

# Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 17th August, 1949.

## CONTENTS.

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Questions : Guildford-road, as to disrepair near Whatley Siding .....  | 1216 |
| Coal, as to imports and price .....  | 1216 |
| Trolleybus services, as to projected Mt. Hawthorn route .....  | 1216 |
| Native affairs, as to taxi hire for departmental use .....   | 1217 |
| Education, as to Bunline school shelter shed .....   | 1217 |
| Water supplies, as to plan for Wongan and Midland districts .....  | 1217 |
| Divorce inquiry agents, as to control ...  | 1218 |
| Select Committee : Potatoes Disposal, extension of time .....  | 1218 |
| Motions : Prices control, as to appointment of commission .....  | 1219 |
| Stock Diseases Act, to disallow pig-wash regulation, defeated .....  | 1225 |
| Bills : Workers' Compensation Act Amendment (No. 2), 3r. ....  | 1218 |
| Wheat Pool Act Amendment (No. 3), 3r. ....   | 1218 |
| Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, 3r. ....  | 1218 |
| City of Perth Scheme for Superannuation (Amendments Authorisation) (No. 2), 2r., Com., report .....                                    | 1218 |
| Electoral Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r. ....  | 1222 |
| Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance Guarantee and Endowment (Local Governing Bodies' Employees) Funds Act Amendment, returned ..... | 1225 |
| Guildford Old Cemetery (Lands Revestment), returned .....  | 1225 |

I would further advise the hon. member that a talk on the road question is outstanding as between the Main Roads Department and the local authorities, but a date for that meeting has not yet been decided upon.

## COAL.

### *As to Imports and Price.*

Mr. MAY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) What was the total tonnage of coal imported into Western Australia from all sources for the period 1st July, 1938, to 30th June, 1939?

(2) What is the present price per ton of Newcastle coal landed f.o.b. Fremantle?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

(1) 72,985 tons.

(2) The price varies from shipment to shipment and according to the class and source of the coal.

The last shipment was from the "River Hunter" in June, 1949, the price being 78s. 8d. per ton c.i.f. Fremantle for gas coal plus 4s. 8d. per ton for port charges. For bunker coal the price was 76s. 4d. c.i.f. Fremantle plus 4s. 8d. per ton port charges.

## TROLLEYBUS SERVICES.

### *As to Projected Mt. Hawthorn Route.*

Mr. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) What distance will the trolleybuses travel in Hobart-street and Edinborough-street in effecting a turn-round at the proposed terminus at Oxford-street, Mt. Hawthorn?

(2) What is the distance from the proposed terminus to the present tram terminus in Mt. Hawthorn?

(3) Is he aware that a number of residents in Mt. Hawthorn will be penalised in connection with transport if the above proposed terminus is insisted upon?

(4) Has any consideration been given to making the trolleybus terminus at the junction of the Boulevard and Dover-street with Scarborough Beach-road?

(5) If not, will he inquire into the advisability of making such terminus at the location?

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

## QUESTIONS.

### GUILDFORD ROAD.

#### *As to Disrepair near Whatley Siding.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has any arrangement been made between the Government and the Bayswater Road Board to straighten or repair the main Guildford-road approaching the level crossing near Whatley Siding, Bayswater?

(2) If the answer is "Yes" will he expedite the work in view of the dangerous state of the road at present?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 17 chains.

(2) 18 chains.

(3) No, as the Osborne Park omnibus and the Scarborough Beach omnibus pass through Mt. Hawthorn, and if it is found necessary an Osborne Park bus service will be augmented.

(4) No.

(5) No, for the reasons given in answer to No. (3).

### NATIVE AFFAIRS.

*As to Taxi Hire for Departmental Use.*

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Native Affairs:

(1) What amount of taxi hire, for departmental officers' use, has already been paid to R. S. Maxted, Derby?

(2) Is the taxi still in use by the Department, and what further amounts are expected to be paid to R. S. Maxted?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Native Affairs) replied:

(1) Taxi hire accounts from R. S. Maxted, Derby, amount to £144.

(2) The taxi is still in use by Mr. S. Elliott-Smith, Northern Administrator for the Department, who is engaged on an administrative inspection of the northern portion of the State. It is not known at present what further amounts are expected to be paid to Mr. Maxted.

Further use of the vehicle concerned is contingent upon the purchase of a motor utility which has been on order since March last, and has not yet been supplied.

The mileage rate of 1s. 3d. payable for the taxi hire is not considered to be excessive and the Department is fortunate in being able to obtain such a means of transport. Mileage rates payable to police officers in the Kimberley area are at least equivalent to this figure, and in some instances higher rates up to at least 1s. 4d. per mile are acknowledged. The use of this vehicle has made it possible for the work of this Department to proceed, without which the senior administrative officers of the Department would have been immobilised.

### EDUCATION.

*As to Buntine School Shelter Shed.*

Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in the issue of "The West Australian" dated the 16th August, 1949, concerning Buntine school shelter shed?

(2) Can he state on what date was the contract let, and to whom?

(3) As timber will be required for the building of this shed, will he have full inquiry made with a view to making this material available?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) 20th December, 1948. Mr. E. Waite.

(3) Recent information indicates that the contractor has had supplies forwarded to Buntine. Further inquiries are being made.

### WATER SUPPLIES.

*As to Plan for Wongan and Midland Districts.*

Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Water Supply:

(1) What progress has been made with the proposed plan to provide water supplies to towns along the Wongan and Midland lines?

(2) Is it the intention of the Department to give priority to any town in the scheme?

(3) Would Morawa be considered as a town and district most in need of water for domestic and rural requirements?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is anticipated that plans and surveys for the towns along the Wongan and Midland lines will be completed by June, 1950, and that construction work will commence about September, 1950.

(2) The order of carrying out the work will be determined by the Government on the basis of urgency after plans and estimates have been completed.

(3) Answered by (2).

## DIVORCE INQUIRY AGENTS.

*As to Control.*

Hon. A. H. PANTON (without notice) asked the Attorney General:

In view of the censuring by the Chief Justice of one, Roy Mansfield, will he give consideration to exercising some control over these alleged divorce agents?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

I will consider what the Chief Justice has said with a view to acquiring a proper appreciation of his remarks.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Something ought to be done.

## POTATOES DISPOSAL SELECT COMMITTEE.

*Extension of Time.*

On motion by Hon. J. T. Tonkin, the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee was extended for three weeks.

## BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Workers' Compensation Act Amendment (No. 2).

Transmitted to the Council.

- 2, Wheat Pool Act Amendment (No. 3). Returned to the Council with amendments.

- 3, Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment. Returned to the Council with an amendment.

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

*Second Reading.*

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [4.41] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is a necessary corollary to the transfer of the Electricity and Gas Department from the Perth City Council to the State Government. With the transfer, all the employees of the City Electricity and Gas Department who were covered by the municipal superannuation scheme are now, of course, under the provisions of the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act. That being so, consequential amendments to the applicable legislation are necessary. The present Act provides for the payment of an annual sum, not exceeding £1,700, from the Electricity and Gas Department and a further annual sum, not exceeding £1,800, from other departments of the municipal council.

The Bill provides for the deletion of the sum to be paid from the Electricity and Gas Department, as the necessary amount in connection with the officers and wages employees affected will now be provided by the State Electricity Commission under the terms of purchase of the Electricity and Gas Department by the Government. The period of years for the council to contribute its sum, which is not to exceed £1,800, has been reduced from 21 years to 19 years. This is due to the fact that two yearly payments have already been made since the Act was amended in 1947. Certain alterations are also necessary with regard to the constitution of the board owing to the transfer of the department to the State Electricity Commission, which involves an amendment to paragraph (4). There is now no electricity and gas committee of the council and the Bill, therefore, seeks to alter the Act to refer to "a member of the Electricity Committee."

Another amendment deals with the Superannuation Fund Board, one member of which was the general manager of the Electricity and Gas Department. As there is now no such position in the council, it is proposed to substitute the words "the City Treasurer of the council for the time being." Then again an alteration is necessary to paragraph (1) of the definition of "officer" owing to the Electricity and Gas Department no longer being under the control of the Perth City Council. These are the amendments embodied in the Bill which contains nothing of a controversial nature. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Hon. A. F. Watts—Kataning) [4.44]: The member for Perth was good enough some days ago to supply me with a copy of the Bill and I therefore have no intention of holding up its passage by asking for an adjournment of the debate. I have, both personally and through departmental officers concerned, examined this measure and find it is strictly in accordance with the views expressed by the hon. member. As a consequence of the transfer of the Electricity and Gas Department of the Perth City Council to the State Electricity Commission, the amendments sought are necessary. Furthermore, the changes in the superannuation concerns of

the employees affected as they now come under the Government scheme, involve the further amendments outlined, in consequence of the alteration in the management. The other amendments in the Bill are considered to be necessary and I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

### **MOTION—PRICES CONTROL.**

*As to Appointment of Commission.*

Debate resumed for the 14th July, on the following motion by Hon. A. R. G. Hawke:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should introduce legislation to establish a Prices Commission and to give consumers and business interests direct representation thereon with an independent chairman appointed by the Government.

**MR. BRADY** (Guildford-Midland) [4.49]: I support the motion which seeks to set up control of prices by a commission of three in place of the single control that operates at present. In my opinion, prices control in the hands of one man has failed, just as land sales control has failed in the hands of one man. The stage has been reached in our social and economic advancement when in the interests of industrial peace, we should have a commission of three along the lines suggested by the member for Northam in order mainly to protect the consumers by seeing that prices are kept within bounds and that a position is not set up that most of us do not desire to see.

Under the present method the consumers are at a very great disadvantage, through not having a direct representative to submit their point of view when prices are being fixed. I understand that at present if a manufacturer goes to the Prices Commissioner and puts certain figures before him and convinces him that increased charges are necessary, they are allowed by the Commissioner. My view is that the reaction of the consumers should be considered, and that they should have some say as to whether the proposed increases are justified. They should be able to question whether the manufacturer has put up a good case.

The Attorney General: Mr. Mathea is the consumers' representative. That is what he is there for.

**MR. BRADY:** It is obvious that he has not been doing his job—

The Attorney General: I am glad you admit that that is your view.

**MR. BRADY:**—because prices have got out of hand in all directions and blackmarketing is prevalent. A few months ago in this Chamber the member for Pilbara asked the Minister in charge of prices control how many inspectors were engaged in the administration of this department and how many prosecutions for irregular prices had been made. I understand from the records in "Hansard" that the Minister said there were 66 inspectors and there had been no convictions.

The Attorney General: I did not say there had been no convictions.

**MR. BRADY:** That was in "Hansard." It was stated there had been no convictions, and yet 66 inspectors were supposed to be policing the matter! If Mr. Mathea is doing his job, he is doing it for one side only. I have had three personal experiences with the department, and in every instance the staff flew to the protection of the retailer. I instanced a case in the House previously in which a man charged 2s. over the fixed price for cleaning suits.

The Attorney General: How long ago?

**MR. BRADY:** That was about March, 1947. That was certainly under Commonwealth control; but just as Mr. Mathea and his staff were lax in that period, so they are lax now. The member for Pilbara mentioned that a butcher in his district was charging 5d. a lb over the fixed price for a certain cut of meat.

The Attorney General: I do not take much notice of anyone who does not report these things.

**MR. BRADY:** One has to report them and then go along and prove them, but I say it is the job of the officer in charge of price-fixing to do that. If there were more convictions there would be less overcharging. The consumers should have direct representation on the board with Mr. Mathea. He is trying to do his job as far as he can see it, but he does not know all the angles. Business people get up to all sorts of ramps to dodge price-fixing. The sort of thing they

do is evident from the amount of income taxation they dodge. Almost daily we read in the newspaper of big businessmen having been fined for evading their responsibilities to the Taxation Department. In the same way they are making huge profits at the expense of the consumers through badly controlled price-fixing.

So I am all with the member for Northam in trying to get some better system of control; since if we do not, there will be quite a lot of industrial trouble because workers will argue that the basic wage is not sufficient and that margins allowed to tradesmen are not as great as they are entitled to. Somebody must control the position. If it were the Arbitration Court, that would suit me because we have a consumers' representative, to some extent, in the person of the workers' representative on that bench. In the debate on price control in the Victorian Parliament in October, 1948, since price control was taken over by the State, one member quoted a draper who had a turnover of £200,000 a year and £800,000 worth of stock which he was holding so that when subsidies were lifted he could benefit from the increased prices and boost his profits.

As that is done in Victoria, so it is done in Western Australia and in every other State where there is not proper control. This man had £800,000 worth of stock, four times more than his annual turnover! That is the sort of thing that is being done in the retail trade by business people who are working within the law. If the law allows them to do this sort of thing, they will do it. On the other hand, if there were a consumers' representative and a manufacturers' representative on a price-fixing commission, both sides would see that their respective sections were protected as far as possible, and they might be able to put Mr. Mathea and his staff up to some of the dodges that are prevalent at the moment.

One man who supplies raw materials to a manufacturer in the city told me recently that as the result of a certain individual introducing a patent into his factory, he has reduced his costs by 50 per cent. at least. I doubt whether the benefit of that has been passed on to the consumers. This person is so astute that he will not let any apprentices learn the new process. He is keeping it in his own family and refusing

apprenticeship to returned soldiers so that he can rake off extra profit. One day last week a cabinet maker told me that he did certain work for an antique dealer in Perth as a result of which the dealer would make 100 per cent. profit. There are two examples of what can be done if the consumers do not have a representative on a price-fixing board. I think it is obvious from the increase in prices of late that something should be done to protect the workers, if not the employers.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Prices of antiques are not controlled at all.

Mr. BRADY: I want to quote from a booklet entitled "Economic and Financial Survey of Australia (1947-1948)," which is in the Parliamentary Library. The booklet was published by a firm known as Birt and Company (Pty.) Limited, and on page 7 appears the following:—

The rise in the cost of living is more real than the official C/L figures suggest. Though wages generally are practically 100 per cent. higher than the average of 1938-39 and, for very many, supplemented by a much wider and more generous system of social services, there is a constant demand for further wage increase to meet the equally constant rise in prices.

I mention that particular aspect of the cost of living figures because the Acting Premier when replying to the member for Northam when this motion was first introduced, said that the cost of living figures had not risen as steeply since the State had taken charge of price-fixing as when the Commonwealth was in control. Yet we have a booklet printed late this year in which it is stated that despite the fact that wages have gone up 100 per cent. and the cost of living figures showed that there has been an increase, the cost of living figures compiled by the Statistician do not show the actual increase in prices. I want to quote some figures which were compiled by a certain organisation, covering the cost of catering for approximately 100 people for one month in the years 1947, 1948 and 1949. In August, 1947, the cost of supplying meals, including meat, to those 100 people, was £30 0s. 6d., in August, 1948, it was £64 9s. 10d., and in July, 1949, it was £80. In other words the increase in the cost of meat, between August, 1947, and July, 1949, was 133 per cent.

The Attorney General: Do you say the cost was £80 for 100 people?

Mr. BRADY: Yes, they were catered for by this establishment.

The Attorney General: Over what period were they catered for?

Mr. BRADY: One month, and the number of people was the same in each year. For groceries the cost in August, 1947, was £47, and in July, 1949 it was £60. For milk, in August, 1947, the cost was £11 19s. In August, 1948, it was £18 18s., and in July, 1949, it was £24. The cost of greengroceries in August, 1947, was £27, in August, 1948, it was £48 and in July, 1949, it was £51.

The Attorney General: Mr. Pollard says the price of milk should be further increased.

Mr. BRADY: I do not know what he says, but the time has arrived when the consumer should be protected against what is taking place. When on the hustings, the present Government told the people that if they would vote for State control the Government would prevent prices going up. The people believed that story and voted accordingly, but prices are still rising.

The Acting Premier: We said only that we would do as well as the Commonwealth Government could do in preventing a rise in prices.

Mr. BRADY: The Acting Premier endeavoured to show that certain figures had not gone up. I would remind him that the figures supplied by the Statistician do not deal with half the commodities used in the average household. Fish, vegetables and so on are not dealt with and the workers do not get the benefit in the fixing of the basic wage. When at Collie during the recent coal dispute I saw rabbits being sold for 1s. 3d. each in the shops, and at the same time in Perth they were selling for 2s. 6d. That is a 100 per cent. increase, and freight could not possibly account for it. Candles were selling for 7d. each in Perth but could be bought in Collie in packets for 3d. each. Yet we are told that the Price Fixing Commissioner is doing his job.

Members wishing to check my figures have only to see the Controller of Parliament House, Mr. Roberts, who looks after our catering. I asked him to get out for me the figures I have quoted. They are a practical and positive demonstration that the cost of

living is getting out of hand. The time is long overdue when the consumers should be given representation on the price-fixing tribunal of this State in order that they may be protected. The position regarding a lot of items, the prices of which are fixed, is such that large private firms that have no price-fixing are making high profits, and are able to draw workers away from essential industries by offering higher wages and better conditions. Unless certain luxury lines are brought under control essential industries will be short of manpower and numerous commodities will go up in price still further, either on the black market or by virtue of the fact that increased wages will have to be paid to induce workers to remain in those industries.

The Attorney General: Do you think workers should be pegged to their employment?

Mr. BRADY: No, but that they should be paid sufficient wages and given sufficiently good conditions to keep them in their jobs. The Minister for Railways gave a classic example yesterday when he said that 144 men had recently left the railway workshops to go to other jobs where they would have improved conditions.

The Attorney General: You do not agree with that?

Mr. BRADY: I do not agree with the railways paying less or offering worse conditions than do outside firms. Luxury lines such as radios, electric washing-machines and other non-essentials are attracting workers into those industries, by virtue of higher wages and better amenities, and essential industries are struggling for manpower with which to keep going.

The Attorney General: That would not apply to Western Australia, in regard to the items you have mentioned.

Mr. BRADY: If the consumers had representation on the price-fixing tribunal they could make recommendations as to what was required to keep essential industries in a position where they could sell their products at reasonable prices and pay wages sufficient to hold their workers against competition by other industries. The continued increase in prices will reduce the spending power of the people generally and such a reduction

will create a surplus of goods in certain shops, and therefore unemployment. Industries that would receive the benefit of price-fixing directly or indirectly will shortly find, if price-fixing is not taken in hand, that they will have a surplus of goods, with consequent unemployment. That is, another angle that the Government should consider in support of the suggestion that there should be a consumer's representative on the price-fixing tribunal to see that prices are kept at reasonable levels, so that money will go further and be spread over a wider range of industries. I support the member for Northam in his desire to have on the Price Fixing Commission representatives of both sides.

On motion by Hon. A. A. M. Coverley, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

### *Second Reading.*

**MR. RODOREDA** (Roebourne) [5.8] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this Bill is to amend two sections of the Electoral Act in a modified way, and I hope the Attorney General and the House will agree to those amendments. I think it will be agreed that it is the job of Parliament, in connection with the Electoral Act, to make it as easy as possible for electors to get on the roll and remain on it, because it is compulsory for electors to do both those things. I feel that the Act requires a thorough overhaul. Some of its provisions are vague and it has not been properly reviewed since the compulsory voting provisions were introduced. I therefore think we should do something to make it easier for electors—particularly in the back country—to remain on the roll once they have filled in claim cards and lodged them with the Registrar. The first amendment contained in the Bill is to Section 45 of the parent Act. Section 45, Subsection (2) reads—

Every person who is enrolled on the roll of any district or sub-district, and who changes his place of living from one address in the district or sub-district to another address therein, shall make, sign, and deliver a new claim within 21 days after the change, to the Registrar of the district or sub-district.

There is a penalty of £2 for the elector failing to do that. I would like to have added to that subsection a proviso reading as follows:—

Provided that the name of any person whose occupation is of a nomadic character and whose address on the roll is outside the boundaries of a municipal district or town site shall not be removed from the roll solely on the ground that he has changed his place of residence within the same district.

It has been my experience, and that of other members representing outlying electorates, that the names of many electors have been struck off the rolls, though the people concerned have not moved outside the boundaries of those electorates. I refer to people whose occupations are of a nomadic character—prospectors, well-sinkers, miners and others. It is unreasonable to expect workers of that nature to be eternally filling in new claim cards. It is difficult enough to get them to fill in claim cards and get their names on the roll in the first place. They should not have to fill in perhaps three cards in a year to retain their names on the roll.

I recently had an argument with the Electoral Registrar on this point. He is Mining Registrar also, and apparently has not sufficient work in that capacity to keep him busy. He makes it as difficult as possible for the nomadic worker to keep his name on the roll. He told me that he would on every possible occasion object to a man's name being on the roll if he knew that that man was not at the address shown on the roll. He said that his job was to administer the Act, and that he would do it. Normally it does not matter much, but it is important when an election is approaching that men who are entitled to believe their names are on the roll should not find that they have been struck off simply because they have moved 50 or 60 miles away in the same district.

I do not think the Act gives the Registrar the right to object to a man's name being on the roll, and have it removed solely because he has left his place of residence if he is still in the same district. The only reference to the change of residence that I can find in the Act is in Section 45, which states that a man may be fined £2. It gives the Registrar no right to strike that man's name from the roll because he has changed

his address. I asked the following question of the Attorney General a week or two ago:—

What section of the Electoral Act gives power to Electoral Registrars to object to the name of any elector remaining on the roll solely because the elector is at a different place of residence to that shown on the roll, although still in the same district?

The Attorney General replied:—

Section 48 of the Electoral Act, 1907-1948, is the section which gives Electoral Registrars the right to object to any name on the roll.

That is the section upon which Electoral Registrars rely. Section 48 sets out the procedure when objections to enrolment are to be made. It states—

(1) Any name on the roll may be objected to—

(b) by the Registrar.

but later in Subsection (2) the following provision applies:—

(d) The Registrar shall give notice to the objector and the person objected to of the day and place appointed for the hearing, and a copy of the objection, setting forth the grounds thereof, shall be sent therewith to the person objected to.

The ground for objection which the Registrar states on the form sent to the elector is that he is not at the address shown on the roll. Surely the Attorney General will agree with me that the Electoral Registrar has to act in conformity with the Act. I have been unable to find any section which gives the Registrar power to object because a man has changed his place of residence. All that the Act states is that the man may be fined £2. Let us see what Section 17 says. It reads—

Division (1)—Qualifications of Electors.

17. (1) (c) has lived in the district or, when a district is divided into sub-districts, in the sub-district, for which he claims to be enrolled for a continuous period of one month immediately preceding the date of this claim,

That period has now been amended to three months. Subsection (1) (c) continues —

shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of this Act, to be enrolled as an elector, and when enrolled,

and this is the important part—

and so long as he continues to live in the district for which he is enrolled, to vote at any polling-place in the district at the election of a member of the Legislative Assembly for that district.

Not a specified address in the district! As long as he lives in the district this Act gives him power to stay enrolled and to vote. I asked the Crown Law Department to point out to me any section in the Act which gave the Registrar power to remove a man's name because he had changed his address in a district. The department could not do that and neither could the Attorney General when I asked him.

The Attorney General: If a man objects to having his name taken off the roll, it will not be done.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: That is not the point. The point is that the Registrar's grounds of objection are not in conformity with the Act. That is what I want remedied. It is useless for the Attorney General to adopt that attitude. I am trying to protect people in the back country who never see a notice of objection. The Act states that the notice of objection shall be posted to an elector and that he should be given more than seven days in which to reply. The matter is entirely in the hands of the Registrar. He can give the elector 14 days in which to reply and in 14 or even 21 days the men whom I am trying to protect would not even have received the notice of the grounds of his objection.

An amending Bill was put before the House last year to provide for the registration of these notices of objection, and to ensure that the electors would receive them or that they would be returned. It is ridiculous for a Registrar to send a notice to a place where he knows the man does not reside. These men do not leave addresses behind them and, if they did, half the time these notices of objection would not be forwarded on to them. For that reason I hope something will be done to overcome that position. It is grossly unfair to expect men to be filling in claim cards three or four times a year. The Act clearly states that as long as they remain in the district they are entitled to vote. I would like the Attorney General to reply to that point if he possibly can.

The qualifications of an elector are outlined in Section 17, which states quite definitely that as long as he continues to live in the district for which he is enrolled he is entitled to vote at any polling-place in that district. The only other references to alterations to the roll are in Sections 51 and



52. Section 51 gives power to the Chief Electoral Officer to direct the Registrar to remove the name of any person where such name appears more than once on the same roll or on more than one Assembly roll. Section 52 reads—

In addition to the other powers of alteration conferred by this Act, rolls may be altered by the Registrar as follows:—

(a) By correcting any obvious mistake or omission but not to the extent of wholly removing a name from the roll except where a name is repeated,

and so on. There is not a word as to removing the name of an elector who has changed his place of residence in the district. I claim that all the parent Act under Section 45 sets down is to inflict a penalty of £2 on a man who does not notify a change of address. If such cases were put before a magistrate, I do not see how he could possibly agree with the Registrar. As the Attorney General is aware, the names of electors are removed within a week of the date of polling and there is no chance of getting their names put back on the roll in time for them to vote.

The Attorney General: How would the Registrar know where he was? He might be in Timbuktoo.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: I want to have these notices of objection registered when they are sent out. The Registrar would then have some information as to whether the man was there or not.

The Attorney General: Assuming the notice of objection was returned undelivered, what is he to do then?

Mr. RODOREDÁ: He will allow it to lapse. A man's name should not be taken off the roll. The Act gives no power to the Registrar to do that. That point should be cleared up. That is the reason for my proposed amendment to Section 45. The second amendment in the Bill deals with Section 70. I endeavoured, when the amending Bill was before this House last year, to have this section amended, but the Minister refused and now I am submitting a similar amendment which is not so comprehensive. Section 70 reads—

The date fixed for the nomination of candidates shall not be less than seven nor more than thirty days from the date of the writ.

By the amending Bill of last year that was altered to read "not less than seven nor

more than forty-five days." However, a proviso was added which reads as follows:—

Provided that the date fixed for the nomination of candidates for any election in the North Province or in any district situated therein shall not be less than thirty-five days before the date fixed for the polling.

I propose to delete from that provision the words "any district situated therein." That means that the provision would still specify a 35 days' minimum for any Legislative Council election but, so far as an Assembly district is concerned, it would not be on the same basis as every other district in the State. For what reason the North-West seats were selected for this special attention is beyond me. There is neither rhyme nor reason about it. It could just as well have applied to five or six electorates.

The Attorney General: The transport difficulties are more accentuated in that district.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: The transport difficulties are not greater in the North than anywhere else. I do not suppose there are many districts so adequately served by air transport as is the North-West.

The Attorney General: The air services only take in a few towns.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: There is a network of air services in that area. There is one which the local residents call the "sugar and tea run." There are three 'planes a week serving Port Hedland. Also, the roads are being gradually improved and motor transport has increased. Therefore, I say these districts are better served by transport facilities than is, say, Kanowna, or some of the other electorates. Facts and figures make little of the objection by the Attorney General because the statistical table published after each election shows an extremely high percentage of votes polled. In fact, it is higher than the average for the State. If the same period of time was given to other electorates as is given to the North-West, which was sanctioned when the Electoral Act was first enforced, it would be all right.

Those conditions were good enough 30 years ago when there were no good roads or motor or air transport in the North, and now when we have those facilities the Minister wants to bind us down to a 35 days' minimum. Let us be placed on the same basis as every other electorate in the State.

There is only one course for the Government to pursue if the parent Act is left as it is, and that is that the nominations for the North-West must close at least two or three weeks before they close in any other part of the State. That means that the North-West campaign will start two or three weeks earlier. Where is there any reason for that? Why should we tinker with the Electoral Act to achieve that state of affairs? I do not think that is justified on any grounds. If the Minister tries to justify it on the transport difficulties why does he not include these other electorates? The same conditions as to transport prevail in those districts and are even worse.

I am not trying to alter the set-up relating to the North provinces but I do want the electoral districts put on the same basis as any other district. If the Minister retains the compulsory five weeks' provision, the other outlying electorates should be placed on the same basis. The Minister knows as well as anybody else that a long-drawn-out election campaign is of no use to anyone. I hope the Minister will change his tune when he has time to consider this question. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Attorney General, debate adjourned.

### BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

- 1, Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance, Guarantee and Endowment (Local Governing Bodies' Employees) Funds Act Amendment.
  - 2, Guildford Old Cemetery (Lands Revestment).
- Without amendment.

### MOTION—STOCK DISEASES ACT.

*To Disallow Pig Wash Regulation.*

Debate resumed from the 20th July on the following motion by Mr. Grayden:—

That new regulation No. 77A made under the Stock Diseases Act, 1895, published in the "Government Gazette" on the 11th February, 1949, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 15th June, 1949, be, and is hereby disallowed.

I

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. L. Thorn—Toodyay)** [5.30]: In moving that Regulation 77A made under the Stock Diseases Act be disallowed, it is apparent

that the member for Middle Swan has failed to acquaint himself with all the facts of the matter, and that he is acting, upon the advice of a small group of pig-farmers in the metropolitan area who are seeking to break down the regulations to their own advantage, but with an utter disregard for the interests of the majority of pig-farmers throughout the State who support the policy of the department. So that the position may be understood, it is necessary that it be considered against the background of the swine fever outbreak of 1942. No-one who was associated with that outbreak and who witnessed the annihilation of piggery after piggery in rapid succession would deny the necessity for retention of the present regulations. Swine fever was introduced in this State in American pig-meat.

The first outbreak occurred in a piggery at Welshpool, the owner of which was collecting food refuse—commonly known as pigswill—from the military camp at Claremont which at that time was occupied by American troops. There was serious mortality at the piggery, but the owner, instead of reporting the matter to the department as he was required to do under the Stock Diseases Act, consigned the pigs—which still appeared to be healthy—to the Midland Junction market. These pigs, however, were incubating the disease and spread the infection to the remainder of the yard. Most of the pigs were purchased by bacon curers, but principally by Watson's Supply Stores at Spearwood. At the time, Watson's had about 4,000 pigs in a paddock adjoining their bacon factory and it was not long before mortality occurred there. In order to minimise the losses, the pigs were slaughtered as rapidly as possible, the majority of carcasses which passed the meat inspectors being converted to bacon which was distributed throughout the metropolitan and country districts.

As this bacon had been derived from pigs which had suffered from swine fever, it was infected with the virus of the disease which remained infective and able to infect other pigs for a period of several months. Scraps of this bacon found their way into garbage bins and were fed to pigs, resulting in outbreaks of the disease over a wide area of the State. A slaughter policy was adopted to combat the disease. Whenever an outbreak was reported, all pigs on the

property were slaughtered and their carcasses destroyed by burning. The movement of all pigs, other than those destined for immediate slaughter at bacon factories in the metropolitan district, was prohibited. No markets were conducted for a period of six months.

Notwithstanding these restrictions, outbreaks continued to occur and it was not until the feeding of food refuse or swill was prohibited by regulation that the disease was brought under control and finally eradicated. Had this action not been taken, the disease must have continued to spread and the pig industry would have been crippled, if not eliminated. During this outbreak, 13,000 pigs were lost, of which approximately 10,000 died or were destroyed on piggeries in and around the metropolitan district during the first month. Had the regulations been in force, this outbreak would not have occurred and the State would have been saved not only the loss of £30,000 paid to pig-farmers in compensation, but also the losses which resulted from quarantine and restriction of movement which virtually paralysed the pig industry for a period of six months.

This outbreak was not due to any past mistake of the department. At the time it occurred the feeding of unboiled food refuse to pigs was prohibited both by the Health Act and the National Security Regulations. It is recognised that thorough boiling will destroy the infective agent of swine fever and other diseases, but unfortunately the pig-farmer could not be relied upon to observe this simple requirement. Even after swine fever had become established and notwithstanding the issue of frequent warnings both in the Press and over the air, unboiled swill continued to be fed to pigs and fresh outbreaks of the disease occurred. Complete prohibition of swill feeding provided the only remedy and once this condition was enforced the disease rapidly subsided. It was, however, obvious that should the use of swill again be permitted more drastic conditions would have to be imposed.

The outbreak continued for three months, by which time the disease was eradicated, but practically no pigs remained in the metropolitan area. Moreover, owners of affected properties, having received substantial compensation and obtained other employment, did not seek to re-enter the

industry. The Perth City Council therefore had no alternative but to collect and bury food refuse accumulated in its territory. This practice continued until September, 1947, when, primarily as a result of representations on the part of A. Simmons who had installed a large vertical digester of a capacity of four tons on a property at Riverton, the regulations were amended to allow the use of food refuse for feeding pigs subject to sterilisation by steam pressure at 40 lb. per square inch for three hours. This plant was subsequently purchased and operated by Fergusons Pty. Ltd., and the City Council co-operated in the matter by delivering food refuse to the premises. The plant was at all times operated in strict accordance with the provisions of the amended regulations. The results were not entirely satisfactory, there being considerable doubt whether the steam was able to penetrate the compacted mass of swill and whether effective sterilisation was being attained.

Fergusons Ltd. decided to dispense with this vertical digester and replace it by a dry rendering unit, or "Laabs Cooker." This plant is capable of handling three tons of swill per charge and the temperature attained is such that the material continues to boil violently for upwards of half-an-hour after having been transferred to the holding vats, each of which has a capacity of 360 gallons. At present Fergusons Ltd. are treating 30 tons of swill per week and are carrying approximately 2,500 pigs on the property. The capacity of the plant is such that the whole of the output of swill from the metropolitan area, amounting to about 90 tons a week, could be handled without difficulty. No approach has ever been made to the department for permission to sell "processed" swill to other pig-farmers. Such an arrangement would have suited the purpose of the department admirably, as it would have ensured that all the swill would be sterilised at a central depot in an efficient plant working under constant supervision.

It may be of some interest to point out that this practice has been adopted in Great Britain where the treatment of all food is a municipal responsibility, and no food is made available to pig-raisers until it has been sterilised under supervision in a municipal treatment plant. Early in 1944 it was suggested that the same procedure

should be adopted in Perth, but neither the Government nor the Perth City Council was prepared to accept any responsibility in the matter. When the regulations were amended, Tomlinson & Co., acting for some pig-owners at Belmont, submitted plans of a sterilising plant which it was desired to install at the smaller piggeries. This plant had a capacity of 200 gallons and was operated by a two horsepower boiler. Upon the specifications being submitted it did not appear that the plant could be worked successfully, but when a trial—which was attended by departmental officers—was made on the property of A. A. Bloomfield at Belmont, the results were observed to be entirely satisfactory.

Approval for the use of this plant was finally granted in November, 1948. Since that time Tomlinson & Co. have supplied 11 of these plants to metropolitan pig-farmers, the majority of which are now being operated under the supervision of one of the department's inspectors. These plants, together with the Laab's Cooker installed by Fergusons Ltd., are now handling all the food refuse available in the metropolitan area, and one owner has complained that he cannot now obtain his full requirements. The hon. member's statement that the department is forcing the small pig-farmer out of business is therefore very misleading. Of the 55 metropolitan pig-farmers to whom he refers, only 15 are carrying 100 or more pigs on their properties and, apart from those who have now acquired treatment plants, few of these have displayed any interest in the swill question.

Nowotny's statement that he was convicted and fined in the Perth Police Court for utilising food waste from his own kitchen is also misleading. He was collecting large quantities of food refuse from St. John of God Hospital at Subiaco and feeding it to his pigs at Forrestfield without any treatment whatever, and was prosecuted by the department for that reason. It has never been suggested that the feeding of table scraps to pigs could be prevented. But outbreaks of swine fever on isolated farms were traced to that cause in 1942. It is contended that adequate control can be exercised over the use of food refuse at ports, cities and large towns where the risks are greatest and where considerable numbers of pigs are kept.

The hon. member's reference to the lack of restrictions in other States, particularly New South Wales, is rather unfortunate. He is apparently unaware that not one but two disastrous outbreaks of swine fever have occurred in that State during the last 20 years. I think it is desirable that we should endeavour to set a good example rather than follow a bad one. Others with whom the hon. member is associated have mentioned the lack of restrictions in America, but they are surely unaware that swine fever, or hog cholera as it is called, occurs throughout the length and breadth of that country, and according to the Year Book issued by the U.S.A. Department of Agriculture in 1942, is costing 12½ million dollars annually.

Hon. A. H. Panton: To kill the pigs?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, to combat the disease. In Great Britain, where recurrent outbreaks of swine fever and foot and mouth disease present a serious problem, the latter being introduced in Argentine beef, the importance of sterilising food refuse is recognised, and, as previously pointed out, none of this material is entrusted to pig feeders until it has been sterilised in a municipal plant. It has never been asserted that there are any risks associated with the use of vegetable refuse. It must at the same time be recognised that at many green-grocers' shops, meat products such as ham, bacon, and smallgoods are also sold and it is therefore not possible to make any exceptions.

I will quote an example. During the swine fever epidemic an outbreak occurred at North Dandalup at a farm owned by a well known Perth solicitor. There were no other pigs within miles of this property. Enquiries revealed that the owner was in the habit of visiting his farm during the week-end and taking with him a load of vegetable tops obtained from a greengrocery at Claremont. It transpired that smallgoods were also stocked on those premises. The reason for the treatment of vegetable refuse from shops will thus be obvious. No restrictions are placed upon the collection of vegetable refuse from markets or market gardens. Pig owners during the epidemic were observed to remove meat and bones from vegetable refuse soaking in the same vat, and to feed the residue to their pigs without treatment in the belief that it would be harmless.

At present the department is more concerned with the risk of the introduction of foot and mouth disease than of swine fever. This disease affects all cloven hooved animals, so that beef, mutton or pork, even though it may be purchased by the housewife at a butcher's shop and appear quite wholesome, may still be a source of great danger to animals. Pigs may contract the disease by access to unsterilised swill, and subsequently transmit the disease which is extremely contagious, to sheep and cattle. Large numbers of migrants are now entering Australia from Europe and other countries and are bringing in their luggage parcels of foodstuffs, particularly sausage composed of uncooked or partially cooked meat, all of which is potentially dangerous. During May, 600 lb. of this material was intercepted and destroyed on the Fremantle wharves.

There is always the risk that quantities of this meat will escape detection and pass beyond the quarantine barrier, causing an outbreak of foot and mouth disease or perhaps rinderpest, in just the same manner as the outbreak of swine fever was caused by American pigmeat in 1942. Should this occur the infection would be disseminated through the agency of meat products derived from any cloven-hooved species, and it is therefore obvious that butchers' bones must be subjected to just the same treatment as food refuse from any other source. The Department must be in a position to meet any contingency, and Regulation 77A in its present form provides it with the necessary powers. The Director General of Health, who administers the Commonwealth Quarantine Act, is greatly concerned at the risk to which Australia is being exposed at the present time, and has repeatedly requested Chief Veterinary Officers, who are also Chief Quarantine Officers, in all States to adopt every possible precaution.

The introduction of foot and mouth disease into Australia would be little short of a national disaster, as, apart from direct losses in livestock, it would jeopardise our export trade in animals and animal products, particularly wool and meat, with other countries. The recent outbreak in Mexico will provide an illustration. The disease was introduced with bulls imported by the Mexican Government from Brazil against the advice of veterinary authorities.

The disease has already cost Mexico millions of dollars in fruitless endeavours at eradication, as well as in its export trade in cattle to the United States. The hon. member now suggests that Regulation 77A should be scrapped and that we should revert to the method of haphazard boiling which applied prior to 1942. He makes this recommendation in the face of evidence that has shown over and over again that pigowners generally cannot be relied upon to observe this simple requirement. If pigowners could not be persuaded to boil food refuse in the midst of an epidemic of swine fever which threatened to annihilate their herds, is there any reason to believe that they will do so now?

If Regulation 77A is disallowed and the hon. member's recommendations are adopted, it may be anticipated that small amounts of swill will pass into the hands of a large number of pig keepers over whom it will be both impracticable and physically impossible to exercise an adequate degree of supervision. If the regulation is retained the treatment of swill in the metropolitan area will be confined to probably 12 pig farmers equipped with treatment plants capable of effectively sterilising the material, and over which a constant and adequate supervision can be exercised. Similar plants will no doubt be erected in the larger country towns. The operation of these plants will reduce to a minimum the risks of the introduction of infectious disease from abroad, and will enable immediate steps to be taken to prevent the dissemination of infection should any such disease be inadvertently introduced.

The Department is faced with a difficult task and is entitled to receive all of the support the regulations can provide. The decline in the pig industry since 1942 has been largely due to factors other than the availability of food refuse. Anyone who has been associated with the industry will know that the pig population fluctuates with the price of wheat. When prices are high, farmers prefer to dispose of their wheat through the normal channels. When, however, the price of this commodity is low, it can be profitably fed to pigs and large numbers of these animals are carried on wheat farms as a side line. During these periods a marked increase in the pig

population of the State has always occurred. Shortage of meatmeal and the lack of suitable farm labour have also had an important bearing on the matter.

In view of the information I have given the House, I cannot support the motion moved by the member for Middle Swan that Regulation 77A under the Stock Diseases Act, 1895, be disallowed. I have received two letters, one from the Royal Agricultural Society and one from the Pig Breeders' Association of Western Australia, imploring me to do all I can to defeat the motion. They point out the seriousness of the epidemics of swine fever that have taken place in the past and they feel that in these regulations a real effort was made to do something to prevent that disease breaking out again.

Without wishing to be critical, I am rather surprised at the member for Middle Swan's moving for the disallowance of this regulation. The electorate that he represents contains many pig farmers. I think it has been ably demonstrated to this House and to the State generally that it would be fatal to run any risk of a recurrence in the future of this disease and I say to the hon. member, in the interests of his electors who are engaged in the industry, that it is not fair to move for the disallowance of this regulation. I feel confident that this Chamber will not approve of the motion.

**MR. FOX** (South Fremantle) [5.58]: I think members will agree that the department should do everything possible to prevent another outbreak of swine fever in this State. That disease, when it made its appearance in Western Australia, decimated the pig herds of the metropolitan area and also, to some extent, those in the country areas. It is impracticable for pig breeders in a very small way to install digesters in order to comply with the regulations. It would take an army of inspectors to police the regulations and ensure that the swill was properly treated. However, I think each municipality could erect a digester to treat the swill, which could then be sold to the pig raisers. Pig farmers, with whom I have spoken do not regard swill as a valuable pig food. They say there is very little body in the swill collected round the town.

When the Americans were here a great deal of food was thrown into the receptacles from which swill was collected, and in that way it was given a much greater food value. I have been told by experienced men that the meat of pigs that have been fed on swill is not nearly as good as that of pigs raised on other feed. One pig raiser that I know said that if one fried bacon made from a pig fed on swill one would think from the odour that there was swill in the pan, rather than bacon. There are two fairly big pig raisers in the district I represent and neither of them favours feeding swill at all. They say it is expensive to collect, and that most of it is simply water.

In times of labour shortage it is a costly procedure to collect swill and cart it away if there is very little body in it. The men with whom I have discussed the matter feed their pigs on grain and are quite satisfied. They say they can make a fair profit in that way. They are not much concerned with swill, and prefer to feed grain. One of them runs some thousands of pigs and the other about 600, and they have plant worth £700 or more installed. My only objection to the regulation has to do with the provision dealing with the collection of vegetable waste from market gardens or from the markets generally, but, as the Minister has said there will be no objection to that, I hope the regulation will not be disallowed.

**MR. MANN** (Beverley) [6.0]: I am interested in pig raising as there are many pig farmers in my electorate. I am sorry the member for Middle Swan moved this motion, as I feel it would be fatal to the industry if the regulations were disallowed. We have had experience of swine fever in the past and Western Australia is now one of the only countries in the world that is free from it. America, Great Britain, France and Germany are full of it. We should not allow swill to be fed to swine in the metropolitan area or anywhere else in the State, as it lowers the quality of the bacon or meat. Pigs are similar to human beings in the matter of disease and many human complaints can be spread by means of diseased pig-meat.

It is wrong to have piggeries in the metropolitan area at all, and I hope to see the day when both pig farms and dairy

farms will be entirely removed from the vicinity of the metropolis. With the sandy nature of the soil within a 20 mile radius of Perth the ground is cold in winter and dusty in summer and is ideal for the growth and spread of a great number of germs. Pig breeders of today do not use the small pens that were popular in the past. They have realised that the pigs pick up a great deal of necessary minerals from plant food and therefore larger pens or runs are provided. We must inevitably experience a fall in the price of wheat and with that in view we should build up an export trade in pig-meat from this State. With our hot summers and reasonably mild winters the climate is ideal for pig-raising.

We are told that the world will be short of pork for many years to come and I think we should therefore do all we can to develop the industry for the export trade. That raises the question of the type and quality of pork that is to be sent oversea, either as meat or as bacon. We can ensure quality only by correct breeding and feeding, and that is where the feeding of swill will prove detrimental. Watsons Pty. Ltd. have said that prior to the outbreak of swine fever they had to hold pigs, that had been fed on swill, for anything up to a month or six weeks in order to harden them up for killing purposes.

I give the member for Middle Swan credit for his sincerity but I think he has been misguided in this matter. I believe that all of the food waste or swill from the metropolitan area should be made into compost instead of being treated in digesters as pig feed. In Chicago, for instance, all the swill is made into fertiliser for the soil. If all our refuse in Fremantle, Perth and Kalgoorlie, as well as other parts of the State, were used for such a scheme, it would be of considerable benefit. This compost could be used as a fertiliser that would be of value to the State. I believe the Government to be right in its objection to this motion.

I remember a time when swine fever reached serious proportions in this State. I pay tribute to the member for Kimberley because at that time I think he was acting as the Minister for Agriculture. He discussed the question, as well as the position concerning the meat held in cold storage, with me. All this meat was destroyed

and all ships coming in were inspected and the pig-meat in the freezing chamber was destroyed. The virus of swine fever can remain in the skin, hide or bone of a pig for at least 12 months even when the meat is in cold storage. The virus remains alive and, as soon as it is subject to the right conditions it revives and spreads the disease. I hope the House, with all due respect to my worthy young colleague, will not pass this motion.

**MR. ACKLAND** (Irwin-Moore) [6.6]: I also hope the House will not agree to the disallowance of this regulation. The member for Middle Swan cannot possibly appreciate the position when he advocates that this should be done. I believe that he has permitted himself to be used by a very small number of the pigbreeders in the State. If the motion is agreed to it will be to the detriment of a great number of people who are producing pigmeats throughout Western Australia.

The Minister, in his summary, mentioned something about the disastrous outbreak of swine fever which occurred some few years ago. At that time the pigbreeders were expected to treat the whole of the pig swill by boiling. We know that it is almost impossible for that to be policed. The result was the outbreak of swine fever in this State which cost the fund some £30,000. Although it cost the fund that sum, it cost the industry, at the very least, double that amount. Should these regulations be disallowed, we would find that the same sort of thing is quite likely to occur again at any time. During the war years, when the American troops were here, pigmeat was imported to this State to feed them. It has been said that swine fever was introduced into this State in that way, and that because we are no longer importing meat from America, the same set of circumstances is not likely to arise.

The Perth City Council is very anxious that these regulations should be disallowed. We have been told that it has cost that authority £10,000 per year to destroy or bury this pig-swill. It has also been suggested that it has cost the council something in the vicinity of £100,000 to get rid of something which should be of use whether, as the member for Beverley has said, by making it into a fertiliser, or by

treating it as pig food. I believe that the Perth City Council has been very neglectful of its ratepayers' funds when it permitted such an expenditure as that. Even at a cost to that authority of £70,000 or £80,000, it should have put that money into the erection of treatment works for producing fertiliser or pig food. That would have been an asset and would have resulted in a useful product which could have been sold at a profit.

I am told that in Great Britain during the war years, it was an offence for any householder not to take proper care of the refuse from his home. The people of England were not permitted to put such refuse in the same receptacle that they had for general rubbish. This refuse had to be put in a bin which served a certain number of people. Those bins were collected by the local authorities and taken away where the contents were used to make stock food to help feed the pigs of Great Britain. That necessity does not arise here, but the economic waste is to be deplored. The City Council has been the most active body, over a number of years, in endeavouring to have this regulation disallowed.

I have with me a copy of a letter which was sent to me by the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society. It was written to the Minister for Agriculture and it is dated the 27th July, and reads as follows:—

I have read and learn with some concern that a move is to be made shortly to relax to a great extent, the present restrictions on the handling of food waste by pig producers; in other words, pig swill.

On behalf of the council of this society, I strongly urge you to do everything in your power to prevent any further relaxation of these regulations. My society has, on many an occasion, approached you on this matter and we feel that the present restrictions are not a great hardship to anyone, particularly when it is borne in mind the danger which would be created to the pig industry in particular, and the State in general, if the restrictions on the handling of pig swill were relaxed at all.

My council feels you will agree that it would be, to say the least, extremely unwise to do anything which might endanger the pig industry, by leaving any loophole which would tend to bring about another outbreak of swine fever, such as the State suffered some few years ago.

My society feels very strongly on this subject and we trust that you will strongly oppose the proposal which, I understand, is to be brought forward as above indicated.

I also have a letter from the Farmers' Union of Western Australia.

Mr. Marshall: Who are they?

Mr. ACKLAND: It reads as follows:—

It is understood that there has been action taken to have the restrictions in regard to the use of swill for pig feeding lifted, and that those desiring this course are seeking the total abolition of the present regulations. We request that you will oppose this action, and must emphatically protest against the move.

We consider that there is a grave danger in relaxing any of the present controls, and that the indiscriminate use of swill for pig feed without adequate control and proper processing will precipitate the incidence of disease.

Our policy in regard to the use of pig swill, as previously communicated to Mr. Wood, is that it should not be permitted for use at all owing to the difficulty of policing the regulations, but if it is used the regulations should be very stringent and properly enforced.

Having now acquainted you of our opinion on this matter, we feel justified in asking that you will strongly support our request.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. ACKLAND: Before tea, I read two letters which had come to me from the Royal Agricultural Society and the Farmers' Union. I failed to mention that the former has been sent by D. T. Luek, president, and the latter by A. J. Train, the assistant general secretary. I should like also to read to the House a letter I received from The Australian Pig Society (W.A. Branch). It reads—

It has been brought to our notice that there is another attempt to be made for the lifting or relaxation of the present restrictions on handling of pig swill, and on behalf of this Society we are writing you to urge that you strongly oppose any such measure.

We feel that you, personally, know just how this society views any action which might bring about even the possibility of another outbreak of swine fever in this State, which a few years ago had such a devastating effect on the pig industry in Western Australia.

Our society commends the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture for the strong attitude he has adopted towards this important subject and although some relaxation has taken place during the past twelve or eighteen months, our society is firmly convinced that any further relaxation should not be entertained, otherwise the matter will get completely out of control and the pig industry and the State as a whole will be faced with a similar state of affairs which existed prior to the outbreak of swine fever above referred to.



We are of the opinion that the pig industry is in such a condition at present that anything of this nature may upset it to the extent of its complete collapse.

We trust, therefore, that you will do your utmost to prevent relaxation to any extent of the present restrictions.

It has been suggested that there has been set up a monopoly for the treatment of pig-swill in this State. Such is not the case. I am informed that there are 11 licensed treatment plants in the State at present. One firm, Fergusons Ltd., was persuaded by the Department of Agriculture to establish a plant to treat this material in a large way. I believe it should have been the responsibility, as I have already stated, of the Perth City Council to deal with the swill, the same as is done in Great Britain. It has been suggested that the plant was not available. That may be so, but plants have been available, particularly in the case of Fergusons Ltd., which company has commenced this business, and there are also ten other people who have licenses to treat swill. Therefore, I think that the claim that a monopoly exists cannot be substantiated.

The pig industry in Western Australia should be in a flourishing condition. I well remember at the beginning of hostilities when wheat cost the pig industry somewhere in the vicinity of 4s. 8d. a bushel and the price for prime baconers was about 70s. or 80s. At a later stage during the war the price of wheat rose to a little under 6s. In the meantime, the price of a heavy baconer had increased to about 130s. or 150s. Today the price of wheat to these people is 6s. 8d. a bushel, Fremantle, with a reduction in price if the freight is less than the freight from the country to the port. Exactly similar pigs sold in 1939 at from 70s. to 80s. are now returning to the grower anything from 200s. to 240s. A little while ago it was 250s., but I believe the last market price was about 220s. So although there has been an increase in the price to the feeder, it has no comparison with the price the feeder is receiving for the finished product. I have taken up sufficient time to impress upon members the necessity for treating this matter with a great deal of caution.

We do not want a recurrence of the outbreak of swine fever we experienced some years ago. It has been said that restrictions have been lifted in the Eastern States.

That is true, but they have had outbreaks in the Eastern States of different diseases, including foot and mouth disease as well as swine fever. It has been said that now there are no imports of pigmeats from America there is no longer any need for restrictions. I have here some sausages made from pigmeats which I think came from China or some other part of Asia. These are finding their way into this country. I have here another sample of pigmeat which is being imported, and such meats are just as likely to contain the germs of these diseases as any we have received from America in the past.

Mr. Needham: Will you lay them on the Table of the House?

Mr. ACKLAND: I hope the House will not agree to the motion.

MR. READ (Victoria Park) [7.39]: I consider that the Minister did not draw a true picture of this position. Whether Regulation No. 77A should be disallowed or in some way amended is for this House to decide. When the Minister stated that there were 12 plants in this State that had been issued with a permit to treat swill, it may have been correct, but I doubt whether in the metropolitan area there are two small producers who were told by the Minister that if their plants were installed they would obtain a license. The member for Middle Swan is trying to protect the small producer of pigmeats only. He is doing what he has been asked to do by those people who have been in the industry for 20 or 30 years. He has no letters from departments or big business to back up their desires, but he is placing before this House something which he thinks will benefit the small people; something which they have not been able to get themselves for the past two years.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture took action in this matter some 18 months ago. He was asked to inspect these plants with his officers. I was present at the time he made the inspection and heard him address the men engaged in the industry. He said that if they would install the plant approved by the Department of Agriculture they would be given a license. I understand the plant has a capacity of 200 gallons and that it has an agitator which moves the food refuse around while it is being treated under 40lb. steam pressure. From what I learn,

however, permission has not been given to those producers to use the plants. There may be digesters licensed in many of the big towns of the State, but these men are without the means of carrying on their business as they have been doing for many years past.

Swine fever was introduced by the Americans into this State. They brought their own bacon and it was the waste meat that was thrown out of their camps which caused the outbreak of swine fever. The then Minister for Health forbade the Perth City Council to collect food waste for pig food, which a previous member referred to as filthy matter. That Minister's action was followed by the subsequent Minister for Health upon the change of Government. This food waste is not filthy matter; it is valuable animal food. It is collected by the Perth City Council every morning by an army of men. It is not allowed to be placed in ordinary rubbish bins, but must be put in special containers.

Mr. Mann: Is it sterilised?

Mr. READ: I believe there are one or two persons who have been granted licenses to sterilise this food waste. As members have been told, the council has had to provide transport to remove the waste; under the regulations it was required to trench the earth and bury the waste. That cost the council about £10,000 a year, whereas previously the waste was collected by pig-farmers. I believe that at present one big concern is treating swill and complying with the regulations in the same way as the small producers would do if allowed to use it.

Notwithstanding that some of the producers have installed a plant, they are not permitted to use it and I think there have been four prosecutions for breach of the regulations in that respect. Swine fever was not only introduced into Western Australia; it was also introduced into all the other States which adopted exactly the same procedure as we did. Swill was not allowed to be used there, but was collected and buried or incinerated. That ban has been lifted for the past few years and consequently this valuable food is again available for pigs. The member for Irwin-Moore referred to the Perth City Council. I do not know that councillors elected by the people are any worse than the members of the Farmers'

Union. Of course, the outlook of the councillors is different, as they are elected to serve in an honorary capacity.

The outlook of the farmer is different. The object of the Farmers' Union is to serve the farmers to the best of its ability. I have no fault to find with that, but I point out that those elected to serve on local governing bodies are doing their best, according to their ability, to serve the people they represent. Provided the plants to be used by the small producers to whom I have referred come up to the specifications required by the Department of Agriculture or by the Health Department, I think their use should be permitted.

**MR. MARSHALL** (Murchison) [7.47]: While I consider there is justification for regulations such as those with which we are now dealing, I feel I cannot do other than support the motion. It seems to be a common practice of departmental officers, when drafting regulations, to make them as comprehensive as possible, all-embracing, all-powerful. There are no exceptions or reservations at all. In recent years we on the Goldfields have had some experience of health inspectors; I am one of those who wish to God they would not come near us. We got on very well without them before. We had no epidemics, but at this late date, when the population is declining, they are running round the country when they might render better service if they cleaned up the metropolitan area.

I am rather sceptical about these regulations. Small places like Meekatharra, and now Wiluna and other towns, have abattoirs which comply with the bylaws of the local authority; but whatever refuse is collected during the slaughtering must be destroyed unless it is sterilised. The butchers are not allowed to feed it to the few paltry head of pigs being raised in the district. In these outback places there are no big industries and the butchers usually have only a few porkers to sell in a meagre market. All the arguments up to date have had some application to the city and the country districts. It is very nice for the member for Beverley to tell us how swine thrive in marshy country; but we have no marshy country on the Goldfields, and as the Government charges an extortionate fee for reticulation we are not in a position to have any either.

While regulations like this might apply to the city, when they are given application to isolated places a system of persecution is introduced. Neither the Minister nor any other speaker indicated that swine fever had ever been experienced in Western Australia until 1942. I am not saying that it did not appear before then, but 1942 was the date specifically mentioned, and the Minister went on to show and almost to prove conclusively that the outbreak was due to the importation of pig meats from America. The possibility is that the importation of further pigmeats from America has vanished.

The Attorney General: Pigmeats are coming from America every day, in tins.

Mr. MARSHALL: In replying to what the member for Middle Swan said, the Minister told us distinctly that there was no chance of an outbreak of swine fever due to causes similar to those that were responsible for the original outbreak in 1942, the importation of pigmeats from America, but that it was still necessary to protect the industry; and I do not disagree. So long as we protect industry in such a way as not to impose undue burdens upon sections of it and give the minor section—although probably the major producer—a monopoly, or the possibility of a monopoly, I will agree.

We have always argued here that when a provision is made compulsory, some protection should be provided. Thus in connection with workers' compensation it is compulsory for an employer to insure, but we protect the employer by seeing that the rate charged is the lowest possible. But we have not established any protection in this regulation. We are telling the industry as a whole, "you shall do this," but we have not provided facilities for those not in a position to supply such facilities themselves. If the Government considers this industry is so important, then where it is in great evidence—in the metropolitan area—it is the responsibility of the Agricultural Department to provide the facilities necessary.

The Minister for Lands: The Perth City Council has to get rid of the swill.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not interested in the Perth City Council. We have had enough of its bylaws. This is a regulation from the Agriculture Department, making a certain course compulsory, and I take the attitude

that the Government is responsible. It is a Government regulation and not a City Council bylaw with which we are dealing. I venture to suggest that every individual who has a very large piggery, started in a very small way and had the opportunity of expanding cheaply and without any regulations compelling him to do this, that and the other. Now that he finds himself able, because of the profits from the industry—which are big—to comply with these regulations, he wants to have them enforced because that will cram the smaller producers out and prevent anyone else from coming into the industry. The small producers will have to sell out to those who have digesters or sterilisers and no other individual will be prepared to start in the industry.

So in a way we will give a complete monopoly to the few who are able to finance the proposition demanded by this regulation. Naturally the Wheatgrowers' Union does not want the regulation to be defeated because wheat plays a big part in the everyday diet of a pig—in fact, the major part—and anything that might be found as a substitute will naturally be looked upon with a degree of scorn by the Farmers' Union. While I would be prepared to support a regulation designed to protect the industry as far as possible, I am not going to give this regulation my blessing because of its drastic nature.

What in the name of goodness would an officer be doing at Meekatharra where there are about only a dozen pigs, which are bred in healthy conditions? Under this regulation an officer could come along and demand that certain things be done. Officers are doing that sort of thing now. We have had experience in recent years of these fellows coming along with a badge of authority and demanding that certain things be done, and we will have them requiring pig-breeders up there to install a digester at a cost of £300 or £400. What will a man do in those circumstances? He will say, "Right, I am finished with pork production!" and the people on the Goldfields will be further persecuted—not in the big towns where there are large abattoirs but in the smaller areas. The butchers will refuse to bother with pigs at all.

The people on the Goldfields—and more particularly in the outer centres—are putting up with enough hardship already. I

do not like the regulation. It is too comprehensive and all-embracing and it is monopolistic in character. Ultimately that is what will happen; there will be a complete monopoly. I am not going to argue whether swill is a valuable food or not, or as to what should be done with it; but I know what will happen under this regulation, and I know what departmental officers have been doing in recent years. I will do all I can to protect people outback, more particularly those in isolated centres, from being further persecuted under regulations or laws of any sort. If the Minister would bring down regulations which would be more just in their effect, I would be prepared to support them; but I am not going to support an all-embracing regulation which is monopolistic and will have a drastic effect on the people in isolated areas, who will not produce pork at all if they are to be humbugged and bothered by inspectors talking about digesters and sterilisers.

We have never had any epidemics on the Goldfields of which I have been aware, and I have been in those areas almost all my life. Yet under this regulation the people in those areas will be told by an inspector what they can do and what they cannot do. My first move when the regulation was brought under my notice was to see whether it would apply only in a proclaimed area. That would have been a reasonable way to go about the business. I have never known of any epidemics of swine fever on the Goldfields in all the years I have been there. As a matter of fact, all the animals are particularly healthy, including sheep and beef cattle. Never on the Murchison have we had any trouble; but now the people there are to be subjected to control, because the regulation has reference to any part of Western Australia, though the Minister and others have spoken as though it will apply only to the metropolitan area. When they look beyond the Darling Range they are blind: they can see everything this side of it and nothing on the other side.

Mr. Graham: They can see as far as Toodyay.

Mr. MARSHALL: That may be so. I do not like the regulations and bylaws that have been promulgated in recent years as a result of which officers are running around showing their authority and demanding this, that and the other, and generally inconveniencing people. I could

mention something about the Meekatharra picture hall. It has been there for donkeys' years. It provided sufficient accommodation for the days when there were thousands of people in the district, but now that there are a paltry few hundred it has to be pretty well pulled down and rebuilt. It is stupid in the extreme for these people to come along and show their authority by prosecuting the inhabitants of these places. As far as I am concerned, it is finished. I shall vote against the regulation.

MR. NALDER (Wagin) [8.1]: I hope the House will not agree to the disallowance of these regulations. As one who has been interested in the pig industry for many years and knows the effect that swine fever had on it in Western Australia in 1942, I feel that such a move would be most inadvisable. This is an industry that we must foster and encourage in Western Australia. If we disallow these regulations and so make it possible for the scourge to return, we will do the State a considerable amount of harm. I think the member for Murchison has rather been considering regulations as such than the actual effect of this one on the pig industry. We have to be sufficiently broadminded to know that regulations are necessary, and that when put into effect they will do much to stimulate industry.

I want to know why this industry has not gone ahead as it should. The answers to the questions I asked the Minister for Lands some time ago prove that the pig industry is not progressing in Western Australia, but deteriorating. I disagree a little with the member for Irwin-Moore when he says that pig prices go up to the enormous amount of about 240s. per head. If we look at the results of even last week's sales at Midland we find that we can count on our fingers the number of pigs sold at a price greater than 220s. The average is considerably less. If the industry is producing such remunerative results why is it not thriving more?

Mr. Marshall: This will not make it thrive but will stop anybody else coming in.

Mr. NALDER: It will help to save the industry from the possible re-introduction of the terrible scourge that swept Western Australia in 1942. The member for Victoria Park said that farmers were out only

to look after themselves. I say, "God help the farmers if they do not look after themselves because nobody else will." Here we must endeavour to protect those in the industry, and we can do that by having these regulations carried out to ensure that the industry will be kept on a sound footing and protected from hampering diseases.

**MR. PERKINS** (York) [8.4]: I think the member for Murchison was under a misapprehension, as to how swine fever is transmitted to pigs. The conditions under which the pigs are kept do not matter. If pigs eat offal in which there is pigmeat containing the germ of swine fever, they will contract the disease, no matter what the conditions are.

**Mr. Marshall**: We have never had it on the Goldfields, anyhow.

**Mr. PERKINS**: It just so happens that none of this contaminated imported pigmeat has been fed to pigs in that area. The opinion of the veterinary officers is that if the pigs eat any affected pigmeat which has not been suitably treated, it is inevitable that they will contract the serious disease known as swine fever.

**Mr. Marshall**: It is strange that not one of the Eastern States has suffered to any great degree, and they have no regulations.

**Mr. PERKINS**: Western Australia suffered from this disease during the war when pigmeats were being imported for the American troops. We know that America is not the only country which has periodical outbreaks of swine fever, and from which contaminated pigmeats may be brought into Australia. This is only a reasonable precaution. When we compare the possible benefits to a limited number of people in using this offal for the feeding of pigs, with the possible damage to the industry generally and the tremendous losses that would be incurred as the result of an outbreak of swine fever, we must vote against the motion.

Some exception may be taken to the regulations in the form in which they have been gazetted, or to the way they are being administered, but I think the House would be adopting an irresponsible attitude if it opened the way for the feeding of this doubtful offal because, although most of it probably does not contain any overseas pigmeat contaminated with the swine fever

germ, it is not, in my opinion, worth the risk of another outbreak of swine fever. I am personally not interested in the raising of pigs, and never have been. The member for Murchison is in great error when he thinks the pig-raising industry is of any advantage to the wheatgrowers, because it is not. The wheatgrowers would be very well pleased if the pig-raisers did not take any of their wheat because wheat has been sold outside Australia for double the price that is being paid by those in the pig industry.

**Hon. J. T. Tonkin**: Circumstances can change.

**Mr. PERKINS**: They cannot change materially in the next few years, at any rate, because the stabilisation fund has been set up and it will maintain a floor price for wheat whether it is fed to pigs or exported. In any case, it is most improbable that the production costs of wheat in other countries are less than they are in Australia. I, for one, am not going to be scared into believing that there is going to be any disastrous fall in wheat values. But that is by the way. I would not like the House to be misled by what the member for Murchison, who is not au fait with the position, had to say.

**MR. YATES** (Canning) [8.10]: I have been interested in this problem for about two years and have a number of pig-raisers in my electorate. There is one, in particular, who has gone into the business in a big way and has spent large sums of money in trying to establish in this State—as nearly perfect as possible—a depot to sterilise the food that is being fed to pigs and to produce the best possible quality of pigs. I am referring to Fergusons Ltd., who are established in the Riverton area. I have seen that firm grow from a very small beginning, two years ago, to one of the most modern and up-to-date piggeries in Australia. That firm has been helped by the advice of experts from the Department of Agriculture, as have all other pig-raisers in the State, whether in the country or in the metropolitan area. From time to time in this House we pass new legislation or alter existing laws in an endeavour to help the State progress on a par with the other States of the Commonwealth. The member for Murchison

spoke of the drastic nature of these regulations, but I do not think the one with which we are dealing at present is as drastic as some people think.

The Minister for Lands: It is a plainly worded and simple regulation.

Mr. YATES: During the regime of the Labour Government, before the present Government took office, the present Milk Board was founded.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Do not get that idea into your head, because we did not found the present milk board.

Mr. YATES: The hon. member's Government was mainly responsible for the setting up of the present milk board.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The present milk board is constituted entirely differently from that set up by the Labour Government.

Mr. YATES: I am speaking of the set-up of the industry in this State under a milk board, and am pointing out that the Labour Government endeavoured to put the milk industry on a sound footing in this State. The present Government, in its wisdom, has made certain alterations to that legislation and under this administration the milk industry has been placed on a sound basis. The Government has terminated the activity of a number of those in the milk industry who were not hygienic in their handling of the commodity. In the annual report of the Milk Board there is a number of photographs showing conditions in some of the dairies before the Milk Board took draste steps to improve conditions in the industry. In that publication there are other photographs showing improvements effected on the same properties, where there are now hygienic depots working under the strict supervision of the board. This has resulted in a much better product being put on the market for the people of this State.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Are you going to feed the pigs on milk?

Mr. YATES: Inspectors under the Health Act move around various business houses in the city, keeping a check on the rats and on the conditions obtaining in the kitchens of eating-houses, and so on. From time to time it is found necessary to introduce new legislation to keep our laws in line with the progress that Australia as

a whole is making. If we do not introduce new regulations occasionally, we find ourselves dropping back, instead of advancing side by side with the other States.

The Minister for Agriculture, on the advice of his senior experts, has introduced regulations to assist in controlling, to some degree, the activities of the pig industry in Western Australia. The member for Wagin mentioned the variation in prices of pigs at the market held recently at Midland Junction, and said that the member for Irwin-Moore had quoted wrong figures. The figures for the 10 years from 1939 to 1949 give some indication as to the rise in the price of pig-meats. In 1939 prime bacon was quoted at from 75s. to 80s., rising in 1949 to an average of from 200s. to 240s., an increase of about 300 per cent. In the same period wheat rose in price by only 30 per cent.

Member: That is an exaggeration.

Mr. YATES: Those figures are correct. The regulation under discussion will not make the piggeries dependent upon pigswill. Many of them do not use it at all, but buy feedstuffs from merchants. Because swill is available in the metropolitan area a number of piggeries are using it. The department is concerned to see that the swill is sterilised and given to the pigs in the form of a good and sound food. Whenever we endeavour to change something that has obtained for years we find a number of people up against the change. As an example, I would remind members of the controversy over the Local Government Bill. People are always content to carry on with something even though it has become out-of-date or unhygienic. This regulation is for the good of the industry. I would like members to visit Riverton and there inspect one of the finest piggeries in Australia; the result of the efforts of two short years.

In the early stages Mr. Ferguson installed machinery to sterilise pigswill. He brought it from oversea, but it was not successful, and at great cost he recently reorganised the depot and installed new machinery that is now turning out pigswill 100 per cent. pure and free from all disease. He has put down concrete floors in modern sheds and has installed trolleys on rails and employs a number of men keeping the property clean. That depot is kept as clean as it is possible to keep any piggery, but that

does not apply to most of the small piggeries throughout the State or in the metropolitan area. I think members will find quite a number of them do not come up to that standard. One member asked why has not the industry gone ahead. It is not an industry in which very many men would become interested because it is a most obnoxious trade, especially in the summer months. It requires a good deal of attention, long hours and strict supervision to maintain cleanliness at all times. Unless a man is progressive and is minded to keep his depot clean, then he will not be interested in an industry such as this. Even the price ruling today is not sufficiently conducive to bring others into the industry.

But let us look after what we already have and try to build it up. There is no monopoly in this industry, as the member for Victoria Park mentioned. I can say that quite definitely. At least 10 licenses have been granted to small farms in the metropolitan area. Ten have been approved by the Agricultural Department for the treatment of swill. Whether the people concerned have purchased the plant or not is their own business, but they have been given authority to do so. That is the information I have received from the department. I would not like to see this regulation disallowed. I would rather see it tried out for a little longer because it has not been in operation very long. It would be for the good of the industry, and all the men concerned, if the present conditions were permitted to continue. It would prove, one way or the other, whether it is warranted or not. Personally, I consider it to be necessary legislation and the regulation is warranted. All members should realise that in this, as in all other industries, these regulations are brought down not for the benefit of one but for the benefit of the industry as a whole.

**HON. A. A. M. COVERLEY** (Kimberley) [8.22]: I do not intend to cast a silent vote on this motion, but I feel some sympathy towards the member for Middle Swan because neither he nor any other member can move to amend the regulation. He has one alternative only and that is to move that the regulation be disallowed. Some explanation is due to members of this Chamber

from the Minister responsible for the introduction of this regulation. I gathered from addresses already made by at least two members that the present Minister for Agriculture, after making some inspectional tours, promised that he would permit the feeding of swill at certain piggeries on condition that they erected some particular plant. Now we find that the position is that these plants have not been registered.

The Minister for Lands: Eleven of them have been registered.

**Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY**: We did not get that explanation from the Minister when he made his contribution to this debate.

The Minister for Lands: I mentioned it.

**Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY**: We know, of course, that one particular pig factory has been established, and the member for Canning has given us to understand that it is all that could be desired. He told us that it is an up-to-date place and that its functions are in the best interests of the whole of the pig industry. I disagree with him. It is certainly in the interests of the person who was prepared to expend the money and improvise this particular plant. However, if I listened correctly to the member for Victoria Park, he said that the license was granted on the understanding that this pig plant was to cater for all pigswill in the metropolitan area and it was to be retailed to the smaller piggeries as meatmeal. The gentleman in question has increased the number of his pigs, is using all the product for his own purposes and selling pigs instead of retailing the meatmeal which should have been sold to the other smaller piggeries.

**Mr. Yates**: That is not true.

**Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY**: I can only go by the information that has been given to the Chamber. If that be a fact, and I have no reason to doubt the word of the member for Victoria Park, then I think there is need for the Minister at least to alter the regulation to ensure that smaller piggeries are protected from monopoly. I likewise agreed with the member for Murchison when he said that he did not think these regulations ought to be applicable to the whole of Western Australia. I consider the Minister erred when he introduced a regulation of that description because it should have been applicable to prescribed areas. There is a

considerable portion of Western Australia where pigs would not be a danger to the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Lands: You have no proof of that.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: If I have no proof, then I have as much proof as the Minister had when he interjected. I did not interject when the Minister made his speech and I would prefer him to let me try to explain my case. There are pigs in the Kimberleys—plenty of them.

The Attorney General: Most of them wild.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: The Attorney General is wrong again.

Mr. Graham: As usual.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: They are not all wild. There are some very nice Tamworth and Berkshire-cross pigs in the Kimberleys, just as there are in the more settled areas. They are not there in huge numbers. The local butchers keep a few adjacent to the ports for consumption purposes. It would not pay them to run large herds of pigs, of course, because they want a few for local use only. There is an instance where pigs would not come into contact with those in the metropolitan area. It would not pay these local butchers, or anyone else in those districts, to treat pigs to send to the metropolitan area. So I do not know why some local health inspector with a swelled head should be given an opportunity to rush out to the local butcher and say, "I find that your pigs are eating the bones and offal which are the remains of a bullock you have slaughtered. It is not being treated according to the regulation." I do not know why he should be permitted to drag that butcher before the local court and have him fined £5 or £10 for contravening the regulations. I know there would be a bit of a battle between the pigs and the crows to clean up the offal, and I am not sure who would win.

The Minister for Lands: Were you not responsible, as the Minister of the day, for bringing in the bulk of these regulations dealing with the question?

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: I did not bring in this regulation.

The Minister for Lands: No, but it is an amendment to Regulation 74, which you brought in.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: It is the amendment that has made the regulation wrong. If the member for Middle Swan had introduced a motion to prohibit swill being fed to pigs under any circumstances, I would have supported him. I am of the opinion that it is not in the interests of the public to feed pigs on swill of any description. I am also satisfied that it is economically unsound for the producers to feed swill to pigs. I agree with the member for Beverley that the natural way to feed pigs is by grazing and with grain. The member for Wagin said that the pig industry is not expanding. That is simple to understand. The average wheat and sheep farmer may run a few pigs as a sideline to clean up the debris of wheat that is spilled about his paddocks. In times when wheat was not such a payable product it was economically sound for a farmer to keep a few pigs to enable him to make a few pounds now and again.

I remember during the depression that the farmers who kept a few pigs were the only ones that could buy a drop of beer because it was the only way by which they could raise any money. So it is the closely settled areas which cater for pigs and go in for pig-farming. Therefore, it does not pay the producers in those areas to expand their businesses because of the high price of wheat which they feed to the pigs. In the closely settled areas, except for the mangoes that are found in the swamps around the city, grain must be bought to feed the pigs. To an ordinary person two pens of pigs may look exactly the same but to Watson, a man who understands pigs, they are entirely different and he will pay 10s. a head more for the pigs in one pen than he will for those in the other because the former are grain-fed pigs.

In the stock branch of the Department of Agriculture I have to admit we have officers who compare with any in the Commonwealth. We have several particularly good veterinary officers. I know what it cost the pig industry in this State when we had an outbreak of swine fever. Not only did we suffer financially but the State also lost numerous breeding pigs which set the industry back at least two years. Therefore, I have no wish to see the regulation abolished because I know, in the interests of the pig producers and the people of Western Australia generally, it



is necessary to have the protection and for that reason I must vote against the motion.

I suggest to the Government it should give further consideration to this regulation and amend it. It should give some protection to the people on the outskirts who will not in any way be responsible for bringing disease to the metropolitan area or to the centre of the pig-breeding industry even if the pigs which they keep contract a disease of some description. There is no need to persecute the people in the outback country with regulations that are absolutely necessary for the closer settled areas.

There is need for revision of this particular regulation and in the course of the next 12 months if it does what the member for Middle Swan is afraid it will do—create a monopoly—he will still have the right to introduce another motion in this House which will be received and considered on its merits at that stage. I suggest to the Minister that he interview the officers of the Department of Agriculture with a view to having this regulation revised.

**MR. LESLIE** (Mt. Marshall). [8.34]: During the course of the debate members have drifted away from the main point of this regulation. I am not reflecting on you, Mr. Speaker, and that is not my intention. The main purpose of the regulation has been lost sight of. The whole question before the House is whether swill is to be fed untreated, with all the attendant risks, to pigs or whether the regulation is to stand to provide a safeguard for those engaged in the pig industry.

Mr. Graham: Rubbish!

**MR. LESLIE**: The regulation provides that pigswill must be treated in a proper manner before it is fed to pigs. The outbreak of swine fever which we experienced and which was traced to this particular source is sufficient to justify the continuance of the regulation which sets down that pigswill is to be treated in a certain manner. There is no monopoly granted to anybody for the treatment of pig swill as far as I know. Earlier this evening I understood the Minister to say that 11 permits have been issued to people to treat the swill with proper plants.

The Minister for Lands: That is correct.

**MR. LESLIE**: I presume that any pig-breeder who installs a proper plant to treat swill will obtain a permit to carry out that work. If the House is really interested in the future of the industry and desires to avoid severe financial loss to the State which would follow an outbreak of fever in the industry, we must insist that the regulation be enforced.

**HON. J. T. TONKIN** (North-East Fremantle) [8.37]: Although this question appears to be a simple one it will not be simply resolved because there are arguments for and against it. When this State promulgated regulations to prohibit the feeding of swill to pigs it did not do so in contemplation of a permanent measure. It introduced the regulations in the belief that they would be of a temporary character to meet a situation which was abnormal at that time. From that commencement the regulations have been strengthened. I recall a deputation from the Perth City Council waiting upon the Minister for Agriculture asking him for an assurance that the regulations would not be withdrawn under a period of five years, because the council was in negotiation with a firm which contemplated substantial expenditure for the purpose of treating swill.

My recollection of the subject is that originally the regulation was regarded as a temporary expedient. It is rather remarkable that this is the only State in the Commonwealth that should have seen fit to continue this prohibition. The Minister mentioned a circumstance with regard to New South Wales, but I thought that weakened rather than strengthened his argument. He admitted that there was no prohibitory regulation in that State and said that there had been two outbreaks of swine fever there in 20 years. Is it not singular that in a State where two outbreaks of swine fever have occurred in 20 years neither the Government nor the department sees fit to have the regulation we have? I would have thought that the recurrence of an outbreak would be a circumstance requiring action to be taken rather than a circumstance to emphasise the fact that there was no regulation in force.

The Acting Premier: Perhaps they are inoculating the pigs there.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think so. I understand there is no regulation prohibiting the use of swill in Great Britain or America. We know that the Americans raise hogs, to use their own term, in an extensive way. I do not advocate the use of swill for feeding pigs, as I believe pigs should be fed on good wholesome food in the same way as other animals.

The Minister for Lands: I did mention that in Great Britain all swill is sterilised in municipal plants before being supplied to the pig-farmers.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What about the small farmers in the country areas? Do they obtain the sterilised swill or are they allowed to use cabbage leaves from their own farms?

The Minister for Lands: I am not sure.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They would not be allowed to do so under this regulation. That is the whole trouble about it; it is so all-embracing in character, that food which could not possibly be contaminated with the germ of swine fever or foot and mouth disease cannot be used as pig-food unless it is first boiled. It seems to me that that might be pushing the matter a little too far, especially in view of the fact that this regulation was brought into force to prevent the use of foods which could possibly contain the germ of swine fever. I suppose that finally a decision on this matter will turn on the question of the ratio of the economic advantage to be derived from using swill to the degree of risk involved in using it. Timid people, who will not take any risk, will be all out for prohibition. I am reminded of the action of the Government regarding the use of coal in the recent electricity trouble. If we are not prepared to take any risk whatever then, of course, the line to follow is to clamp down and at once prohibit everything which might be a danger. If we carried out that principle in connection with all things which affect us we would be like a man in a straitjacket. We run all sorts of risks ourselves in various ways and if we set out to eliminate all possible risk then we shall certainly have a job to do.

Consider the risk we run, for example, when we visit a friend in hospital, but we visit him despite the risk. Consider the risk we run when we drink milk, but we take the risk and drink milk. There are many things we use which contain elements of risk. That

is the risk involved here. Should we take the risk of swine fever being introduced into the piggeries because of the use of some contaminated food or should we take a step which will eliminate all risk as far as possible? Ultimately that would become a question of economics. If we lose more by prohibiting the feeding of swill than we would ultimately lose if we had an epidemic of swine fever then it would not be sound economics to prohibit its use. If, on the other hand, we did not lose very much, comparatively, by prohibiting the use of swill, but would lose a lot through an outbreak of swine fever, then our course ought to be to prohibit the use of swill. We have to make up our minds about that.

The farmer who wants to use swill will not contemplate any risk at all. He would admit little or no risk; he is anxious to use the swill and will do all he can to get permission to do so. The man who is not raising pigs and consequently is not interested in getting food for them will be inclined to say, "Let us take action that will stop these people from using swill, which might introduce a disease into the country." So it will boil down, as far as the general public is concerned, to a matter of personal interest. Those who have some connection with the trade will take a certain line of action. It is natural for officers of a Government department to be cautious and eliminate risk. What have they to gain by taking a risk? Nothing! They have everything to lose. Should the officers recommend the Government to lift the regulations and an epidemic occur, they will be blamed, make no mistake about that.

Mr. Leslie: What about the Government being blamed?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No. It would shelter behind the officers, as it did the other night when I raised a question in connection with the Crown Law Department.

Mr. Leslie: You still blame the Government.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If the officers of a department recommended the lifting of a regulation and the Government acted on that recommendation, the officers would be blamed for any mistake made, because the Government would say, "We are entitled to accept expert advice." Therefore, can anyone blame the officers if they do not take the risk? It is much better for them to play

safe and keep the regulation in force, because if an epidemic broke out, which is extremely unlikely, no blame would be attachable to them, for what more could they do than recommend the course to be followed?

Mr. Leslie: What if the Government lies in the face of that recommendation?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This Government would never do that. The only occasion in which it would fly from recommendations by experienced officers would be in regard to Co-operative Bulk Handling, and it has already done that. That is the only instance I can recall where this Government has acted contrary to the advice of expert officers. In all other instances it is very pleased to accept the advice and rely upon it. That is what it is doing in this case, and I do not blame it. The question private members have to ask themselves is, what is the right thing to do after weighing up the pros and cons?

I am going to vote against the motion because I am not in favour of using swill at all for feeding pigs. In connection with this matter I think the member for Beverley made a very sound suggestion. There is a very much better use to which swill can be put than the feeding of pigs, and that is to make a compost of it and use it as a fertiliser for the growing of good wholesome stuff to feed to pigs; and that is an aspect which might be investigated. It would save this substantial loss which is being incurred by the Perth City Council, and would provide something which would be eagerly sought after by persons who require fertiliser for ground urgently needing it.

I think that would be a much better use to which to put the swill than by trying to utilise it as a food, and especially some of the wash that I have seen which is supposed to be valuable as pig-food. No wonder the pig is regarded as a dirty animal when we see some of the ways in which pigs are fed! Then we expect people to eat the flesh that is grown on such unwholesome food! Many years ago I read a very interesting article, written by a doctor, on the value of various types of meat which were available for human food; and this doctor very roundly condemned pig-meat because of the way pigs were fed—not because of any characteristic of the animal

itself, but because it was unreasonable to expect to get good sound flesh on animals that were fed on unwholesome food. He mentioned a number of things that were thrown to pigs as food; and we know how common is the expression, "Why, the thing is not even fit for pigs": meaning, of course, that when it is not fit for anybody else it might be tried out on the pig and, if he will not eat it, it must be pretty bad.

That emphasises what a lot of people think about the type of food required for pigs. My view is that the pig is just as much entitled to good wholesome food as is any other animal, and he will show results if he is fed on grain. We know that in the United States they use maize very substantially for the feeding of their hogs and the result is very satisfactory. While I agree with a good deal that was said by the member for Middle Swan—a lot of which was not answered by the Minister, who skirted around it—

The Minister for Lands: What an unkind thing to say!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister knows it is true, though! While I agree with a good deal of what the hon. member said, and especially with his contention that this regulation is all-embracing; and while I think it goes a bit further than is necessary, I am not prepared to knock it out and so leave it that untreated food can be fed to pigs. That is undesirable. But I suggest that the Government might make some inquiries from Departments of Agriculture in the other States with a view to ascertaining the reasons why they have not seen fit to impose a prohibition like this. Possibly the Honorary Minister for Agriculture could have the question discussed at a meeting of the Agricultural Council, because it is an important one. It affects quite a big industry, and it is as well that we should know the impact upon it of the action which is being taken. It should not be left to the decision made here tonight without any further action being taken. The matter should be inquired into further to demonstrate whether we are setting a good example here or taking some unnecessary action.

MR. GRAYDEN (Middle Swan—in reply) [8.56]: I regret to some extent that this motion came forward tonight. Most of

us had anticipated it would have been discussed next Wednesday, and I know a number of members who would have spoken in favour of it. I also regret that members appear to have already made up their minds on the issue. The case for the disallowance of the regulation was submitted possibly a month ago. The Minister replied today; and, without hearing the reply to the Minister, members have practically without exception already made up their minds how they are going to vote. I regret that very much indeed, and I hope they will reconsider their attitude.

Mr. Hoar: I have still an open mind, so go for your life!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am glad to hear that. In the first place, may I clear up one misapprehension? The Minister made the solemn statement that 11 of these pigfarmers in the metropolitan area had been granted licenses for sterilisation plants. That statement was made and referred to by other members. I want to tell the Minister that only two licenses have been granted, one to Mr. Ferguson and another to Mr. Mason. So the statement by the Minister is wholly incorrect. I do not blame the Minister, but the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Is the hon. member certain of that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am certain of it. I am in contact with these 11 people, who have big plants, and only two have received permits.

The Minister for Lands: My notes from the responsible officer say that the majority of these men have been granted licenses.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is in line with previous experiences I have had with the department in connection with this industry. We have heard quite a number of speakers against the disallowance of this regulation, but they are at cross-purposes with those supporting the motion. I have not moved for the disallowance of the regulation because its abolition is desired, but simply because a more effective and more equitable and practicable regulation is wanted. Yet we have had one member after another talk as though the abolition of the regulation had been advocated. We want other and better regulations introduced. The member for

Irwin-Moore quoted several letters from organisations which were obviously under the impression that we sought to remove the regulation with the object of permitting an open go. They are under a complete misapprehension, because we want it disallowed so that more effective regulations can be introduced.

The Minister for Lands: You did not say that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I made it extremely clear when I moved the motion. I have moved for the disallowance of the regulation because I believe that not only is it iniquitous but it will cripple the pig industry in Western Australia. I shall point out a little later in exactly what way it will affect the industry. The regulation has been designed by the Agricultural Department simply to cover up a mistake it made. It introduced the regulation to prevent the feeding of swill, and in doing so it deprived 50 families in the metropolitan area alone of a livelihood.

The Minister for Lands: It has sent them out of business.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, right out of business.

The Minister for Lands: Swine fever did not do that, did it?

Mr. GRAYDEN: No, it was the attitude of the Department of Agriculture. It put these 50 people out of business and then negotiated with one firm, Fergusons, to have a complete monopoly of the swill in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Triat: It is getting a habit with this Government.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have two screeds here from the Agricultural Department dealing with the early stages when the department was putting up a proposition to the Perth City Council. I have nothing against Mr. Ferguson. I believe he is an enterprising business man and I say "Good luck," to him. My concern in this instance is over the 50 families who have been deprived of swill for their pigs. In some cases they have been depending on it for more than 20 years. The regulation is all-embracing. About the only thing it will not cover is a bag full of bran or pollard. It will cover cabbage leaves. Of the greenstuff fed to pigs, possibly 50 per cent. comes from greengrocers' shops in the

metropolitan area. Under the regulations the pig farmers will be prevented from getting cabbage leaves, fruit, etc., from those shops. It will cover skimmed milk, and practically everything.

Mr. Kelly: Are these pigfarmers using digesters?

Mr. GRAYDEN: They are allowed to use this greenstuff if they put it through a digester which costs £400. The man who feeds no swill, but a few cabbage leaves only, has to install a £400 plant in order to feed cabbage leaves once a week to his one pig.

The Minister for Lands: That is not quite true because there are no restrictions on waste from the markets or any market garden.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am glad to hear the Minister say that. I went to the Agricultural Department and presented the regulations to McKenzie Clark. To my representations he said the department was not going to administer the regulations to the very letter. So I went back to the pigfarmers in my electorate and told them that. I thought I could rely on it because I got it from McKenzie Clark. Two weeks later the pigfarmers came to me with their summonses. Action was being taken against them by the Department of Agriculture. I have here copies of some statutory declarations by these people. The first is from Mr. Nowotny of Forrestfield, as follows:—

Officials from the Department of Agriculture called on me and informed me that from then on fruit and greens collected from greengrocers would be regarded as swill and must be treated under steam pressure before being fed to pigs.

That is in direct conflict with what McKenzie Clark told me and what the Minister is trying to tell us now.

The Minister for Lands: It is nothing of the sort. I spoke of markets and market gardeners. I never mentioned fruitshops.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister says that these people will be denied the opportunity of getting cabbage leaves from the small greengrocers' shops.

The Minister for Lands: They will.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, and 50 per cent. comes from there. So the man who feeds no swill at all, but only cabbage leaves so as to give his pigs some greenstuff because he is not 50 miles out of Perth where he can

grow it, and has not water laid on, will not be allowed to get the greenstuff from the grocer because of the regulations.

The Minister for Lands: Because he gets it from shops handling cooked meats.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister says it is because of the cooked meats.

The Minister for Lands: I am glad to see you looking so happy. You were not too happy over fish.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister may not be too happy over fish for too long either. The next one is from Mr. J. D. McNeil of Welshpool in which he states—

I, James McNeil, of Welshpool Road, Welshpool, pig farmer, do hereby wish to state that during April a Mr. Robinson, an inspector of the Stock Department of Department of Agriculture, called on me and informed me that from then on that I must cease the practice of feeding vegetable and fruit waste to my pigs. This I had been doing since I began operations in 1943 to the knowledge of the department until receiving the above order.

The last one is from Mr. Riordan as under—

I, Patrick Riordan, of Wright Street, South Belmont, pig farmer, do hereby wish to state that in the month of February Mr. Robinson, an officer of the Stock Department of the Department of Agriculture, called on me and informed me that from then on I must cease the practice of feeding vegetable and fruit waste to my pigs.

They are statutory declarations from people who are actually concerned. Those things have occurred despite the solemn assurance given me by the Director of Agriculture, McKenzie Clark, that the department would not administer these regulations to the letter. The Minister inferred earlier that the regulation would not embrace the smaller shops, although he has since clarified the point.

The Minister for Lands: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If the Minister refers to the report of his speech in "Hansard" he will find he did. The regulation affects not only the pigfarmers in the metropolitan area, but those throughout the State. The regulation provides—

No owner of swine shall in any part of Western Australia collect or utilise any kitchen or other refuse or pig wash from any hotel, slaughterhouse, boardinghouse, military or other camp or premises, or any premises whatsoever.

So we can see it is all-embracing. It is not even lawful for a man to feed his pigs scraps from his own kitchen. Farmers throughout the State are not going to bury their kitchen scraps or make compost of them. Of course they will continue to feed such scraps to their pigs. I know they will have departmental officers taking them to court for doing so, from time to time. There again, Mr. McKenzie Clark said the regulations would not be administered to the letter in that regard. I told that to the pigfarmers in my electorate, and again they were summonsed. Mr. Nowotny, of Forrestfield, declares—

Officials from the Department of Agriculture called on me and informed me that from then on fruit and greens collected from green-grocers would be regarded as swill and must be treated under steam pressure before being fed to pigs.

Mr. E. K. Nowotny, of Hale-road, Forrestfield, pigfarmer, states—

I do hereby wish to state that I was convicted and fined in the Perth Police Court on my own admission that I utilised food waste from my own kitchen. The magistrate said, "I am sorry to convict you on your own evidence, but the Act is sufficiently wide to include your own household scraps."

As the result of these regulations, he was fined. Those who have spoken against my motion were at cross-purposes, inasmuch as I do not want to abolish the regulations altogether but to have others introduced that would be more effective. Swine fever first occurred in this State in 1916, and not again until 1942. It occurred in 1942 because the Yanks were here and were importing pigmeats from overseas. Swine fever occurred in the other States also about that time, and they applied restrictions, but later lifted them. We have continued these regulations. As the member for Victoria Park pointed out, it cost the ratepayers of Perth £10,000 per year to bury the swill and the actual value of the swill so disposed of was £137,000. That is the type of thing the Department of Agriculture is doing.

The Minister for Lands: It cost the State £30,000 in compensation.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, because the authorities killed 10,000 pigs, and not because 20 or more pigs died of swine fever. They went ahead with this comprehensive slaughtering policy and slaughtered 10,000 pigs, at a total cost of only £30,000. In the war years they buried £137,000 worth

of swill at a cost to the ratepayers of £10,000 each year. There was an outbreak of the disease in 1916 and not another until 1942.

The Minister for Lands: You seem to treat the matter lightly.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister will not say that when I reach the end of my speech, as there are other facts to be brought forward. We are foisting on pigfarmers small sterilisers that cost £400 each, but these men may not have more than five or six pigs.

The Minister for Lands: You hawked it round the House long enough.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The commonsense way to sterilise the swill would be to boil it in vats, as has been done for many years. That is what was done between 1916 and 1942, and it was not even policed, but we now say that it should be policed. I suggest that the pigfarmers be licensed, and they are anxious for that to be done. They are willing to pay £5 5s. or so each for the license, and that fee could go towards the cost of maintaining inspectors. If that were done, we could have the same method of treating swill as was used for so many years during which there was no outbreak of swine fever. That method could be policed and the cost would be paid by the pigfarmers themselves. If swill is boiled for two hours, it is sterilised as effectively as is possible by any means. One could boil it for a further two weeks without making it any more sterile.

The pigfarmers in the metropolitan area are not running just a few pigs, as some members have mentioned, but in some cases thousands. One had 3,000 pigs yearly before the war. They are in a big way and it is in their interests to insure against future outbreaks of swine fever. They say that if they were licensed and inspectors appointed, the treatment of swill could be policed, and they would be agreeable to extremely heavy penalties being inflicted and to their licenses being taken away on a second offence. Nothing could be fairer than that. Not even the member for Irwin-Moore can deny that if swill is boiled for two hours it is effectively sterilised. The method I have suggested would enable full use to be made of swill throughout the State. What will be the result of these regulations if they are endorsed by the House? Some Country Party

members should be aware that in 1942 there were 149,000 pigs in this State, while this year there are only 100,000.

Mr. Marshall: And there will be less when these regulations are enforced.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Pig production in Western Australia has decreased since that time by one-third.

The Minister for Lands: What is the cause of that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The regulations are responsible for it. I have here some letters, from people engaged in the pig-raising industry, which will enlighten the House on that point. Our pig production has decreased by one third since the regulations were introduced, and the Department of Agriculture has not yet got into its stride in administering them. Up to date it has been concentrating on the smaller men in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Ackland: Has pig production gone down by one-third since January?

Mr. GRAYDEN: What an astounding suggestion! The feeding of pigswill was prevented in 1942 and since that time the number of pigs in the State has declined by one-third.

The Minister for Lands: But you said it was since the regulations.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Other regulations have been in force. The Department of Agriculture is just getting into its stride. It has been on the job all the time but it only introduced these new regulations in January and by the powers given under them it will be able to operate on an even wider scale. So, what is going to be the result in the next six months? The department has been enforcing these latest amendments to the regulations for only six months!

Mr. Hoar: We will have all the swill and no pigs.

Mr. GRAYDEN: There is no doubt about that. We should re-name our Department of Agriculture. I have always understood, in the past, that after a State becomes a little more civilised we set up a Government. That Government forms various departments and, in this instance it forms the Department of Agriculture. The job of that Department of

Agriculture should be to stimulate the production of a country, and no-one will dispute that. But I suggest that instead of this Department of Agriculture being one to increase production, it is a department that has decreased production.

The Minister for Lands: Don't say that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It has succeeded in doing that.

The Minister for Lands: Don't be silly.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We have the facts and if the Minister cannot absorb them—

Hon. A. H. Panton: You would not expect him to.

The Minister for Lands: I must admit that I cannot understand the hon. member.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister knows very well that the department introduced regulations in 1942 and between that date and 1949 the pig production dropped by one-third. That has been the result of the regulations. Could anyone, therefore, call the department anything else but the department for decreased production. It naturally follows that it should be called such a name.

The Minister for Lands: It is easy enough for anyone to get up in this House and sling off at the department.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The department has reduced the pig production in this State by one-third over the last few years and now it is just getting into its stride. The regulations have just been amended and they completely cut out pigswill. Previously it was enforced only in the metropolitan area but now it will be effective throughout the whole State. Pigswill, as a food for pigs, cannot be disregarded inasmuch as it is one of the largest sources of pigfood in the State. It will always be so. We have a tremendous amount coming from the metropolitan area; we have some from Geraldton, some from Albany, some from Norham and some from Kalgoorlie.

In every town there is one hotel—there might be nothing else—but from that one hotel we get pigswill and some farmer comes along and picks it up. Members can thus see that throughout the State the amount of pigswill available comprises one of the largest sources of pigfood. However, by these regulations we will wipe out

that source of food and the Minister cannot deny it. This will mean that any person who has half a dozen pigs will have to put in a plant worth £400, even though he may not be able to afford it. That means that all the pigswill in this State will be lost to the industry. Therefore our pig production will drop even further.

The Minister for Lands: If you say much more about pigswill, the people will go off pork.

Mr. Yates: Has not the Perth City Council been burying swill up till recently?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It has in the metropolitan area, but not in the country districts. In connection with that point, I think the Department of Agriculture has done surprisingly well by decreasing the pig population.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Sabotaged it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: But the department will do even better in the future, now that the regulations have been amended.

The Minister for Lands: Swine fever had nothing to do with it!

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister tells us that swine fever had nothing to do with the reduction in the pig production.

The Minister for Lands: It had nothing to do with the reduction in the pig supply; it was all because of the regulations!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAYDEN: This in one of two States in the Commonwealth which has regulations of this nature.

The Minister for Lands: We have always been a progressive State.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We are progressing all right. We have decreased production by one-third and we will reduce it even further in future. Other States have no regulations of this kind. They did impose them when the outbreaks occurred but the regulations were lifted after the outbreaks had been controlled. The Minister has also given the House to understand that in England they have over-all regulations regarding the handling of pigswill. That is not so.

The Minister for Lands: I did not say that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If the Minister did not say it, then I withdraw my remarks on that particular point.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: You have him on the run.

Mr. GRAYDEN: In England, when an outbreak of swine fever occurs, the pigs are inoculated and isolated in the areas where the fever occurs. But, they still allow them to feed pigswill.

Mr. Yates: It is sterilised, though.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is not sterilised. They feed it raw and boiled.

Mr. Yates: It is sterilised.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know what the member for Canning knows on that particular point but I happen to know that it is not a fact because I have a letter from England supporting my statement.

The Minister for Lands: He probably knows as much as you do about it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I should hope that the member for Canning knows a lot more than the Minister.

Labour members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAYDEN: We did not have an outbreak of swine fever between 1914 and 1942. During those years hundreds and thousands—and possibly millions—of pounds worth of pigswill was fed to pigs. In the war years alone when it was buried in the metropolitan area, there was £137,000 worth. Therefore, how much worth was produced between the years 1914 to 1942? After this lapse of years we had an outbreak in 1942 and the Department of Agriculture killed 10,000 pigs, in many cases needlessly, but the pigs were killed. That cost £30,000. Now we are probably going to face another 26 years without one outbreak of swine fever and yet for the whole of that 26 years we intend to deprive Western Australia of pigswill. The pig industry is to be deprived of millions of pounds worth of swill because we had one little outbreak. We effectively stopped it when we did have it just as every other State has done. Yet, that is the policy of the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: And the Government.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes, and the Government. I can only say that it is a weird policy.

Mr. Graham: It is a weird Government.

Mr. GRAYDEN: This is in accord with one or two other things that have happened recently. We had one the other night in connection with the fish canning industry,



to which the Minister referred, and one or two other things have happened as well. It is the most weird policy that I have ever come in contact with. A Government, an Agricultural Department, can set out to deprive a State and a country of millions of pounds of feed because they have one little outbreak of swine fever in 26 years. The outbreak was checked in a few weeks at a cost of £30,000. Then they proceed to kill the pigs. I know of one property where they left a few pigs. They ran into the bush and some months later they were caught and eaten. Those pigs caused no ill effects to the people that ate them though hundreds of others on the property were killed by the Agricultural Department.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: No wonder you are deserting the Government.

Mr. Reynolds: When are you going to resign?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I would like to read a letter from W. O. Johnston & Sons which firm is one of the biggest manufacturers of smallgoods in the State. They deal with a tremendous quantity of pigmeats yearly and they say this:—

Re pig swill.—Further to our discussion on the above subject we now record the fact that in the writer's opinion the present regulations in regard to pig swill are definitely detrimental to pig production in the metropolitan area. At present the production of pig meats is at a very low level and we are repeatedly turning down orders for export due to the shortage of supplies. We estimate that in the metropolitan area alone the pig population has dropped at least 40 per cent. since the introduction of the present controls on swill.

That company buys pigmeats and it should know something about the position, but the Minister disagrees with them on that particular point. Continuing with the letter—

Least there should be any misunderstanding we wish to make it clear that we consider some measure of control is essential but suggest that the collection of supplies of swill could be confined to registered pig growers, and regulations gazetted compelling them to boil the swill for a specified period which would make the use of this class of food perfectly safe. In view of the acute shortage and high price of other types of pig-food we are of the opinion that a relinquishing of control, which would promote the use of pig swill to registered growers, would do much to eke out the present shortage of other types of food, and would be beneficial in achieving greater production of pigs which are so urgently needed at present.

Here is another letter from Watson's Supply Stores—

With reference to your request to us for our opinion regarding the feeding of swill to pigs, we have given this matter a lot of serious consideration and in our opinion the Act and Regulations as they stand today can prove detrimental to the pig industry. Firstly, we would like to point out that the number of pigs produced in the metropolitan area at the present time would be at least 60 per cent. below the number produced in the metropolitan area before 1942. No doubt the restrictions on the feeding of swill have been responsible for most of the reduction in production. Secondly, we would like to state that we are very much in favour of strict control over the use of swill as a ration for pig-feed. We think that the source of supply should be registered and the pig farmer using swill should also be registered. Both the source of supply and the pig farmer using swill should be under strict supervision.

The Minister for Lands: They are backing the Government.

Mr. GRAYDEN: They are not backing the Government as the Minister should be able to see. He knows perfectly well what our object is in moving to disallow this regulation. We are taking that course because it is the only one open to us. We want to introduce a new regulation which will be more practicable.

The Minister for Lands: Watson's Supply Stores are referring to the burying of pigswill.

Mr. GRADYEN: They are referring to nothing of the kind.

The Minister for Lands: It has been buried up till recently.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I wonder whether the Minister could tell us how recently.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Why does not the Minister give the hon. member a chance to make his reply?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The pigfarmers have been in contact with Watson's Supply Stores recently, and they are under no misapprehension as to what they are referring in this particular letter, so when the Minister says they are referring to the burying of pigswill he is entirely on the wrong track. The letter continues—

We also consider that swill used as a part of a balanced ration (now that meatmeal is in such short supply) can be a tremendous help to a pig farmer, and if properly used with grain, does not in any way lower the quality of pork produced.

That is in conflict with some of the statements that have been made tonight. I heard one member say that if Watson were choosing between two pens of pigs he would pay extra per head for the pigs in one pen as against the other because they were grain fed. Yet in this particular letter Watson's Supply Stores are emphasising that the feeding of swill in no way reduces the quality of pigs.

Mr. Styants: What does Johnston know about the rearing of pigs?

Mr. GRAYDEN: This letter is not from Johnston; it is from Watson's Supply Stores. They should know quite a lot about the feeding of pigs because they are in close contact with the producers. The letter goes on—

In our opinion, this product should be used to the maximum possible and the greater spread of its use should be encouraged as it will mean a considerable overall lift in production of pigs. Big treatment works can be detrimental insofar as in the event of a breakdown, or the closing down of a big treatment plant, the difficulty of dispensing of a big quantity of refuse could prove awkward to the authorities.

That is a point. Continuing—

In the framing of the regulations, under the heading of Swill, many items, including vegetables, have been brought into the control. Actually this could prove very detrimental to pig feeders who pick up vegetables from markets and market gardens, to be used as pig feed. Our suggestion is that swill only, and bones under certain conditions should be brought under control by regulation. The pig industry has fallen into very bad shape in Western Australia. There is now insufficient pig meat available to supply the Western Australian need over a large portion of the year.

Might I interpolate here that there is insufficient pigmeat in Western Australia to supply the local market over a large part of the year? What is to be the ultimate effect? We will import pigmeats and immediately we will have the threat of an outbreak of swine fever. Surely it is a better policy to feed pig swill to local pigs to increase the production than it is to import pigmeats from foreign countries. Continuing with the letter—

We feel that every effort should be made to stimulate production, and in our opinion the authorities should make every facility available to the farmers to secure foodstuffs for the production of meat which is so sorely needed, and not hinder production as could be the case under the existing regulations.

Here is another letter from Foggitt Jones Pty. Ltd. and they commence with—

We are very concerned at the rapid decline in the production of pigs which has taken place over the past few years.

They go on to say—

It is our opinion that the regulations which have been framed controlling kitchen and other waste fed to pigs are totally unjust and will certainly jeopardise a very valuable industry. We therefore strongly recommend that these regulations be disallowed and the breeding and feeding of pigs be encouraged to enable us to reach that stage where pig meats can again be exported to Great Britain. At the moment, owing to the low production, practically no pig meats are being exported.

I have another letter here from Elder, Smith & Co. but as it is fairly lengthy I will not bother to read it.

Mr. May: Are they all addressed to you?

Mr. GRAYDEN: No, they are addressed to various pigfarmers who handed them to me. Members can see exactly how these people feel on the subject, and they are in close contact with the pigbreeders. Yet the Agricultural Department says it is far better to wipe out two-thirds of the pig population of the State than risk one outbreak of swine fever that might cost £30,000. That is to say, it is better to do that than risk one outbreak of swine fever in 26 years—not necessarily that there would be an outbreak, but merely the risk of one. I suggest to members if they are to support the Government in this matter, that when they are going home tonight they should think of the dog they may own which is worried by one or two fleas. I suggest to them that in those circumstances they will take action that will be akin to what is contemplated in this instance. They will have the dog put painlessly to death, so that they may get rid of those couple of fleas!

Mr. Hegney: What does the Minister think about that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Here we are going to destroy the pig industry because we do not want to risk an outbreak of swine fever—and that type of outbreak could be controlled. That is the position in a nutshell.

Next I want to touch very briefly upon what I feel is the dishonest attitude of the Department of Agriculture in connection with this particular matter. That is quite apart from what has been said to me and

which afterwards has been contradicted by the departmental officials themselves. The Minister is relying upon advice received from the department, and I do not blame him upon any particular point. I have had experience with the department. I say it has adopted a dishonest attitude. Officers there have made statements to me but have gone away and completely ignored them.

The Minister, acting on the advice he received from the department, has inferred that if we want to treat swill, all that is necessary is to go to the Agricultural Department and get a permit. Then we can go to Tomlinsons and at a cost of £400 we can procure a sterilisation plant and then proceed to treat swill. That is an utter fallacy. I do not know whether the Minister gave members that impression, but certainly other speakers have. I entirely discount that suggestion. I have an instance affecting one of my electors. He went to the Agricultural Department. He had been stopped from feeding cabbage leaves to his pigs. Members will observe that I mentioned cabbage leaves, and not swill. He was told by a departmental officer that he would have to put the leaves through a steriliser first. He considered what he would do and whether he would ask for a permit. As the result, I have here a statutory declaration.

The Minister for Lands: What is the date of that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is dated the 26th July, 1949, and reads—

I, Robert Sharp, of Boulder Avenue, Belmont, hereby solemnly and sincerely declare I am conducting a pig farm.

That towards the end of February, 1949, I had a visit from a Mr. Robinson of the Department of Agriculture. He asked me what I was feeding my pigs on. I told him that I was feeding on green stuff, waste vegetables and wheat and horse meat at the time. He told me that I could not pick up green stuff from greengrocers' shops and he advised me that I would have to install a digester if I wished to do so.

Here we have an inspector of the Department of Agriculture advising him along those lines. He prevented this man from feeding his pigs with vegetables and so forth, and told him he would have to put in a sterilising plant as a cost of about £400. To proceed—

The following week I called on Tomlinsons Ltd. and inquired about a digester. Subsequently the same day I called on Mr. Toop of the Department of Agriculture—

He is a gentleman I have had quite a lot to do with in connection with this business.—regarding the possibility of me getting a permit to pick up swill.

He is a modest type of person and before doing anything he went along to ascertain what his chances were. He continues—

He asked me, supposing I had a plant, how did I know I was going to get any swill as the output of swill in Perth was 90 tons a day, and Fergusons Ltd. had to get 60 tons of it.

That is a serious statement and bears out what I have said that the Agricultural Department was prepared to grant a monopoly. However, we forced the position and no-one knows better than I do how many times we had to go to the department. We could not get anywhere, and would not have got anywhere, had it not been for the Honorary Minister for Agriculture, Hon. G. B. Wood, who insisted upon the matter being investigated. Some inquiries were made and eventually we got the sanction of the department. We were told that if we installed a digester we could treat cabbage leaves and swill. Here is a man who goes along with the idea of doing that and the officials laugh at him and say, "If you get the plant, how do you think you will get the swill because we are going to see that Fergusons get their 60 tons first."

Mr. Yates: A supply of 60 tons would feed 1,000 more than Fergusons have today.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Can- ning should know that when the plant was originally put in it was to feed 10,000 pigs. It was to take the whole of the output of swill in the metropolitan area. While it was building up its herds the firm was going to treat the swill and sell the output to farmers. Later on when its own herds had been built up, the firm would use all the swill for its own requirements. However, I have read the statutory declaration. What does the Minister say to that?

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Government policy!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Members in considering this matter may believe that the regulations will be administered fairly. I think they have now sufficient evidence adduced to show that they will not be administered fairly. I feel I have made it clear just what harm will be done to the pig industry if members do

not vote in favour of the motion. If they do not do that, they, I consider, will have accomplished more to destroy the pig industry than any other single action that could be taken in the State.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Do you know whether, if a person got a license, he would have to get a permit as well to install the plant so that he could treat the swill?

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes. I wish to place before the House some particulars from a cutting I have taken from a farmers' paper published in New Zealand. Under the headline "Outstanding Achievement of Swine Husbandry" some interesting particulars are set out. After dealing with the weight of pigs and so forth it says—

Garbage the Main Food:—

That means to say, pigswill that we are decrying in this State and want to abolish the use of—

Garbage was also the main feed for the litter and was obtained from the training college at Ardmore.

The garbage was not obtained from some obscure farm tucked away in the never-never of New Zealand, but from an agricultural training college! In the "Western Mail" of the 11th August I find the following headline:—

Swill-Fed Pigs Do Best.

I asked myself what some of the country members know about pigraising. I am aware that there is a large section in the country that says, "Why allow one small section of the industry to have access to a cheap pigfood? Why have we to compete with them when they can feed pigswill which we cannot get? They can get it at a much lower cost than we have to pay for our pigfood." That parochial attitude is adopted by a certain section of country people who do not want the metropolitan pigfarmers to have access to pigswill.

The Minister for Lands: Who wrote the article?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know. I refer the Minister to Malcolm Uren. I understand he edits the "Western Mail." The article is not signed.

The Minister for Lands: You might have written it yourself.

Mr. GRAYDEN: As it is not signed, I take it that the article expressed the views of the "Western Mail." I do not think the Minister will dispute that statement. I omitted to read the first portion of the headline, which is "Commercial pigkeepers were surprised to learn that—" Then follows the headline which I quoted, "Swill-Fed Pigs Do Best." The article reads—

A comparative feeding test conducted by the Farmers' Union in England has revealed that swill-fed pigs do best, so that money subscribed for the test was well spent.

So convinced were most of the 400 commercial pig keepers in Middlesex that concentrated kitchen waste has filling value but little or no feeding value that they willingly subscribed to a fund to make a feeding test of comparative methods of nutrition. Results have been spectacular.

The article then goes on to state how swill-fed pigs excelled over those given other food. Yet the Honorary Minister for Agriculture says that we are more progressive in this State. As regards pigswill, we are 100 years behind the times. In England they admit it is the best food. Here we have a regulation that prohibits its use.

The Minister for Lands: A regulation dealing with the treatment of pigswill.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister said we have a regulation to control pigswill.

The Minister for Lands: No, for its treatment.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have read a statutory declaration to the House which contains the statement that one man tried to get a permit for a sterilisation plant, but was refused it. How can the Minister assert that the regulation was promulgated in order to assist in the treatment of swill?

The Minister for Lands: All the swill available is treated.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It was treated up till 1942; that is why we then had one-third more pigs in the State. Since the regulations were promulgated and swill has not been treated, pig production has fallen by one-third.

The Minister for Lands: That was the time when the pigs were buried. I agree with you there.

Mr. GRAYDEN: In the issue of the "Western Mail" of the 21st July last there appears a letter from A. A. Bloomfield, jnr., honorary secretary of the Metropolitan Pig

Farmers' Association, who knows twice as much about pig-raising as do some of the experts of the Agricultural Department. In his letter he says—

Recent statements by the Acting Chief Veterinary Surgeon (Mr. C. R. Toop) concerning imported stock diseases may present a rosy picture to the general public of efficient management by the Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately those of us who are associated with pig-raising know that ruthless slaughter and the present swill-feeding regulations are not quite so efficient and do not create such a Utopia as pictured in the article.

For instance there are thousands of tons of kitchen waste being utilised as pig feed in country centres in this State. This waste is equally vulnerable to imported diseases and is often used without the preliminary precaution of boiling.

In the same issue of the "Western Mail" there is a reply by Mr. Toop, who says—

The outbreak of swine fever in 1942 was responsible for the loss of 13,000 pigs, approximately 10,000 of which died in the metropolitan area within the space of a month.

But Mr. Toop does not say that they were killed because one or two pigs in a herd showed signs of the disease. His letter proceeds—

A similar and probably greater risk exists at the present time. Large numbers of migrants are entering Australia and are bringing with them parcels of foodstuff containing uncooked meat products. 600 lb. of this material was intercepted at Fremantle during May.

We have officers on the wharf to stop that sort of thing. But there was no outbreak of swine fever between 1914 and 1942 and yet pigmeats were being brought into the State during those years. There was no outbreak after World War I, when migrants were coming to this State and bringing large quantities of pigmeats with them. But the officer of the department now comes along and points out this danger! The member for Irwin-Moore held up in this Chamber two sausages which he said came from some Asiatic country. I point out to him that similar sausages have been coming here for 26 years, but they did not introduce swine fever. I do not know where he procured the sausages; perhaps they were part of the 600 lb. referred to in Mr. Toop's letter. It would be easy to procure them if one wrote for them, but that is not the point.

The large number of pigfarmers in the metropolitan area are not in the happy position of the country pigfarmers, nor are

those on the Goldfields. The metropolitan pigfarmers cannot turn their pigs out into a paddock to root up turnips and other root vegetables and then throw in a few tins of boiled wheat, or perhaps drag a dead horse into the paddock. The metropolitan pigfarmers depend entirely on swill as a base food for their pigs. Before the war we were raising 10,000 pigs a year in the metropolitan area. Apparently there is nothing to prevent the country pigfarmers from dragging a dead horse into a paddock and leaving it there for a week for half-a-dozen pigs to feed on. They would very soon disembowel the dead horse and during the week slowly eat the carcass. There is going to be nothing against that. But let that farmer throw one eggshell into that pigyard and he will find himself in the position of the one I mentioned.

The Minister for Lands: You will get the farmers' support tonight all right.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will not get the support of a certain section who want to see the other pigfarmers deprived of a cheap source of food, but I will get the support of all those with commonsense and a little imagination, who can see that there are more effective ways of treating swill than are proposed by the regulation. I apologise for having kept the House so long.

Hon. A. H. Panton: No apology is necessary!

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is an extremely important matter, the most vital one that has ever been brought up in connection with the pig industry in Western Australia. I therefore ask members to support the motion. I reiterate that we ask for the disallowance of the regulation simply because we want another introduced that will be more effective. No-one can say that it will not be effective because we are going to license pigfarmers and they are going to contribute £5 5s. a year, which will ensure that we shall be able to appoint inspectors to police the boiling of swill. Such a regulation as we have in mind will restore pig production in Western Australia to the 1942 level, before regulations were introduced to stop the feeding of swill to pigs. We will restore pig production in this State to that level instead of cutting it even more, which is what the amended regulation the Government has put forward will do.

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 |
|---|------|
| <b>Bills:</b> 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