

I would like to touch on one other point, to which reference was made by some members who asked what swill is. I would like to point out that it is not quite the unsavoury concoction that some think it is, inasmuch as every item that goes into swill has been on a restaurant or hotel table and has gone from there into the swill. It was good enough for human consumption and, simply because it is all mixed up, that does not mean it is something that should not be fed to pigs. Members have heard both angles of this case put forward tonight; and I submit there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the only practical and effective way to control the treatment of swill is to disallow this regulation and introduce another along the lines I have suggested. I would remind members that the future of the pig industry is in their hands tonight, and would ask them to reject the all-embracing regulation for the disallowance of which I have moved, with a view to the introduction of something more effective.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	27
Majority against	13

AYES.

Mr. Graham	Mr. Mav
Mr. Graydon	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Read
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Brady

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Needham
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Oliver
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Perkins
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Reynolds
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Seward
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Doney	Mr. Styants
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wild
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Yates
Mr. Murray	Mr. Brand
Mr. Nalder	

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the motion defeated.

House adjourned at 10.9 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 18th August, 1949.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Bills: Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment (No. 4), 3r.	1253
Petroleum Act Amendment, 3r.	1253
Wheat Pool Act Amendment (No. 8), Assembly's amendment	1253
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, Assembly's amendment	1254
City of Perth Scheme for Superannuation (Amendments Authorisation), (No. 2), 1r.	1257
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	1257
Canning District Sanitary Site Act Amendment, 2r.	1280

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

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment (No. 4).
Returned to the Assembly with amendments.
- 2, Petroleum Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—WHEAT POOL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Assembly's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment is as follows:—

Clause 3. Delete paragraph (d) on page 2. Insert a new paragraph (d) as follows:—
(d) not less than a total of ninety per centum shall be prime and seconds oats, the latter being those held on a 1.5 millimetre sieve.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am in substantial agreement with the amendment as I think it is an improvement, and I shall ask the Committee to agree to it, but subject to further amendments. I want to insert after the word "centum" the words "of the whole," and then I want to substitute for

the word "seconds" the word "grade" as it is used more by farmers and people in the trade, and is more popular. The word "seconds" means oats that go out of the screen.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I support the views of the Honorary Minister for Agriculture. The word "seconds" as applied to oats describes oats of an inferior quality. The word "grade" will be better.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "centum" in line 1 of proposed new paragraph (d) and the words "of the whole."

Question put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be further amended by striking out the word "seconds" in line 2 of proposed new paragraph (d) and inserting the word "grade" in lieu.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment is as follows:—

Clause 4: Add the following proviso:—
"Provided that eggs used or sold for the purpose of hatching shall be exempt from all charges under this Act."

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I intend to ask the Committee not to agree to the amendment. There is not the slightest doubt that eggs used for sale to commercial hatcheries do derive benefit from egg stabilisation, because their price is based on eggs used for human consumption. Whether they are sold to a consumer or to a commercial hatchery, the transaction is a marketing of eggs. If a producer likes to produce eggs for hatching instead of for consumption, it is still considered to be a sale of eggs.

The Act refers to the sale of eggs. There is no legal argument about it. If a person undertakes incubation of his own eggs so as to sell the resultant hatch in the form of chicks, it is an entirely different matter. That cannot be said to be a marketing of eggs. We agree that such eggs should not come under the provisions for a levy. They should be the subject of separate legislation dealing with hatcheries. I emphasise again that producers selling eggs to commercial hatcheries derive the benefits of stabilised marketing. If eggs are sold by the board to retailers at 2s. 11d. a dozen, those to the hatcheries are 3s. 11d. a dozen. Members know that before the stabilisation scheme came into being egg prices fluctuated considerably throughout the year.

Hon. H. Hearn: Does not the Government assist the cattle industry?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member is referring to the subsidy for the breeding of stock?

Hon. H. Hearn: Yes.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, there is that subsidy. It is not a fair proposition that a small number should escape at the expense of the majority.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But they do not.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, they do.

Hon. E. H. Gray: For three months of the year only.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is something in that. Only a certain number of the eggs go into hatcheries and probably only a third of the eggs would be subject to the levy, but why should not that third be subject as well? I know that Mr. Gray has some good arguments. However, it is very doubtful whether hatchery eggs should be exempted, because the Act definitely says that eggs for sale shall come under the jurisdiction of the board. On the other hand, in another part of the Act, it says that the board can exempt certain eggs, but I believe that the meaning of the Act is that it should apply to the sale of eggs whether to hatcheries, to the wholesaler or to the retailer for human consumption. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I was hopeful that the Honorary Minister would agree to this amendment. When the Bill was intro-

duced I contacted one section of the people in this industry but they were all of the opinion that people who put eggs into hatcheries were exempt. When the Bill was brought before another place, I endeavoured to try to find officers of the Poultry Farmers' Association and was lucky enough to meet the secretary and a few others at a deputation to the Minister on another subject. I asked their opinion of the amendment and they told me that they had not had a meeting and were not prepared to express an opinion on it. They seemed to be a little indifferent about it. We have all received a letter from the executive council of the Poultry Farmers' Association and I understand that there are about 4,000 people producing eggs for the Egg Marketing Board while there are under 500 members in the Association. No branch of this association has been consulted in regard to the Bill, but the council has had ample opportunity to call meetings of the poultry farmers to get an expression of opinion, so I feel that we should completely disregard the letter.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture : Who told you that ?

Hon. E. H. GRAY : I received a letter and I have been informed that no meetings have been called to consider the amendment.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture : I think a meeting was held at Armadale.

Hon. E. H. GRAY : I have with me a letter which gives an interpretation of the Act when it was under the control of the Commonwealth. I know of three people who are affected by the amendment and one of them is Mr. Shaw who was at one time the poultry expert in the Agricultural Department. He is a man whose word can be taken. This letter was written on the 27th August, 1947, and addressed to Mr. Shaw from the Deputy Controller of Egg Supplies, Mr. Gibson. Portion of that letter reads as follows :—

Whilst it may be conceded, on your explanation, that the method adopted in custom hatching your eggs, might be correct, the procedure as disclosed in the hatchery books is highly irregular. If you use this hatchery for custom hatching, the eggs should not be treated as they were and regarded as a "sale."

There can be no objection, under the National Security (Egg Industry) Regulations, to incubating your eggs for the purpose of selling the resultant hatch, provided the transaction is not a sale of eggs and if you desire to continue using that

hatchery then some other system must be devised to effect payment which will not be in conflict with the requirements of the regulations.

The advice of the Deputy Controller of Egg Supplies was that Albany Bell Hatchery could alter its books to evade the Act. If we do not agree with the Assembly's amendment, books could be faked and taxes evaded. This Bill affects the front rank portion of the industry. Men who breed fowls have to carry twice as many poultry in their yards to produce first class eggs, as the man next door who produces eggs only for sale to the Egg Marketing Board.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture : Why did you not say that when I introduced the Bill ?

Hon. E. H. GRAY : I did not know then. When measures such as this are brought before Parliament, the people interested should be notified and called in for an opinion. That is where the department made a mistake. Nobody woke up to the effect of the Bill until the question was brought up in another place. How is it possible for us to pass legislation of such a character ? I made some inquiries today and ascertained that of the amount of tax involved, namely, £700, eight men would pay £400 of it !

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture : Who do you say would pay that ?

Hon. E. H. GRAY : The eight breeders I have referred to. I impress upon members that in other branches of primary industry the State has subsidised those engaged in stock breeding and so forth. To give some idea of what it means in this instance, I will quote some figures given to me by a man whom I have known for 25 years. He has made a great success of his poultry farm and has concentrated on the breeding of first class poultry for the supply of eggs to hatcheries. The particulars include the following details :—

Data included : (1) Egg prices taken at board's rates for dates when supplied to the hatcheries.

(2) A breeder is compelled to keep large numbers of cockerels the extra costs of which must be borne by returns from hatching eggs.

(3) In returns submitted herewith, calculation at the flock production has been shown if pullets were kept instead of cockerels and breeding was eliminated.

	£	s.	d.
Total eggs supplied, May to September,			
1948—3,155 dozen at 3s. 6d.	552	2	6

	£	s.	d.
Value of eggs if sold at Egg Board prices—			
May 3 to Aug. 19, 2,048 doz. at 2s. 2d.	228	16	8
— 7s. 8d.			
Aug. 23 to Sept. 5, 540 doz. at 1s. 11d.	50	12	6
— 7s. 8d.			
Sept. 9 to Sept. 22, 567 doz. at 1s. 9d.	51	13	7
— 7s. 8d.			
	331	2	9
Value of eggs to be laid by 150 pullets if kept instead of 150 cockerels—			
May 1 to Sept. 22, 1,065 doz. at 2s. 1d., 1s. 11d., 1s. 9d.	105	10	9
	436	13	6
Summary—			
Value ex hatchery	552	2	6
Value ex Egg Board	436	13	6
Difference	116	9	0
Board levy	24	8	10
Profit ex hatchery only	£91	0	2

That discloses the position of this man, who is a successful breeder.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It is through the stabilisation plan that he has been able to get that extra money.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: These figures show that he has secured a return of only £91 for all his first class work. Is that fair?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: What about the benefits he derived from the work of the board?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Everyone knows about the Albany Bell Hatchery. That firm has spent a large amount of money in endeavouring to improve the breed of poultry here by importing eggs from the Eastern States, and so on.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: The levy was not paid on those eggs.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I know that; but in view of the work that is being done, we should encourage such people.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Albany Bell Hatchery charges more for chicks than anyone else.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: And it is well worth while paying the extra money to get the better class birds. Surely these breeders should receive encouragement and not discouragement.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Are you fighting for the hatcheries or for the egg producers?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We should not pass legislation that is neither fair nor just. The Honorary Minister is not game to introduce legislation that will bring everyone in.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: What do you mean?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Everyone who owns his own incubator will be excluded, and so will poultry farmers who pay hatchery proprietors for hatching their eggs.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Those people do not sell eggs.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The point is that the Egg Board is supposed to control the price of eggs to the consumer.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: The board has control—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the debate would be better conducted if the Honorary Minister refrained from so many interjections. He will have an opportunity to reply.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am in a position to know that the statements I have made cannot be challenged. The men I have been referring to will not cook their books although, according to what I have been told, it would be quite easy to evade the levy. This will not make any difference to the hatcheries but it will affect those who supply eggs to the hatcheries. Why should this impost apply only to the comparatively few men who are doing so much to improve the breed of poultry and egg production in Western Australia? Why should we pass legislation that will extend preference to one section of the industry and not to the rest?

Hon. G. FRASER: During the course of the "quiz session" between the Honorary Minister for Agriculture and Mr. Gray, I tried to reach a conclusion as to what the amendment really means and the effect of the proposed legislation. The attitude of the Honorary Minister seems to be that in the respect of all eggs sold, the levy must be paid.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That is in accordance with the Act.

Hon. G. FRASER: The person who puts eggs through a hatchery for his own purposes will not pay the levy. That applies to a person who puts his eggs through a hatchery for himself but the person who sells his eggs to the hatchery, will have to pay the tax. If that is the position, is it fair or reasonable? The amendment seeks

to exempt some people from the payment of the levy. That appears to be fair enough because subsidies are paid in other industries to encourage the improvement of stock. I shall support the amendment.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Mr. Fraser has missed the point with regard to livestock. I would refer to the pig compensation fund. If a man sells a stud pig he has to make a contribution to that fund. I fail to see why these hatchery people should not also make a contribution to the levy, because the marketing of eggs does affect their business. The producer of eggs for a hatchery receives a benefit through the Act. Although he produces for hatcheries for only three months, he gets a special price during that period and during the rest of the year his fowls are still in production. Admittedly he has to maintain and feed his cockerels, but the eggs from the fowls are sold under the Act, and he pays his levy. Most people do not continue in an industry unless it is payable. If these people can make sufficient out of the business in three months and then sell eggs on the floor, receiving the benefits of the Act, they should pay the levy.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am sorry this debate did not occur when I introduced the Bill. Mr. Gray said that people did not wake up, but the measure was not rushed through. The provision regarding sales does apply to eggs whether sold for incubation or consumption. A lot has been said about a few bulls and stallions being subsidised. Very few people get the benefit of that. This industry, too, has been subsidised. For every dozen eggs these people can charge 1s. more than the wholesale price. Is not that a subsidy?

Hon. E. H. Gray: They have to work for that!

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Of course! But so does the man who gets only the ordinary wholesale price. The member for Swan in another place said that the only people who were making a success out of poultry farming were those selling eggs for incubation and hatching chicks. Whether that is right or wrong I cannot say. I do not know whether we should exempt these people, though they are getting at least one-third more for their eggs than are the other producers. I am prepared to leave it to the wisdom of the Committee to decide the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Committee disagree with the amendment made by the Legislative Assembly. I would point out that a vote in the affirmative will mean that the Assembly's amendment is disagreed with and a vote in the negative will mean that the amendment will remain in the Bill.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SCHEME FOR SUPERANNUATION (AMENDMENTS AUTHORISATION) (No. 2).

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. H. K. Watson, read a first time.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [5.23] in moving the second reading said: This Bill contains half a dozen or more amendments to the Act, which have been considered desirable in the light of the experience gained since the measure was dealt with in the early part of this session. Members will recollect that the Act was substantially altered last year, the more important amendments providing for increased amounts of compensation and the appointment of a workers' compensation board. The board has been in operation for four months and during that time the necessity for further amendments to the Act has become apparent.

The first amendment deals with Section 4, which provides that the increased benefits conferred under the Act should become available as from the date that the amending Act of 1948 came into force. Some doubt has been expressed with regard to the interpretation of this section, the contention being that its wording permits the payment of the increased benefits in cases of weekly payments only and excludes lump-sum payments. To clarify this matter, the Bill proposes to repeal Section 4 and to substitute a new section providing that as from the 8th April, 1949, the date on which the amendment of 1948 came

into operation, the increased benefits shall be paid in all cases, whether the beneficiary is receiving weekly payments or otherwise.

The next amendment is consequential, arising from certain amendments made to last year's Bill. Those amendments deleted references in that Bill to loss of the genital organs and, by an inadvertence, paragraph (d) of Subsection (3) of Section 7, which refers to this subject, was not deleted. Opportunity is therefore taken in this Bill to have that rectified.

It is proposed to delete from the Act the provision that no newcomer to Western Australia can benefit under the Act if he contracts silicosis, pneumoconiosis or miner's phthisis, until he has lodged a certificate from a medical referee certifying him to be free from these diseases and also from pulmonary tuberculosis. This is a remarkable poor piece of phraseology. It was intended to mean that no newcomer to the State could obtain compensation for the diseases mentioned unless he had submitted a clearance showing him to be disease-free on entering the industry in this State. In view of the fact that every newcomer to the industry must now be examined at the Kalgoorlie Laboratory, there is no further necessity for the provision.

A further amendment is really consequential on last year's Bill and places persons suffering from silicosis, pneumoconiosis or miner's phthisis on the same plane as those who have contracted other compensable diseases. At present the Act provides in cases of silicosis, etc., that if the employer's liability was agreed to or adjudged prior to the proclamation of the 1948 Act, the total amount of compensation payable can be only £750, even though a proportion is paid after the proclamation of the Act. This was not intended, and the Bill will provide that any payments after the 9th April, 1949, will be at the increased rate.

Opportunity is taken in the Bill to rectify an incorrect reference in Section 13 in which Section 4 is mentioned instead of Section 5. The next amendment deals with paragraph (a) of Subsection (5) of Section 13, which was inserted in the Act last year and gave the State Insurance Office the sole right to insure any employer in the mining industry for his liability to pay compensation to any of his employees in any defined area

in the State as proclaimed. The need to define any area appears unnecessary and, with the concurrence of the Underwriters' Association, this provision is to be deleted by the Bill.

The amendment will give the State Insurance Office the right to insure employers of mining labour anywhere in this State. It is generally agreed that the State office is the only one capable of handling and willing to undertake this type of insurance. This will not affect those employers or groups of employers who, under the Act, have been authorised to establish their own funds for insurance. A minor amendment is the rectification of a printer's error in Section 16 by inserting the word "employer" in place of "employed."

The most important amendment provides for the appointment of inspectors by the Workers' Compensation Board, their duties being to ascertain that employers declare the correct wages upon which premiums should be assessed. It is a regrettable fact that heavy loss of premium income has occurred to insurance offices through understatement of income by some employers. The insurance offices consider that inspectors are necessary to prevent this loss, but they are loth to appoint inspectors themselves as they feel that honest employers may object to the activities of the inspectors and transfer their business to some other company. This could not occur if the appointments were made by the Workers' Compensation Board, and this is recommended by the companies.

Some investigations have been made by the State Insurance Office. In one case it found it had been short-paid £1,700; and, in another, £4,000 over a term of five years. These amounts were recovered by the office as a result of the investigations. Provision is made in the Bill for inspectors to be given authority to inspect the records and books of employers so as to ascertain the correct wages paid. This, I understand, is no departure from existing policy as this condition is contained in the policies of insurance although, for the reasons I have stated, it has not been exercised.

It will be recollected that last year this House, in dealing with the Bill to amend the Act, decided that the expense of the Workers' Compensation Board should not exceed £8,000 per annum, plus an allowance for claims that employers had not

covered by insurance. This amount is to be estimated by the board at the start of each year. The annual allowance of £8,000 will not be sufficient to cope also with the salary, etc., of an inspector or inspectors, and so the Bill provides that in addition to the £8,000 the board shall be authorised to meet the cost of inspectors' expenses. It is probable that one inspector only will be appointed at first, and subsequent appointments will depend on the experience gained from this appointment.

An alteration in the constitution of the Premium Rates Committee is proposed. For reasons which I shall mention, the composition of this committee has not proved satisfactory. The committee consists of the Auditor General as chairman, the manager of the State Government Insurance Office, a representative of the non-tariff insurance companies and a representative of the other insurance companies. It is proposed to add to the committee the three members of the Workers' Compensation Board, Mr. Mews, the chairman, Mr. Christian, representing the Employers' Federation, and Mr. Hodsdon, representing the executive of the A.L.P.

The Act provides that the Premium Rates Committee shall determine the maximum premium rates to be charged on a basis to be formulated from time to time by the Workers' Compensation Board. In the four months of its life, the board has given considerable attention to this matter and in its inquiries from insurance offices, both tariff and non-tariff, and also the State office, it has obtained divergent opinions with regard to the alteration in losses or claims which might take place as a result of the increased benefits. As these increases became operative only on the 9th April, 1949, it was, of course, difficult to assess what the increase in claims would amount to over a year. However, it has been estimated that this would be between 20 per cent. and 24·8 per cent. The board therefore proposed to set a loss ratio of 70 per cent.; the loss ratio being the proportion which claims bear to revenue.

In submitting this figure to the Premium Rates Committee, the board indicated that so far from creating an increase of premium rates, it would result in a reduction; an opinion which was given last year by the manager of the State Insurance Office. Notwithstanding this, the Premium Rates Committee decided that no reduction should

be made in premium rates. A deadlock ensued and the board indicated to the Government its dissatisfaction with the committee. On review, it became apparent that the committee was ill-balanced, three out of its four members being representatives of insurance companies, although one, it must be admitted, was the manager of the State Insurance Office. The board desired that its three members be appointed to the committee and that the insurance representation be reduced. The Minister in charge of the State Insurance Office, Hon. A. F. Watts, did not favour diminishing the insurance representation and asked the board to consider the committee being increased by its three members.

The board unanimously agreed to this proposition, which will create a more balanced committee, comprised of three insurance representatives, the three members of the board, who are entirely uninterested in the collection of premiums and have the successful operation of the Act as their duty, and the Auditor General as an independent and unbiased chairman. The penultimate amendment rectifies a clerical error in the Bill by inserting the correct section and sub-section numbers. The last amendment refers to that part of the First Schedule, Clause 1 (a) (ii), which states that weekly payments of compensation, including payments for dependent children, shall not exceed the average weekly earnings or £6, whichever is the lesser amount.

It is proposed to replace the words "dependent children" with the word "dependants," the reason being that the question has arisen as to whether, because of the specific reference to "dependent children," the worker can, in addition to his £6, receive another £1 for his wife, making £7 per week in all. There is no doubt that it was intended £6 was to be the maximum figure payable and the amendment will establish this beyond doubt. The present wording has left the matter open to question and has caused some trouble to the Workers' Compensation Board. Those are the amendments, of which only one or two are slightly contentious. Members will be given every opportunity to discuss them. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

**BILL—CANNING DISTRICT SANITARY
SITE ACT AMENDMENT.**

Second Reading.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [5.35] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to permit the Perth City Council to continue to use a sanitary site on the south side of the Collier pine plantation for a term of five years beyond the present permissible period. The circumstances giving rise to the introduction of this Bill are, briefly, that in 1946 the Perth City Council acquired, with the consent of the Commissioner of Public Health, the site situated on the south side of the Collier pine plantation. On that site the council erected a model depot which, together with the necessary access roads, cost the municipality over £10,000.

Shortly after the establishment of the site, the then member for Canning successfully sponsored legislation now known as the Canning District Sanitary Site Act. The effective provision of that Act of 1946 reads as follows:—

It shall be unlawful on and after the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and fifty, for any person to use or continue to use the land specified in the Schedule hereto or any part thereof for the purpose of the reception, utilisation or deposit of nightsoil, refuse matter or rubbish.

The Bill proposes to amend that section of the parent Act by deleting the words "first day of January one thousand nine hundred and fifty." and inserting in lieu the words "first day of January one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five." In other words, it proposes to permit the Perth City Council to use this site for the purposes mentioned for a further period of five years. The council is naturally desirous of discontinuing the use of the pan system in Victoria Park as early as possible, but until sewers are available that cannot be done.

The question appears to be governed by the speed with which the area concerned can be sewered. I am informed that it has been stated by the Under Secretary for Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage, that it will be at least five years before it is possible to complete the connection of this area with the main sewer. Until such time as that is done, there clearly devolves on the Perth City Council responsibility to maintain the existing system. I understand that everything possible has been done to minimise anything offensive about the present system, and that

there are no complaints about the site. There is no other site within reasonable distance that offers so few objections.

All new premises at present being erected in the area must either be connected with the sewer or have septic tanks installed. The Perth City Council has insisted on that to ensure that the area requiring this service shall diminish rather than increase. Over a period of years it has diminished in extent but there are still some 2,700 houses not yet connected with the sewer. Of that number, approximately 900 are within range of the existing sewers, approximately 1,100 are thought to be within reasonable range of the next sewer programme, while about 700 seem to have no future in that regard. The Perth City Council does not want to force owners of non-sewered houses in this area to install septic tank systems if there is a chance of those areas being sewered within a reasonable time. I hope the good sense behind that desire will be appreciated. The installation of a septic tank system is an expensive proposition for the householder nowadays and it could well be that within a few years of meeting that expense he would have to discard that system and be involved in the additional cost of having his premises connected to the main sewer.

Hon. G. Bennetts: It costs £80 or £90 now to have a septic tank system installed.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I had a similar experience and installed a septic tank at a cost of about £50, and within two years I had to pay for the connection of the premises to the sewer. I have stated briefly the reasons why the Perth City Council desires this legislation to be amended. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Frank Gibson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.42 p.m.