do not think they mentioned the reason given by the Minister for that action. His reason is to see that "at least one producer is a man of the highest quality." I

do not know whether it is for the same reason that the Minister desires to nominate both the representatives of the brewers and of the maltsters. Does he want all of those four people to be men of the highest quality? Does the reference to "highest quality" have regard to their political opinions? I do not know; perhaps we shall be told. The Minister also insists upon the right to appoint the chairman of the board. He reserves to himself the right to remove these four members at any time—one or all of them—so as to make sure that they will always do just what he wants. That is set out in Clause 11, which provides—

All members other than elective members of the board shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor.

By Clause 15 the Minister reserves to himself the right to direct the board in the matter of establishing and giving powers to executive committees. Having a majority of the members of the board subject to dismissal at his will, and having reserved the right to direct its more important activities, he also establishes, by Clause 18, the right to appoint the manager, the chief executive officer. Then the Bill gives power to the board to appoint clerks and other employees—but again subject to the approval of the Minister. Further on in the same clause the Minister retains the right to direct—not to approve, but to direct—what salaries and allowances shall be paid to the employees of the board.

Then if members turn to Clause 20 they will find that no person shall be entitled to a license to grow barley as a right. In Subclause (2) the board's power to grant or refuse a license for the sale of barley is subject to the direction of the Minister. I do not know what the board is there for at all! Then in Clause 23 we find this—

The amount of compensation to be paid shall be such as the Minister, after taking into consideration the recommendation of the board, determines.

And a little further down it says—

The Minister may, in his absolute discretion, make any payment on account of any claim, notwithstanding that no determination in respect of that claim has been made.

These are not the only instances which show that the object of the Bill is to give complete power to the Minister. Then we come to the powers of the board and we find that the powers given are entirely at the will of the Minister since he is to nominate

the bulk of the members and can remove them at will. The Minister can also appoint the chief executive officer. We have been told that the purpose of this Bill is only for the control of the growing of barley for sale. Let members turn to Clause 40 and they will find that Subclause (2) commences as follows:—

The power hereby given shall (without limiting its generality) be deemed to include power to make regulations—

(a) regulating or prohibiting the production, supply, distribution, transport, purchase, sale or other disposal of barley either unconditionally or subject to such conditions as are specified or imposed in or in pursuance of this Act.

Thus members see that power is given unconditionally to prohibit the production of barley.

The Honorary Minister: That is very necessary.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: The Honorary Minister says that that power is necessary and that the Minister should have power to prohibit the production of barley. Presumably, the Government would like to have power to prohibit the production of anything. In fact, everything should be subject to the Government's will! Mr. Hamersley, when discussing the Bill, made reference to the loss of the market for barley in Belgium. That is a matter of considerable importance because there is no good reason why this country should not export large quantities of this commodity to Belgium. I happened to be a member of the Senate at the time this trouble arose and I took the responsibility of moving the adjournment of the House in order to draw attention to the great injury done to certain industries in Australia and particularly in Western Australia, because they were unable to export large quantities of Kimberley beef and barley due to the imposition of the prohibitive duty on Belgian glass. At first it seemed that the Government of the day would devote some attention to the difficulty and allow some reduction in the tariff, but the head of the Australian Glass Manufacturing Company immediately made an announcement in the Press that if a reduction were made he would have to dismiss immediately so many men—and, of course, the duty was not reduced.

I have a general objection to any form of control that is not absolutely essential. My reasons for objecting to the imposition of restrictions upon production, reasons which those favouring it fail to appreciate, are that there can never be any guarantee that other countries will also restrict their production and it may mean, and too often will mean, that we shall be denying ourselves and other countries will be reaping the benefit in consequence. Then there is another very strong reason. When we attempt to control or restrict production, the good, bad and indifferent farmers are controlled and restricted alike. I do not think it is possible to restrict the operations of the good farmers without destroying the economy of the industry. Farming, in common with any other industry, depends upon the efficient men engaged in it, and if we restrict production we impose that disability upon the first-rate, the second-rate and the bad men equally, and so we inevitably destroy the economy of the industry.

Then there is another objection to this sort of control. We have before us a committee or board which is to say what quantity of barley or wheat or whatever the commodity may be it considers desirable to be produced. Do those who attempt to exercise such control consider that they have control also over the laws of Nature? How do they know there is not to be a drought or an extensive outbreak of fire, or that there will operate some other factor governing production? Should such happenings occur, they find themselves hopelessly in a muddle. Then there is the possibility of building up a small privileged section. A certain few people have the right to do this or that. I spent some time in the sugar districts of Queensland when I was in the Senate and I found that one acre of land, which had the right to grow sugar, could be sold for anything up to £100 while alongside it another acre, equal in every respect except that it had not the right to grow sugar, could be bought for £5. That is what crops up when we commence to restrict production.

We have had some talk, much of it of a very vague character, about migration and encouraging tourists. How far do members think we shall go in bringing people to this country either as permanent settlers or as visitors if they are to be subject to controls and prohibition in every direction. What will those people think when they are told

that in this State the Government can tell them that this or that can be done only at the will of the State? The sooner we get back to some sort of freedom, the better it will be for all of us. I have great admiration for the remarks made by the Foreign Minister in England, Mr. Bevin, when he said that his idea of freedom was that he should be able to go to Victoria Station, buy a ticket to go where he liked with no thought about passports or visas.

I think he had in mind the three freedoms we had before the war and which we have not yet regained—the freedom of a man to go from place to place, able to go about his lawful occasions without the necessity to procure a passport or anything of the sort; the freedom to inquire in any country where he thought he could sell the goods that were produced in his State. Then we miss the freedom to act, not altogether unhampered but not greatly interfered with, so that goods may flow from one country that can produce them to another country most badly in need of them. Again, there is the freedom of money and the need for currency to be placed on a stable basis. We have lost those three freedoms and I do not think we will get back to them if we impose restrictions and controls. Instead of restoring those freedoms we are imposing additional restrictions upon freedom. Without this Bill, brewers were able to make their own arrangements with the growers of barley, and did so.

Although I have not consulted the brewers on this matter, I believe they are quite satisfied with those conditions. I have seen the statement—I do not vouch for it myself—that the brewers would much prefer that this Bill should be given just a year's trial. I do not know whether that is the fact or not, but I think it would be a very much better Bill if it were confined to a single year. I do not know how many growers of barley there are in the State, and I think that when the Minister was asked how many, he was unable to supply an answer, but he did say that the existing local market was 350,000 bushels. The "Statistical Abstract" shows that, for 1945-46, 82,000 acres were sown to barley, producing 970,000 bushels, approximately a little under 12 bushels per acre. In 1941-42, 68,388 acres were sown for 959,364 bushels, or just over 14 bushels per acre. Members will see how uncertain the production from any given area is.

Of course, I can appreciate that some of this barley would not be suitable for the brewer, but should it not be worth our while to give some consideration to the possibilities of export? Personally I think that nearly all of these schemes, nearly all of these guarantees, are merely an attempt to reconcile the primary producer to the continuance of the greatest burden which he has to carry, and that is the high protective tariff of Australia—trying to reconcile him, trying to break down his opposition. This morning I received a letter which I propose to read. I have no doubt it was sent to me because it appeared in the Press that I had the adjournment of this debate. The letter is as follows:—

The Western Australian market had been supplied with pearl barley from manufacturers in South Australia and Victoria, until such time as we realised the opportunity which existed of manufacturing in this State this commodity from locally grown barley. Launching out we secured the necessary plant and had it installed at our mill in Mt. Lawley. Although we were ready to commence operations in 1945 we were denied the opportunity of securing any barley from the Barley Board, who advised us that it would be necessary for us to make application for a supply from the next harvest, 1945-46. This we did, but instead of receiving the quantity we asked for, we received only a proportion which, nevertheless, seemed to us equitable enough because barley in that particular season was in short supply. We received approximately 4,000 three-bushel bags which we manufactured and sold here on the local market. We were denied the opportunity of selling for export any pearl barley whatsoever, notwithstanding the fact that South Australian, Victorian and New South Wales manufacturers were allowed to freely export. In fact, what really happened was that the price per bushel of barley was advanced, but the price of pearl barley allowed by the Prices Branch was not permitted to be advanced accordingly. Therefore, practically no pearl barley was manufactured for the Australian home consumption market, but full production was enjoyed by our Eastern States competitors for the export trade at prices over which the Prices Branch had no jurisdiction. However, because of this practically the total quantity of pearl barley sold in Western Australia during the past year was manufactured by our company at its mill in Mt. Lawley.

This coming year we hope to get 10,000 bags although we could handle much more, but we understand that 10,000 is all we may expect. Of this quantity, 5,000 bags we hope to manufacture for the local market, and 5,000 for the export trade which is in great demand at the moment for practically any part of the world, particularly India and the Near East, these markets so handily placed

to Western Australia and so necessary for us to cultivate. It is a healthy indication of the quality of our product, and the future prospect of this industry, when it is realised that after one year's activity we are in the position to treat such an increase in quantity of the raw material.

It may be of interest to you to know that in processing pearl barley about one-third of the raw material becomes a by-product, and this by-product is stockfeed, in the form of barley pollard, which we have no difficulty whatever in selling. Stock-feed during the past few years has been in constant short demand; in fact it is a rationed commodity in this State.

Last year we paid 5s. 9d. per bushel for barley for the local market which realised, after processing, approximately 11s. per bushel. For export barley we anticipate paying approximately 9s. per bushel for which we hope to realise 20s. The difference would tend to show the amount of handling and wages, etc., expended in processing, all of which is spent in Western Australia.

However, our main concern is that the proposed barley board is to be constituted as follows:—

- Three farmer members
- One chairman (probably a civil servant)
- One maltster representative
- One brewery representative,

and no provision made whatsoever for representation for food processors. We would agree that the main interest should be the farmers' interests, but we certainly do not think that food processing should have no representation whilst the brewery industry is doubly represented—by a maltster representative in addition to a brewery representative. The barley we require for pearling is of the two row variety and therefore similar to that used by the maltsters.

As our orders for export are so much in excess of the quantity of barley which we understand we will be able to obtain from the Western Australian Barley Board, we have made tentative arrangements with the Australian Barley Board, whose head office is in Adelaide, to supply us with South Australian barley, which will be shipped over to us for processing and which we will then ship on overseas.

From orders and inquiries already received it would appear that our pearling plant will be kept in full production and you will readily understand that we are anxious that this happy position should not be stifled in its infancy. We would feel very much happier if we had some direct representation on the proposed barley board.

My opposition to the whole board is so strong that I am not advocating that these processors should have direct representation; but if it were correct that certain users should have direct representation, I

would favour this infant industry in preference to the brewers. The brewers are strong and have behind them the tremendous force of the whole beer-drinking public.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Pearl barley is only about 5 per cent. of the production.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: But this is an infant industry and I am informed that the Department of Industrial Development suggested to the Minister that this young industry should have representation on the board. As I say, I am not particularly asking for that, because I do not think it would make the board any more acceptable than it is now. My chief objection is to perpetuating this system of control by boards and Ministers. I am quite sure that it is going to hamper industry in all directions, and there is no more justification for it in the case of growers of barley than in any other direction. I shall oppose the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.

As to Recommittal.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [5.0]:
I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member proceed?

As to Procedure.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I understand Mr. Loton desires to recommit the Bill in order to alter the period during which the Act shall remain in operation. In view of what occurred yesterday afternoon I oppose the motion. We had a division on the question during the last sitting of the House and I do not think we are justified in spending additional time in recommitting the Bill for the purpose desired.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know whether Mr. Loton has given consideration to the effect his proposed amendment will have.

Hon. A. L. Loton: I have.

Hon. G. FRASER: If he will examine his amendment he will find that the date

he proposes is March or April of next year, when the House will not be sitting. That appears to me to be another way of throwing out the Bill. It would be better that a vote should be taken on the measure and the Bill thrown out at this stage than that such a method as is proposed should be adopted in order to defeat it. Once the Bill passes, either as it is or as amended according to the suggestion of the hon. member, it cannot be reconsidered this season. If it does contain the proposed amendment the law will expire before Parliament meets next year. It seems to me to be a wrong procedure for Mr. Loton to endeavour to defeat the measure by an amendment of the kind proposed. Let the Bill be defeated now or allowed to stand as it is. That is the honest way to deal with it. To make the date April or March of next year when the House will not be sitting would be ridiculous.

Hon. H. Tuckey: The legislation could be extended until next session.

Hon. G. FRASER: Of what use is it to make the alteration? As the Bill stands it will come up for review before the date set out in it, namely about this time next year.

The PRESIDENT: I have allowed a good deal of discussion on the motion and I hope it will not be repeated if the Bill is recommitted. The same purpose could be achieved by the House refusing to recommit the Bill.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Mr. Loton should be permitted to give reasons why he has asked for the recommittal of the Bill. He has not been afforded that opportunity. I think he should give reasons why he has moved this motion. All he has done is to move that the Bill be recommitted.

The PRESIDENT: I have already indicated that the hon. member can speak on the matter. He can do so now if he wishes.

Debate Resumed.

HON. A. L. LOTON: When the Bill was dealt with yesterday I realised that members who last year opposed the extension of the time for 12 months and agreed that the period should last for nine months only, had been silent on this question. I was caught more or less unprepared. I now want to have the Bill recommitted so

that the date may be altered. My original purpose was to have the date altered to the 31st March. I then realised there might be State elections at that time and I have now altered the date to the 31st May. The House may not be in session, but it could be called together if necessary. The Chief Secretary yesterday said the matter would come up for consideration at the next Premiers' Conference. I do not know when that will be.

Hon. G. W. Miles: In January.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: That may be so, but it may be held at any time. I hope that some of the disadvantages that landlords and tenants are suffering from today will be rectified at any early date. That is why I want to see this legislation extended only to the 31st May, 1947.

HCN. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.5]: I cannot see any reason why this question of rent control in Western Australia should be discussed or considered at a Premiers' Conference. We have our own Act. The reason I voted against the Bill was because I felt it was long overdue for the Government to bring down amendments to our Act, not amendments to the Commonwealth regulations, but to the Act under which we have been working ever since it came into being. It seems to me that whilst certain sections of the community—the landlords—have been bound by the Act to accept 15s. or 16s. per week, the Government has not been ignorant of the fact that avaricious tenants are, in effect, not only doing an injustice to the owners of these properties, but have been robbing the public. If I were today charging anything above the fixed price for ordinary commodities the Price Fixing Commissioner would quickly summon me before the court.

It is admitted that we are going to adjourn over next week, but there is nothing to prevent the Government from holding up this legislation and introducing another Bill which will have the effect of preventing many poor working men, their wives and children, to say nothing of returned soldiers, from being exploited by profiteers who are sheltering under the Act. That is why I support Mr. Loton in his endeavour to have this matter reconsidered. The Government could bring down a Bill to protect the many people who today are

being robbed by unscrupulous persons. The Government could even appoint an inspector, as is done in connection with price-fixing, and that officer could find out by visiting different houses what these people are being charged in the way of rent. That is only common justice to many workers and returned Servicemen. They should not be left in the position of being exploited by people who are sheltering under this rent restriction legislation. I hope even now the Minister will agree to hold up the matter and consult Cabinet. There is plenty of time in which to introduce a Bill which would have the effect of giving relief to many people who today are being exploited.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.11]: When I spoke on the measure I was not sufficiently acquainted with it. I congratulate Mr. Loton on his efforts to persuade the Government to do the right thing, as both he and Mr. Thomson have suggested. The Government could bring down a measure that would be very much better than is this one. I cannot see that the remarks of Mr. Fraser affect the question. This is not the closing hour of the session. There is ample time, although we are, I understand, to adjourn over next week for the Federal elections, to enable the Government to bring down a measure that will permit of greater justice being accorded to numbers of people than is possible under the Act that has been in operation for some time.

Last year when we renewed this legislation for 12 months, I thought a very much better measure would have been brought before us, and yet we find it will permit a continuation of present sufferings for many people. A ramp has been going on with respect to those who are renting properties at a peppercorn rental and such people have been protected right through. By this Bill it is proposed still further to protect them and enable them to obtain enormous rentals for properties to which the owners are unable to return. The result is that furniture has been wrecked and ruined and properties damaged—yet the owners have no redress. It is high time something was done to put things on a better footing. I support Mr. Loton and hope the House will agree to further consideration being given

to this question. There is still time in which the Government can bring down a much better measure.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.13]: When I rose earlier I dealt only with the question of re-committal, and did not deal with the merits or demerits of the amendment Mr. Loton proposed to move if the Bill were re-committed. Seeing, however, that you, Mr. President, have allowed some discussion to take place, I would point out that the amendment which Mr. Loton has placed on the notice paper provides for the date, the 31st March, 1947. He now says he desires the date to be the 31st May, 1947. Is that right?

Hon. A. L. Loton: That is right.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Whether the date be May or March the position is the same. We had a division yesterday afternoon to decide whether the Act should be continued or not. Members will recollect that the division was very much in favour of the legislation being continued seeing that only three members voted against the Bill. If this legislation is extended until March or May of next year, Mr. Loton must know that the House will not be meeting at either of those periods. There will be a time lag between the date he wants and the date when the next Parliament can deal with the matter. The hon. member must also know what takes place immediately control in matters of this kind is given up. We have the experience of other places to guide us and we will be in no different circumstances here from what other places are in. The hon. member says there is no reason why Parliament should not meet to deal with this question. I think he has a very poor sense of values. He must know that a general election will be taking place early next year. To call a special meeting of Parliament to deal with this particular measure amounts, I should say, to drawing the long bow.

Hon. A. Thomson: He suggested that you adopt my proposal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I told the House yesterday that this question had been considered by the Premiers' Conference, that it was desired to have uniform legislation throughout the Commonwealth to deal with

it, and that the Premiers of all the States in the Commonwealth had agreed to leave the issue for further discussion in January next in order that we might have uniform procedure in the matters about which the hon. member complains. That is the justification for not making any amendments at the present stage. The position today is no different from that obtaining yesterday, and it seems to me to be a waste of time to recommit the Bill for the purpose of considering the amendment that appears on the notice paper, which is to the effect that the date should be altered to the 31st day of March next year, when I believe we will be involved in a general election for the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Could not this Bill provide for the amendments necessary to get over the trouble that the hon. member has mentioned?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not at this stage. I have advised the House of what has taken place and what is the Government's policy. I have said that the Government agrees that a number of amendments are necessary, and that they will be made, but we desire uniformity. For those reasons, the amendments have not been submitted this year. The Premiers of all the States in the Commonwealth have adopted the same attitude.

The PRESIDENT: In order to amend the parent Act, this Bill would have to be withdrawn.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Undoubtedly. I oppose the motion for recommitment.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is actually what I recommended.

The PRESIDENT: If the clause is re-committed I hope the Chairman of Committees will only allow an amendment specifically dealing with a time period less than that which now appears in the clause.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	13
				—
Majority against	..			6
				—

AYES.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. G. Hislop	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. F. E. Gibson	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL REFERENDUM.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.25]: I heard some of the debate on this measure before I had an opportunity to look at the Bill. From the portion of the debate which I heard, I thought the question at issue in the Bill was whether the Legislative Council should be abolished, but, to my surprise, on looking at the Bill, I found that that question is not the issue at all, and that all that the Bill contains is the question of taking a referendum, together with machinery clauses to enable the referendum to be taken. The pros and cons as to this House are not at stake at all, and consequently I do not intend to enter into the controversy, but merely to deal in a few sentences with what the Bill actually contains. The Bill asks that a referendum of the people be taken on the question of whether certain things should operate. During the debate I have not heard one word as to whether it is right or proper to hold the referendum. To my way of thinking it is a right procedure, and when we look back on the fact that this Chamber has been operating now for over 100 years, practically on the present Constitution—

Hon. G. W. Miles: No.

Hon. G. FRASER: There has been very little alteration in the Constitution of this Chamber in the last 100 years.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: It must have been very good 100 years ago.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is at variance with what the Honorary Minister said yesterday.

Hon. G. FRASER: There has been very little alteration in the Constitution of this Chamber during that time. That being so, even if it were only 25 years—and I can speak authoritatively as to that period, because I have been here for 18 of the last 25 years—

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Too long!

Hon. G. FRASER: Some members may think that has been too long, but the electors of the West Province have not thought so up to date—I cannot recall any widening of the Constitution of this Chamber. If the Constitution has been operating over that period, is it not about time that the people, who when all is said and done have to pay the piper, were consulted as to their opinion of this Chamber? That is all this Bill sets out to do.

The questions introduced into the debate will be raised when that issue comes before the people, but should not be raised here at the present stage. The two questions at issue are to be referred to the people and I think it is time we ascertained their opinion. They have never previously had an opportunity to give us their views as to whether they favour the abolition of this Chamber, or are in favour of adult franchise. Those are fair and reasonable questions to ask. The referendum to be taken is the only method by which we can get the verdict of the people, and that is all the Bill sets out to do. I hope those who follow me in the debate will give reasons why we should not go to the people in order to ask their opinion, leaving out all the other questions that have been raised.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: What are your reasons for asking the people their opinion?

Hon. G. FRASER: I thought I had stated my reasons. It is so long since the people had an opportunity to express their opinion of this Chamber that it is about time we gave them such an opportunity.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: They have never had the opportunity.

Hon. G. FRASER: All the more reason why they should have it now. They are the taxpayers and have the right to some say.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Have they ever had an opportunity to state their opinions of the Legislative Assembly?

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member cannot introduce such a Bill, because he would not be permitted to do so. When and if his party gets into power in this State, he can make a request for that to be done. At the moment we are asking the questions dealt with in this measure. There are two plain and simple questions. If the hon. member desires that any other question should be put to the people, it can be asked at a later date. When the hon. member debates the question, I should like him to tell us why the people should not be consulted. I can see no logical reason why we should not get an opinion from them. That is all we are asking—that the people be given an opportunity to state their attitude. For many years members of my party have said that it is one thing and our opponents have said that it is another. There is only one way to determine who is right and who is wrong, and that is by giving the people an opportunity to vote at a referendum. For the reasons I have given, I intend to support the Bill.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Simpson, debate adjourned.

BILL—MILK.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. F. E. GIBSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.32]: I desire to commend Dr. Hislop on the extensive inquiry made by him into many phases of the problem associated with our milk supply. I listened with considerable interest to the very able and informative speech he made last evening. As a member for a number of years of the Milk Board, which he claimed is not hygiene-minded, there are several observations I desire to make which I feel will convince the hon. member and the House that the board has always been and still is very hygiene-minded. Prior to the board's existence the milk industry was subject to the inspection of and control by those authorities which, I assume, would be regarded as hygiene-minded. If that is so, then I can say from my personal observations that the appalling conditions existing throughout the milk industry at the time of the board's inauguration were a

gross reflection on their administration, and suggested to me very forcibly that they were apparently not aware of the rudimentary elements of hygiene.

I took the trouble personally to inspect numerous dairies and milk vendors' premises, and noted that a number of farms and dairies were without water-coolers for cooling the milk. This was a very serious omission of vital equipment. As members are aware, it is essential that milk be cooled to as low a temperature as possible immediately after it has been drawn from the cow. On a number of dairies the water supply was not connected with either the milk room or the milking shed. In fact, the most primitive system of supplying water to some milk rooms existed. In a number of cases no facilities existed for the provision of boiling water for sterilising equipment. Some sheds did not even have cement floors. These defects were not in all cases the fault of the dairymen, many of whom had never been visited by an inspector. They had not received guidance or instruction from any authority. Furthermore, owing to depressed prices prior to the appointment of the board, many dairymen were impoverished.

The conditions existing in a number of retail premises were shocking. The conditions inherited by the Milk Board at its inception left very much to be desired. Many improvements have been effected throughout the industry, and many more major improvements would have been effected by the board and by the industry if it had not been for the considerable handicaps engendered by lack of material and shortage of labour throughout the war, which position, unfortunately, has not yet been overcome. But there are many other directions in which the board has demonstrated that it is very definitely hygiene-minded.

Prior to the appointment of the board there was no regular bacterial testing of milk, but the board inaugurated and has continued the regular bacterial testing of milk. It advises the dairymen where high counts are revealed, and instructs them to remedy these unsatisfactory conditions. Nothing was ever done in this direction previously. We know perfectly well that, as a result of the board's activities, the keeping quality of milk today is vastly superior to what it was before. No auth-

ority took sediment tests of dairymen's milk before the board came into existence, and the board acquired testers and regularly takes sediment tests, which have been of material assistance in preventing dirty milk from coming on to the market. It has rejected milk where bad sediment tests have been revealed.

Little if anything was being done by any other authority to ascertain the incidence of mastitis, or to take action to prohibit milk from cows suffering from contagious streptococcal mastitis from coming on to the market, but the board has been very active in this direction. So far as I am aware, no endeavours had been made to ascertain the presence of T.B. organisms in the milk, but the board arranged for the Department of Agriculture to carry out an investigation and subsidised the department for the costs. The samples of milk were taken by the board's inspectors. These were major activities which indicate how seriously the board has been hygiene-minded.

The Bill does not propose to take away any of the rights, powers or authority of the health authorities. Up to date they have had powers which the board lacked. As a matter of fact, it is provided under the model by-laws made under the Health Act that health inspectors can cause stock suffering from diseases, which may affect the wholesomeness of the milk, to be isolated and destroyed when detected, but apparently very little, if anything has been done by the health authorities in this connection, notwithstanding the statements which have been made so freely regarding the incidence of tuberculosis, contagious abortion and mastitis in dairy cattle.

I was particularly interested in the answers given to Dr. Hislop yesterday to a question regarding the number of cases of typhoid fever admitted to hospitals at Perth and Fremantle during the last few years. The figures impressed me as being astoundingly low, and I cannot help thinking that had the conditions been as dangerous as they have been represented to be, we would have had an epidemic every year. I cannot find any evidence to prove that any one of those cases of typhoid fever resulted from the consumption of infected milk.

References in the reports submitted to Parliament show clearly that the board requires various improvements to be effected in relation to the hygienic quality of the milk. It requests that the Act be amended to provide for the compulsory testing of all cattle supplying milk for human consumption. This applies particularly to cattle affected with T.B. Provision is made in the Bill to deal with such cattle, and the dairyman who is in the unfortunate position of owning such cattle is to be compensated at the rate of £20 for each beast destroyed. I suggest that had the measure of last session been passed, disease amongst many of the cattle from which milk is being supplied to the metropolitan area at present would probably have been eliminated and so the risk to that extent would have been reduced.

The board requests that the Act be amended to provide for the compulsory testing of all cattle supplying milk for human consumption. It is considered essential that the Act be amended to prescribe the conditions under which milk shall be pasteurised, handled and bottled, and that it shall be a condition that no plant be permitted to treat milk unless it employs a person holding a certificate of competency from the board. Surely this indicates that the board desires to make very definite progressive reforms! The board wishes to have the power to prosecute under its own Act offenders against hygiene and to improve the conditions under which milk is transported.

The health by-laws provide that the minimum standard of milk shall be 3.8 per cent. butter-fat and 8.5 per cent. solids-not-fat. Dr. Hislop made reference to the higher butter-fat standard of milk in Victoria, but we must bear in mind the vastly different climatic conditions prevailing in that State and Western Australia. The quality of butter-fat is influenced very greatly by the breed of cattle, and in some areas of Victoria the Black Jersey predominates. These cattle are high-testing in butter-fat, but in Western Australia we must have a type of milking cow which will stand up to the rigours of our climate, particularly our hot, dry and fairly long summers. The trouble is that in the flush season we have an excess quantity of milk and in the season when we require the greatest quantity, it is not available.

It has been found that the Australian Illawarra Shorthorn, the Friesian cow, with cross-breeds of these types with an admixture of Guernsey-Jersey strain are most suitable for our milk production throughout what has been known as the milk zone in this State. These cows do not necessarily give such a high butter-fat test as the pure Guernsey-Jersey strain, but they do give a highly nutritious milk containing a good standard of butter-fat and with, what is probably equally important, a good quality of solids-not-fat.

By reference to the board's report it will be seen that the average chemical content of the very considerable number of samples taken by the board over a number of years is very much above the standard prescribed under the Health Act, but the board does not limit the supply of milk to the minimum health standard, as it has approved of many contracts between dairymen and milk vendors for the supply of milk of a butter-fat minimum of 3.6 per cent. and solids-not-fat content of 8.6 per cent. The board has reported that it is aware that adulteration has been practised, and it desires power—and the Bill makes such provision—to prevent the supply of milk if it has been adulterated, notwithstanding the fact that the milk may conform to the chemical standards prescribed under the Health Act. This would prevent a vendor who received milk above the standard from adding water in order to be able to sell a larger quantity than he had purchased.

Members will realise that it is very necessary to provide that if the farmer is required to supply milk of a higher standard, milk of the same quality shall be delivered to consumers. It must be apparent that if the dairyman is compelled to supply a higher standard the possibilities of adulteration are correspondingly increased. However, the Bill will enable the board if it so desires, to prescribe a higher standard than the minimum laid down under the Health Act. In this connection it is interesting to observe that the Bill still proposes to prohibit separators at metropolitan depots without the board's consent.

There is one specific case to which I would like to draw the attention of the House, whereby the board, in furtherance of its desire to raise the standard of hygiene, was frustrated by the evidence of two health in-

spectors. This occurred in September, 1937. The board, being dissatisfied with the conditions existing at a metropolitan dairy, refused the dairyman a license, and on appeal to the magistrate, two health inspectors stated that the property was a fit and proper place on which to conduct a dairy. The magistrate allowed the appeal and directed the board to issue a license. I saw the dairy at the time, and I say without hesitation that the conditions existing were shocking and, in my opinion, it was not a fit and proper place to produce milk.

While I believe that the pasteurisation of milk would be desirable, I am not at present able to support any provision for the compulsory pasteurisation of the milk supply and would like further information on this proposed major reform. It seems to me to be highly undesirable to remove from consumers their preference of obtaining either raw or pasteurised milk unless they can be given an assurance that the pasteurised milk made available is of perfect quality. I do not see how this can be done if every person engaged in the treatment of milk is to be compelled to pasteurise. After all, we must bear in mind that we are dealing with something which vitally affects the people; and in this State it is evident that the great majority of consumers prefer to purchase raw milk, and many boil it in their own homes. This privilege will be denied them under any scheme for compulsory pasteurisation. I am, of course, well aware that the opinion of the medical profession is overwhelmingly in favour of it, but I am concerned with practical aspects and the consumers' right of choice. On these points I desire clarification.

I could not support any scheme for compulsory pasteurisation unless it were provided that all milk must be delivered in sealed containers to homes and to establishments such as tearooms. At present, in New South Wales, in the metropolitan area about 80 per cent. of the milk is pasteurised, but a great deal of it is supplied in bulk to the tearooms. It is carried in and poured from these containers in such a way as to make it liable to contamination after pasteurisation has taken place. Reference was also made by Dr. Hislop to the fact that the inter-departmental committee on the milk supply visited 150 dairies, most of which it was claimed were most unsatisfactory. Is that the correct figure?

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I think the total investigated was 130.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: I am informed by one of the members of the board that not a single dairy in the outer metropolitan area was visited, but that the investigation was made by one of the Agricultural Department's officers; and it was on his report that the satisfactory and the unsatisfactory, the fair and the good dairies were sorted out.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Would it not be better, Mr. President, if the hon. member quoted from the inter-departmental committee's report, which is available to him?

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: I will get that report; but I have this statement from one of the members that the report was based on information obtained from an officer of the Department of Agriculture and the grading of the dairies represented solely the opinion of that particular officer. I think that, in all fairness to the dairymen, it should be stressed that the inspections on which the classifications were made were carried out as stated in the committee's report in the fifth and sixth years of the war when material and manpower were in very short supply. Furthermore, the committee made this comment: "It is only fair to add that there have been improvements in the hygienic conditions of dairies over the past decade." This period, of course, is since the inauguration of the board.

I do not think it necessary or desirable to appoint two additional public servants to the board, such as the Commissioner of Public Health and the Superintendent of Dairying. The Commissioner of Public Health has already stressed that much requires to be done in tightening up the general administration of health matters, and I can well imagine that both of these officers will be fully engaged on the administration of their own particular departments. There is ample power in the Bill for the board to employ whatever officers it may desire, and it can obtain the advice of any professional officer in the Government's employment. I think it can be accepted that the board is very desirous of taking all possible steps to ensure that consumers are given milk of good quality, produced under the best of conditions at the lowest possible price consistent with fair dealing to all concerned. I think that complies with the desires expressed by Dr. Hislop in opening his address

yesterday. The Bill proposes to give the board very wide powers. On the economic and marketing aspect of the industry, the board's organisation is highly commendable. We know that in all civilised countries the production of a satisfactory milk supply constitutes a major problem which, in this State, has been tackled with considerable vigour by the board, whose efforts have been very successful in this regard. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.50]: I am going to talk in a general way because I think this is purely a Committee Bill. I am sure it will pass the second reading, and in the Committee stage we should be able to make a decent job of it in our endeavour to improve the milk supply of the metropolitan area. At the outset I would say that the board has done a very good job within the powers given to it. I hope those powers will be extended. The board was inaugurated when the milk supply to the metropolitan area was very bad, and the supply through the years has undoubtedly greatly improved. We cannot pass from a bad milk supply to a first-class supply in a few years; but we are making progress. We have to recognise that we must eventually work towards pasteurisation. I think that is the objective we should have in front of us; that we must some day have pasteurised all milk supplied to humans.

It must not be forgotten that the Western Australian climate is not the same as that of most other countries. There are few places in the world that have such dry hot summers as we have, with the air for six or eight months of the year heavy with dust which is contaminated and which contaminates milk, not so much in the dairies as in the delivery stages. Personally, I consider that the first step to be taken should be a clean-up of dairies, which are far from being what they should be. The board should have sufficient power to start from the beginning of production and follow the milk through, with full powers, up to its delivery to the consumer. I know many dairies not only in the metropolitan area but in the country as well that are not fit to engage in the production of whole milk for human consumption.

I may be slightly prejudiced but I would not have a dairy in the metropolitan area,

not one. Let me withdraw that. There are odd swampy places where the pasturage is fair, but they are rare. Milk should be produced on first-class pastures, treated straightaway and then sent in. I hate these local dairies! Some of them are filthy. I should say it is quite impossible in the summer to produce good milk in the metropolitan area. The dairies are situated on sand patches and the cows moving in must raise heavily contaminated dust—dust contaminated with decomposed manure. Dr. Hislop said that every sample of milk taken showed signs of manure contamination. I cannot see how that can be avoided in such circumstances.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: They have decreased from 200 to 100.

Hon. L. CRAIG: In how long a period? It is 12 years since the board was inaugurated and that decrease is not a very big one. I hope the number will be down to ten in the next few years. I hope also that the time will come when milk will be sold on a butterfat basis. We need to discourage as much as possible the use of Friesian cattle, many of which produce milk which is below standard. I do not think it is desirable that we should encourage low standard milk to be produced and then lifted up by the inclusion of other milk. I believe that we could raise the standard of our milk to 3.5 without any detriment to the dairymen. With such first-class dairy country as we have, there is no need for a low standard butterfat content in milk.

The Honorary Minister: Hear, hear!

Hon. L. CRAIG: As a matter of fact, some of the whole milk people, because good dairy cattle are so difficult to obtain, are reverting to Jerseys, since it is possible to buy ten Jerseys, of which eight will be good. The other cattle, such as the milking Shorthorns have a tendency to run back to beef and are not good milkers. Consequently many whole milk suppliers are reverting to Jerseys and are selling milk which goes to not less than 4.5, and some to 6 per cent. They are being paid at the same rate as the man selling milk that has a 3.5 butterfat content or a little less—that is, milk from the Shorthorns—or a product, from Friesians, going to as low as 3 per cent.

If a man is going to produce above average quality milk, he should be paid more

for it. That would encourage people to produce the better quality. I do not say that people doing this should be paid sufficient to make up the full difference. For instance, I would not pay a man who produced 6 per cent. milk twice as much as the man who produced 3 per cent., but he could be given a considerable increase in order to encourage him to produce better than the minimum standard. I would like to stress this dry summer of ours. Western Australia is different from a place like Victoria. Here milk is contaminated so easily when the burning sun is on it, and we require greater restrictions in this State than are essential in most other countries of the world.

I notice that one of the first rehabilitation works undertaken in Austria and Germany is the construction of huge milk depots, and in every case they are making provision for pasteurisation. Some people say it is not necessary to have pasteurisation; but those very people never drink milk except when it is pasteurised, because they only drink it in tea or coffee, in which it has been heated. They pasteurise it themselves. I went through many of the dairies in England. There is no compulsory pasteurisation in that country, but they have a grade system of milk supply, and in order to be classed as a grade A supplier, one has to comply with the most stringent conditions. The attendants wear white clothes and their heads have to be covered with white caps; the dairies have to be as clean as, if not cleaner than, this Chamber, and all sorts of conditions of that kind are provided for. Those suppliers get a special price. I have forgotten the amount, but I think it is a shilling a gallon more than is paid for ordinary milk. Not many people can afford to pay that. But it shows the importance attached in England to the necessity for clean milk when there is a willingness to provide as high a price as that for milk produced under hygienic conditions.

Except for T.B., there is not nearly the risk of contamination in England after milking that there is in this country, because they have not the dust to contend with. Dr. Hislop said that the board will be unable to act without the consent of the Minister. I agree that the board should have the power to take action against

dairymen without the consent of the Minister. Its power should be automatic. I admit that on questions of policy the Government must be consulted, but it is no good giving the board a job unless it has the power to do it. I would support any move for power to be given to the board to enable it to do the job it is supposed to carry out. The board has no power to inflict penalties, but it should have that power. I do not think it should have the power to take away a license. Dr. Hislop also mentioned typhoid fever. Like Mr. Gibson, I was amazed to hear that the incidence of typhoid was so small; and apparently the cases which have occurred have not been due to the milk supply.

The Honorary Minister: There should not be any!

Hon. L. CRAIG: Can the Honorary Minister tell me any country with a climate like ours that has not typhoid?

The Honorary Minister: They did not get it in France.

Hon. L. CRAIG: There should not be cancer or anything else of that kind. The point is that the incidence of typhoid is low and its occurrence cannot be blamed on milk. Last night Dr. Hislop pointed out that in Melbourne milk is pasteurised, bottled, sealed, and sold at a lower price than it is in Western Australia. If that is so, there is no reason why we should not aim for the same result here. I do not know quite what to suggest. We cannot say that there shall be compulsory pasteurisation in 12 months, because it would be an impossibility, but unless we make up our minds that we want pasteurisation we shall never get it.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Fix a date.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I have no idea what that date ought to be, but we should make some endeavour to see that all milk coming into the metropolitan area is pasteurised. I leave that point to people who know more about it. We must have an objective. It may take three or four years to clean up the processes that occur before the milk reaches the pasteurisation point. It is of no use pasteurising filthy milk. We must first see that it is reasonably clean. Nestle's do the job pretty well. They say to their suppliers, "We will make a contract with you, but before we take your

milk it must comply with our conditions." They have an inspector who inspects the dairies and if they are not in accord with what the factory desires they do not take the milk.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Why cannot we have something similar here?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Why not? A condition of the right to supply milk in the metropolitan area should be that the dairies must be of a certain standard. In addition, all the cows should be free from T.B. Mammitis occurs suddenly. We cannot say that dairies should be free from mammitis. It will spread through a herd in a day. But we can say that the dairies should conform to certain conditions, that the cows should be tested and that the delivery plant should be all that it ought to be. They are the first conditions, and Nestle's impose them. I was at Nestle's factory where I met one of their officers who was recently from America. I said to him, "How does our milk compare with what you have been testing in America?" He said, "It is cleaner." I said "You surprise me. How do you account for that?" He said, "We are the only buyers here and can lay down our conditions. If they are not complied with we do not take the milk. In America, with more than one buyer, we have to take it." So the competition in America causes the milk to be produced under less hygienic conditions than at Waroona. I understand that the milk coming into Nestle's factory is first-class.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is no dust there.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is so. If the hon. member wishes to see some good dairy pasture country he should take a trip to that district. I was born in this country and so were my father and mother, and no-one has a greater love than I have for Western Australia, but it is a poor sort of person that cannot see defects.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You talk the North-West down and this country too.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do talk about the North-West, which is more than the hon. member does. I deplore the statements made by the representatives of the Retail Dairymen's Association, which were referred to by Dr. Hislop. I think the remark that pasteurisation is harmful to the

people who drink the milk is stupid and does the industry no good. It certainly does the retail dairymen no good and indicates that they have a weak case. I hope the Bill will go into Committee so that we shall be able to make an Act of it that will be acceptable and that will further improve the milk coming into the metropolitan area. We shall have to tackle the outer areas, I expect, but at the moment the main thing is to clean up the industry within the metropolitan area.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Bill brings in the whole State.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, but we can alter that. It is impossible to lay down the same conditions for the whole State. In small villages, and on farms, milk comes straight from a dairy cow and is sent to a neighbour. We cannot enforce pasteurisation there. We should tackle this matter in sections. Having cleaned up the metropolitan area, we can go further afield. Milk going straight from farms to consumers is, as a rule, pretty clean because it has not been handled at all. I admit that it might get a bit dirty in the dairy, but it is consumed almost immediately. I support the Bill.

On motion by Hon. G. Bennetts, debate adjourned.

BILL—BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [6.7]: I have considered the Bill and have gone into the question of the word concerned. As far as I can see there can be no objection to passing the measure. I asked for the adjournment last night because the Bill was sprung on the House and no-one was ready to continue the debate. I thought it as well to hold it over until today in order to consider it. I have done so and now desire to support the second reading.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [6.8]: I rise to ask for some information. I have no recollection of ever having seen the principal Act functioning. I understand that under the Act it is essential that certain firms should place their names promi-

nently in their shops. Has the Act ever been called into effect, or are we just asked to amend something that has never yet been used?

The Chief Secretary: The principal Act is the Business Names Act.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Is it working?

The Chief Secretary: Yes. This amendment is not a Government Bill. It is a private measure and I am supporting it, because the word "co-operative" has been wrongly left in the Act.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East—in reply) [6.9]: I would like to give a brief explanation of the position. This amending Bill has been rendered necessary because certain people went to the department administering the Act and were refused permission to use the word "co-operative," so the Act must be functioning.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Are the names placed in the shops of the people concerned?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not know about that, but some control is exercised because certain companies were refused permission to use the word "co-operative."

Hon. A. Thomson: What companies were refused, and where?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: It is a pity that the hon. member did not listen to me last night. The companies concerned are the co-operative companies at Balkuling, Dangin and Quairading. They were refused permission to use the word "co-operative" in their combined engineering works' scheme. Therefore this amending Bill has come before Parliament.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Are they co-operative concerns?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. The Minister for Justice said that the word "co-operative" should never have appeared in the Act, and I agree with him. If members read the restrictions they will also agree, but somehow it has crept in.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 1st October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 18th September, 1946.

	PAGE
Question: Electricity supply, as to provisional scheme of rationing, etc.	913
Ministerial Statement, as to opposition of wool buyers to selling centres away from Perth	948
Bills: Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 3R.	913
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2R.	913
Road Districts Act, 1919-1942, Amendment, returned.	917
Bookmakers, 2R.	917
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, returned.	926
Traffic Act Amendment, Com.	947
Annual Estimates: Com. of Supply, general debate	926

QUESTION.**ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.**

As to Provisional Scheme of Rationing, etc.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Works:

1, Has it been necessary to adopt any system of rationing of electricity, owing to the inability of the East Perth Power House to supply all demands?

2, If not, has it been found advisable to have a scheme of rationing in readiness in case of need?

3, Is any provision in existence for the protection of—

(a) industrial establishments where a sudden deprivation of electric power might result in injury to plant, or loss of material in process of treatment;

(b) requirements of hospitals;

(c) users of electricity to preserve perishables?

4, If so, what is the provision, and how does it operate?

5, How many additional houses is it estimated could be supplied with light and power from present electricity supplies in the metropolitan area, while still meeting the demands of all other services?

The MINISTER replied:

1, The East Perth Power House, except during the period of breakdown, has been able to supply all demands; therefore rationing has not been necessary.

2, Yes.

3, (a), (b) and (c) Yes.

4, Consumers such as described in (a), (b) and (c) would be given special consideration.

5, It is anticipated the additional houses to be built and industry developed prior to completion of the new South Fremantle Power House will cause some minor restrictions in supply during extreme peak loads in the winter months.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Road Districts Act for a specific purpose. That purpose is to enable road boards to spend either their revenue or moneys to be raised by loan on the acquisition, erection and management of buildings deemed suitable for the reception of school children. The existing position is that there is no power in the Road Districts Act to enable a local authority governed by that Act to expend moneys for such purposes. That is borne out, if any further evidence than the mere provisions of the Act itself were required, by a communication which I have here, addressed to a road board, from the Under-Secretary for Works, dated the 4th July, 1946. Before reading that letter I might perhaps explain that the genesis of this Bill is the desire of the Gnowangerup Road Board to expend moneys for the purpose that I have indicated, and in consequence the communi-