THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney-General) [5.24 p.m.]: I thank the Hon. D. W. Cooley for the support he has indicated on behalf of the Opposition and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower-West—Minister for Justice) [5.26 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Legislative Council: Hours of Sittings

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [5.27 p.m.]: I do not wish to delay the House at any great length but there are some points I would, very briefly, like to raise.

There have been a number of remarks made—and these seem to be increasingly made—by some members of the Labor Party and others to the effect that this House is not performing a useful duty. The remarks made, and which were reported in the Press, were that this House had sat for only 22 minutes in a particular week.

The person who made that remark, indeed members themselves, know full well that the reason for our having sat for only 22 minutes is that no legislation had come forward from the Legislative Assembly to be dealt with in this House. Accordingly we had no choice but to adjourn the House immediately after we commenced this particular part of the session.

It seems to me that this is just another example of the smear tactics that are being used against the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You would know all about that.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The insidious remarks and the suggestions made by some members of the Labor Party were intended to indicate, I believe, that we are not working particularly hard, are costing the taxpayers an enormous amount of money, and therefore our presence here is not justified. Indeed the honourable member who has just interjected asked a question in this House which, although it appeared to be fairly straightforward, was placed on the notice paper for the simple purpose of suggesting that perhaps the members of the Legislative Council were not attending the House for the same number of hours as those attended by members of the Legislative Assembly.

I think the question could have been better asked as to how many hours do the members of this House spend in their electorates to carry out work on behalf of their electors. This would have been a much more sensible question to ask, and perhaps some indication could have been gained of who was giving true value.

I do not think the answer to such a question would have pleased some members of the Labor Party; certainly it would not have pleased the member who asked the question. It could have embarrassed him.

There is no doubt members of the Liberal Party and of the National Country Party work very hard in their electorates as, no doubt, do a few members of the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: All of them do.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Not all of them, by any means. The very wording of the question asked indicates that the honourable member considers his parliamentary duties consist merely of attending this House and once that has been done his parliamentary duties cease.

I do not wish to prolong the sitting any more than I need, but I would point out that in my own case I spent 74 hours in that particular week in my electorate attending to matters on behalf of my electors. I do not complain; indeed, I would spend 85 hours a week if that were necessary. Possibly many members of the Liberal and National Country Parties spend more time in or on behalf of the electorates.

The suggestion was made in another place that during the recess members were practising their golf swings. What a ridiculous statement! We know that any conscientious member of any party in either House would be required to spend plenty of time in his electorate if he wished to retain his seat. For this reason, and in view of that kind of question, I suppose it is not surprising that the Labor Party has only nine members in this House. We know perfectly well that the Hon. Clive Griffiths, for instance, works very long hours, and as a result he is rewarded by being elected to this House. The same can be said of many other members.

I resent the attempt to belittle this House and its operations. I represent the West Province with a great deal of pride, and I do not treat it at all as a joke. Many members of the Liberal, National Country, and Labor Parties have served this House with great distinction, and I therefore think it ill behoves any member of either House to denigrate the Legislative Council or our parliamentary system.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.31 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 17th August, 1976

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

POLICE

Drugs: Display

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): I wish to make an announcement, following on a request to me by the Minister for Police as to whether certain material could be displayed in Parliament House. The material comprises an Alcometer and certain drugs, together with cannabis plants, which will be displayed from 8.00 p.m. onwards in the area near the post office. I understand members of the Police Force will be in attendance to answer queries.

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

1. ENERGY

National Energy Council

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) What action has been taken by the Federal and State Governments regarding the establishment of a National Energy Council to exchange research data on existing and new sources of energy?

(2) Who are the Western Australian representatives on the National Energy Council?

Sir Charles Court (for Mr MENSAROS) replied:

(1) At the meeting of the Australian Minerals Council on the 9th April, 1976 it was decided to form an Australian Minerals and Energy Council to combine the existing functions of the Australian Minerals Council with those intended for the National Energy Council.

(2) The Western Australian representative on the Australian Minerals and Energy Council is the Minister for Industrial Development, Mines, and Fuel and Energy.

2. PRISONS

Air-conditioned Vehicles

Mr SODEMAN, to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is the Government currently using air-conditioned vehicles for the escorting of prisoners in north-west areas of the State?

(2) If "Yes"—

(a) how many vehicles are in use; and

(b) in what localities are they situated?

(3) Is it the Government's intention to extend the use of such vehicles into other localities?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) and (2) No. However, as an interim measure an insulated vehicle, equipped with fans, was tried at Roebourne, but has proved unsuccessful.

(3) The Department of Corrections has air-conditioned escort vehicles in use at Geraldton and Kalgoorlie. Replacements of present escort vehicles with air-conditioned vehicles will be made in the north-west as present vans become due for replacement.

The department is hopeful of replacing the vehicles at Wyndham and Broome with air-conditioned escort vans during the present financial year.

3. HISTORIC BUILDINGS

Bunbury: Survey

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

(1) Has $9 000 been made available for a survey into the Bunbury buildings with an historical and aesthetic significance?

(2) If so, who provided the money?

(3) (a) Has this money been spent; and

(b) who has spent it?

(4) When was the money made available?

(5) Upon what projects has the money been spent?

Mr P. V. Jones (for Mr RUSHTON) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The Commonwealth Government, as part of the national estate programme 1975-76.

(3) (a) No.

(b) Not applicable.

(4) April, 1976.

(5) Not applicable.

4. MEAT

Dried Products

Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Could he detail the quantities of dried meat products consumed throughout the world?

(2) Is the demand for these products expanding?

(3) Which countries are supplying the market?

(4) What type of meat products are made?

(5) What is shelf life of these products?

(6) Is the drying process carried out in Australia?

(7) Would an Australian product be cheaper to consumers in Asia and elsewhere than chilled, frozen or canned meat?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) and (2) As dried meat consumption is generally limited to less developed countries where statistics of local production and consumption are sparse I am unable to indicate what the quantity of dried meat products consumption is throughout the world.

FAO data does provide an indication of world trade in these products, which has decreased from 32 000 tonnes in 1969 to 27 000 tonnes in 1974.

(3) The major exporting countries are U.S.A. 11 100 tonnes, Denmark 2 062 tonnes, Italy 1 627 tonnes, U.K. 1 673 tonnes, France 1 243 tonnes, Bulgaria 1 369 tonnes and Chad 1 000 tonnes.

(4) The main products based on traditional sun drying methods are biltong in South Africa, Kenya; charquis in South America; and pemmican in Switzerland and Norway.

During the second World War research was initiated to produce dried meat with modern technology. Since then freeze drying techniques have been developed and although an acceptable product can be produced these methods are relatively expensive.

(5) Dried meat is subject to spoilage from sunlight, oxygen and moisture and insect attack. Under the correct storage conditions it can be kept for more than a year.

(6) and (7) There were 10 plants in Australia in the mid-40s processing air-dried cooked meat for the armed forces. The product at that time was generally unsatisfactory. The only plant in operation today is believed to be that at the CSIRO meat research centre, Cannon Hill where the CSIRO continues to conduct experiments in this field.

In a recent meat research newsletter (September 1975) the CSIRO concluded that due to the relatively high cost of processing and packaging dried meat products there was little scope for large scale commercial production. With the present level of technology Australian production of dried meat would be more expensive than canned meat.

5. CRAYFISHING

Salmon Bait

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

(1) Is he aware of the concern in the crayfishing industry because of recent regulations pertaining to the use of salmon within the industry?

(2) (a) What action has been taken to alleviate the problem; and

(b) what action is going to be taken in the near future to alleviate the problem?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) Yes, correspondence has been received from members of the rock lobster industry, and my colleague the member for Lower West Province expressed concern to me on behalf of rock lobster fishermen.

(2) (a) The Australian Fishing Industry Council (W.A. Branch) arranged a meeting on 4th August, which was attended by the Director of Fisheries, at which all interested parties were represented to discuss the use of salmon bodies as bait. I am advised that a consensus view from that meeting was that the notices issued which prohibit the use of salmon bodies, as distinct from heads and offal, for bait were in the better interests of the total fishing industry.

(b) A seminar is to be held in Albany on 5th October, to which all members of the fishing industry and representatives of angling associations will be invited to discuss problems being experienced by the salmon fishing industry and the use of salmon bodies as bait. It is expected that the discussion will provide recommendations regarding both topics which will be referred to the general fisheries advisory committee at a meeting in the near future. The general fisheries advisory committee will be making recommendations to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife.

6. COCKBURN SOUND

Environmental Problems

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Will he please outline all steps initiated by his Government towards the rectifying of the possibly serious environmental problem that exists in Cockburn Sound?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

As already advised, the future management of Cockburn Sound is currently being considered by the Government.

The various reports and comments in the public domain provide the information the member seeks.

QUESTIONS (3): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS
Last Pay Period

Mr BERTRAM, to the Treasurer:

I understand the Treasurer has has received some notice of this question, which is as follows—

(1) On what date in June, 1976, did the last pay day occur for each of the following departments—
(a) Education, teaching and other staff;
(b) Hospitals;
(c) Railways;
(d) Police;
(e) Mental Health Services;
(f) Public Health;
(g) Public Works;
(h) Country Water Supply;
(i) Agriculture;
(j) Community Welfare;
(k) Road Traffic Authority; and
(l) All others?

(2) What was the Education Department vote for salaries for the year ended the 30th June, 1976?

(3) What was the actual expenditure by the Education Department for salaries, including the $8 million paid to the so-called "slush fund", for the year ended the 30th June, 1976?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) to (3) I must advise the member for Mt. Hawthorn that I received no notice at all of his question. I could hardly be expected to carry that information in my head. However, I am only too pleased to obtain it for him.

2. FOOD PRICES INDEX
Comparison of Increases

Mr SIBSON, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Is the Minister aware that the July index of food prices for all State capitals was released today? If so, can he—

(1) tell the House what was the figure for Perth;

(2) advise what was Perth's position in relation to other capitals?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question.

Mr T. J. Burke: Who wrote it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: I am delighted to give the result.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I called for order two or three times. There is no need to continue a running back-chat while the Minister is trying to answer a question. Please respond when I call for order. The Minister.

Mr GRAYDEN: The reply is as follows—

(1) The figure for Perth was 0.3 per cent, as compared with the June figure of 1.4 per cent. The national increase for the month of July was 1.1 per cent.

(2) Perth and Brisbane had the lowest increases of all capital cities, and Adelaide had the greatest increase. The increases are as follows—

	per cent
Sydney	1.0
Melbourne	1.4
Brisbane	0.3
Adelaide	1.9
Perth	0.3
Hobart	1.0

3. FARM WORKERS
Training Scheme

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) For what period is it proposed that a "farm trainee" will be employed with a farmer to complete his training?

(2) How many trainees will the scheme train initially?

(3) What is the minimum age for entry?

(4) At age 17 years what minimum wage will a trainee receive at today's rates?

(5) Has the Government provided for the cost of this scheme in the forthcoming Budget?

(6) If so, how much?

(7) Has the scheme been discussed with a trade union?

(8) If so, which one?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The answer is as follows—

(1) Two years.

(2) It is anticipated that 20 trainees will be involved in the initial pilot training scheme.

(3) The school leaving age is the minimum age for entry but the intention is that the scheme will be aimed at adult trainees.

(4) This has not yet been decided.

(5) and (6) This matter is currently under consideration as it involves both State and Commonwealth expenditure.

(7) and (8) TLC representatives on the WA Apprenticeship Advisory Council are aware of this scheme and the matter has also been referred to the AWU. The AWU has been invited to attend meetings in connection with the scheme; however its members have not attended any meetings so far.

DOG BILL

Third Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [4.43 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.44 p.m.]: I would like to avail myself of the opportunity presented by the third reading of this Bill to raise several queries with the Minister and to give him a chance to reply in unequivocal terms in connection with several points. Bearing in mind that shortly we will debate a Bill to repeal the Alsatian Dog Act, there are some points which I feel must be considered.

The terms of this Bill require that the control of all dogs, including all species, will be by regulation. The Minister explained that in his second reading speech, and he pointed out that the Bill allows regulations to be made in respect of a specific breed or a mixed breed of dog which is considered to be a potential danger. Indeed, clause 53(3) on page 43 states that regulations made under this provision in relation to a specified kind of dog may require the sterilisation of any such dog.

At present the Alsatian Dog Act is explicit in respect of the control of Alsatian dogs in this State. I am aware we will have the opportunity to examine this question at some depth when we debate another Bill, but the principle I raise now is that we have before us a piece of legislation that is providing us with the opportunity at some time in the future—probably the near future—to bring down regulations that will replace the Alsatian Dog Act. I call upon the Minister to indicate the intentions of the Government in this regard. Precisely what regulations and what methods of control are envisaged? This, of course, must of necessity bring with it a type of administration to provide some method of policing the regulations; who will be responsible for this, at what stages, and to what degree?

The House is to be called on at a later stage to repeal an Act which categorically and specifically provides a form of control over Alsatian dogs, but all we have before us is a sort of nebulous arrangement whereby other regulations will be brought down. I think we should be told what is intended with regard to these regulations. To what extent will they go? Will it be left to the individual shires to make their own by-laws, or will the regulations be initiated by the Minister and introduced through the normal channels via His Excellency?

If the regulations are to be left to the individual shires—especially regarding Alsatian dogs, because that is the only breed controlled at the moment—there will be a tremendous disparity in them. Even if a group of shires, such as all those in the metropolitan area, introduces a uniform by-law to cover that area, there is likely to be a totally different set of regulations outside the metropolitan area; and that will have an effect on people. We know that people travel fairly extensively nowadays. As a matter of course they take their dogs or animals with them on holidays; or it may even be a case of changing their residence from one side of the border to the other. I think it would be bordering on the ridiculous if a local authority, such as the Boulder Shire, has regulations allowing a complete breeding programme, whereas in a neighbouring and adjacent shire, such as Yilgarn, there is total prohibition.

Mr Clarko: That applies in New South Wales now.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Is the member for Karrinyup suggesting that is the overall answer?

Mr Clarko: No. I was not trying to throw you; I was just putting it to you.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I am aware of the regulations applying in other States of Australia; but I am not saying that they are the correct ones or whether they conform to my own point of view. The point I am raising at present is whether we are going to introduce this situation into Western Australia. If so, is it desirable? The intention of the Government in this regard, I feel, should be clearly stated before we go through the motion of agreeing with the third reading. I think the

Minister has the opportunity now to be explicit on this matter and that he should avail himself of the opportunity.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [4.50 p.m.]: I wish to advise the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that although I moved the third reading of this Bill, I did so in the absence of the Minister in charge of the Bill who is attending a funeral and might be a little late. However, if my explanation of the situation does not satisfy the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and he gives me the nod, I suggest that our Whip would adjourn the debate until a later stage of the sitting when the Minister is here. He may in fact walk into the Chamber while I am talking and that will resolve all problems.

It is true, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, that the only species of dog which is now very strictly controlled is the Alsatian dog. I do not think the honourable member was in the Chamber when the then Minister for Agriculture introduced the Alsatian Dog Act which was violently opposed by his party when in Opposition. From that time onward there has been great pressure from the German Shepherd Dog Association and others to have the Alsatian Dog Act repealed.

Mr H. D. Evans: I am aware of this and the reasons, of course.

Mr O'NEIL: In the legislation we now have, power has been given to make regulations in respect of specific control of named breeds or cross-breeds because there are many more breeds of dogs as large as Alsatians which occasion concern to some people. These include the Dobermann pinscher, perhaps the Great Dane, and a few others.

The Alsatian dog has earned the reputation, rightly or wrongly, as being a rather savage animal mainly because it was used during war time for guarding prisoners and such purposes. But there are people who say that the Alsatian dog, properly trained and cared for, is a friendly pet; and perhaps they are right also.

The legislation enables local authorities to prescribe regulations in respect of not only the Alsatian but also any other dog which the local authority, as the representative of the people, determines is a danger in its area.

The honourable member has admitted that he is aware that the situation which he is afraid will occur here already exists in other States. In some States there are different regulations controlling the keeping of Alsatian dogs, whether neutered or not. They vary from place to place and there are other problems of people moving from place to place. It has been indicated, of course, that unless the present Dog Bill is passed, it is not the Government's intention to repeal the Alsatian Dog Act. We are placing into one Statute total authority to control all sorts of dogs.

Mr H. D. Evans: You are saying that the responsibility for the control of all these animals, including Alsatians, is on local governments?

Mr O'NEIL: I understand that to be the position.

Mr H. D. Evans: Taking it away from the Agriculture Protection Board?

Mr O'NEIL: That is right; I understand that to be the position. In fact, since the introduction of the Alsatian Dog Act, the Alsatian is the only dog that is controlled, I suppose, by the APB, other than dingoes and the like. It is felt that this has always been the responsibility of local government and that is where it ought to rest.

I imagine that model by-laws will be produced in respect of the general control of dogs regarded as dangerous, which by-laws may be applied by various local authorities. That is my understanding of the situation. It may well be that all local authorities will introduce regulations which purport to do the same thing as the Alsatian Dog Act, but I do not know.

Mr H. D. Evans: Can you leave local authorities to determine a matter which will affect a very large area of the State? Would not this be better as a State matter?

Mr O'NEIL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has admitted his awareness of the fact that this situation exists in other States.

Mr H. D. Evans: That does not say it is good.

Mr O'NEIL: It does not say it is bad, and I do not know of any objection that occurs in other States. I am not sufficiently *au fait* with the matter. However, I have done my best as the Minister at present in charge of the Bill and if the honourable member gives me the nod I shall talk to my Whip—

The SPEAKER: I am afraid that is not possible. It is a generous offer to make, but the reply of the mover of the question closes the debate, as we all know.

Mr O'NEIL: I am sorry; I should have realised that.

Mr H. D. Evans: Could we raise this matter in the debate on the Alsatian Dog Act Repeal Bill.

Mr O'NEIL: It is unfortunate that I have closed the debate so there is no possibility to adjourn it. However, the matter can be raised in the debate on the Alsatian Dog Act Repeal Bill. There is also another Bill, the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 3), which is related to this one, so it can be done on either occasion.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RIDGE (Kimberley—Minister for Forests) [4.58 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Forests Act, 1918-1974, to update, strengthen and in some areas extend the existing authority of the Forests Department.

The Forests Act has stood the test of time since 1918 and very few changes have been necessary. It still provides the basis of most satisfactory forest legislation.

The amendments now proposed are important but they must be considered as supplementary to what is already an admirable Act. The amendments will bring the current Act up to date and cater for the changes in demands which are being made on the forests of Western Australia.

Contrary to the widely-held belief that the Forests Act now provides only for the production of timber, the authority to manage the forests for other purposes already exists. This is evidenced in a statement of forest policy issued by the Government earlier this year, in which the whole range of departmental activities was provided. The authority must however be strengthened to emphasise the role of the department as a multiple-use manager of the forests.

Whereas the original and almost sole use of forests was to produce timber, the current demands extend far beyond the original management requirement.

Today there are increasing additional demands for the non-production values which exist in the hardwood forests of this State. Accordingly, the authority of the Forests Department should be strengthened to assist it to define management priorities to meet these demands.

This type of management will incorporate the principle of multiple-use of the forest and embrace a number of compatible forest uses with priority given to the most required attribute for each forest area. In some instances the priority will be production but in others the use may be prescribed for water catchments, amenity, recreation or scientific purposes. The amendment therefore seeks to extend formally the authority of the Forests Department to prepare working plans for purposes other than timber production.

A further important section proposed for amendment refers to the financial provisions of the Forests Act.

The current Act provides for an amount of money equal to 9/10ths of the net revenue of the Forests Department to be paid to a special fund to improve and reforest the State forests. This special fund while admirable in the early years of forestry in Western Australia, is now very cumbersome to administer. This is so because the fund must be supplemented with additional money to meet the increased costs of running the department. The reason for the increased costs is that a much wider range of work is now being undertaken by the department than was done in the early years of this Act.

It is therefore proposed to repeal the existing section relating to financial provisions and substitute what will be a much more acceptable means of controlling the financial aspects of the Forests Department.

Another important amendment is to allow the Conservator of Forests on the authority of the Treasurer to obtain money by raising loans. Funds raised in this manner will be used to supplement the present rate of pine planting in order to meet the future demands for timber in this State. They will provide an additional source of revenue to increase the planting programme.

Currently there are limitations on the authority of the Forests Department to advise private owners or prospective investors on matters relating to establishment and management of forests.

It is therefore intended to amend the Act to allow advice to be given on both the establishment and management of forests owned by private persons.

In the past, the Forests Department has undertaken work on behalf of other authorities in State forests or areas contiguous to these. Examples of this include management of water catchments, work carried out on behalf of national park and tourist authorities, and co-operative fire protection with other land authorities. It is proposed to formalise the authority to carry out these functions which are for the benefit of the public at large through use of an infrastructure the Forests Department has established in State forests.

At the present time the Forests Act precludes the employment of officers who do not hold a degree in forestry, in the professional division of the department. Because of the depth of studies that are now necessary for the management of forests, it is desirable to employ professional officers trained in disciplines other than forestry. It is therefore intended to amend the Act to allow employment of such additional officers as are required for research and other functions of the department.

The effluxion of time has made a number of other provisions of the Act redundant and, indeed, sometimes anachronistic. It is therefore proposed to update the wording where necessary and repeal a number of sections which are no longer applicable to forest protection and improvement in Western Australia.

Finally, because of the increasing and wider ranging demands which the people of Western Australia are now placing on the forest areas, and the desire of the Government to meet these demands in so far as terms are compatible one with the other, I would like to foreshadow further amendments to the Act which will provide for the setting aside of sections of forests as forest parks with special management prescriptions. In the meantime these areas will be examined and plans prepared in consultation with the Environmental Protection Authority.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Local Government), and transmitted to the Council.

SETTLEMENT AGENTS CONTROL BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to provide for the statutory control of settlement agents. Settlement agents are persons who, for reward, undertake to complete the sale and purchase of land by searching the title at the Titles Office, drafting the transfer, adjusting the rates and taxes if this has not already been done by the land agent, arranging for a meeting of the parties' representatives for settlement, filing the necessary documents for registration, and doing whatever else is necessary to complete the transaction.

Settlement agents are unique to Western Australia, and their activities are at present uncontrolled. In most other jurisdictions, the completion of land transactions is arranged by or under the supervision of legal practitioners. South Australia has a system of licensed land brokers, whose activities are somewhat wider than those of settlement agents.

The Law Reform Commission of Western Australia reported that, as at June, 1973, there were 25 settlement agents in existence, 14 having some relationship with a particular land agent, four associated with a particular legal firm, and seven others. The Government has no precise up-to-date figures, but without doubt the number of settlement agents has increased, rather than diminished, since 1973.

When I say that settlement agents are at present uncontrolled, I mean that, although they handle other people's money, they are not legally obliged to operate trust accounts, nor to have their accounts audited, nor are they obliged to provide a fidelity bond or subscribe to a guarantee fund. Further, although settlement agents operate in an area where most people make perhaps the most significant property transaction of their lives—the purchase of a home—there is nowhere clearly laid down what settlement agents should be permitted to do, and what they should be prohibited from doing. There is no clear delineation of their activities to ensure they do not trespass into the proper field of a legal practitioner. It is true that the Legal Practitioners Act forbids anyone but a certificated legal practitioner from performing for reward any work "in connection with the administration of law" or preparing any "deed, instrument or writing" relating to real property, other than a transfer under the Transfer of Land Act. But this section is expressed in general and vague terms, and its limits are not clear.

In November, 1972, the then Government asked the Law Reform Commission to review the activities of settlement agents as part of its general review of the Land Agents Act. The commission reported in January, 1974. As far as settlement agents were concerned, the commission's recommendations were not unanimous.

Two members recommended that settlement agents should not be permitted to continue as a separate business, and were of the view that any legislation controlling and recognising settlement agents would have the effect of creating a para-legal profession, which was against the public interest. This is also the view of the Law Society.

The other member of the commission considered that it was too late to change a position that was well established, whereby persons other than legal practitioners are permitted, to a limited degree, to complete land transactions as agents for reward. However, he considered that the controlling legislation should be so drawn as to ensure that settlement agents are restricted to the clerical and routine aspects of settlements and that they do not perform legal work or act as legal advisers. In other words, they should provide no more than a clerical facility which people could avail themselves of, if they chose.

The Government has given most careful consideration to the question, and has decided, on balance, that settlement agents should be permitted to continue, but on a strictly controlled basis. The Government considers that settlement agents do perform a useful function, and that the real question is control, not abolition. I should also say that it was the unanimous view of the Law Reform Commission that, if settlement agents are to be permitted to continue, they should be regulated broadly along the lines laid down in this Bill.

The main features of the Bill are—

(a) those dealing with licensing, the object being to ensure that only fit and proper persons are permitted to undertake the business of a settlement agency;

(b) those dealing with accounts and audit, and proper business practices, the object being to ensure that clients' money is protected;

(c) those dealing with the ambit of activities permitted settlement agents, the object being to ensure that they are confined to the clerical side of settlements —which is their proper role— that they do not do legal work which they are not competent to do, and that their clients are made aware of this limited function;

(d) those dealing with the establishment of a fidelity reserve fund, the object being to accumulate money for the purpose of compensating those who suffer pecuniary loss due to defalcation by a licensee who has been granted an annual certificate;

(e) those dealing with the establishment of a settlement agents deposits trust.

I will now outline the provisions of the Bill dealing with each of these features.

It is proposed that a person will not be able to act or carry on business as a settlement agent unless he is licensed by the settlement agents supervisory board, which this Bill will set up. A licence may be held by a natural person, a firm, or body corporate. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the board is given a right of appeal to the District Court. In order to save expense, it will be open to the Government to combine the activities of this board with other boards, such as the finance brokers supervisory board which is to be established under the Finance Brokers Control Act, 1975.

An applicant for a licence will be required to lodge with the settlement agents supervisory board a $100 000 bond from an insurance company, a bank or other approved surety, or enter into an insurance policy for not less than $100 000. The bond will be conditional upon the licensee duly accounting for money received and complying with obligations imposed on him in relation to that money. If an insurance policy is effected, it must be conditioned terms similar to those required in respect of a bond.

The Bill has provision for the Minister to fix an appointed day after which a settlement agent shall not carry on business as such unless he is licensed. However, the Bill also provides for the control of settlement agents in the transitional period before the appointed day.

During this period, all the provisions of the legislation that are in force will apply to settlement agents. By this means, the Government will be able to proclaim certain provisions to apply during the period; for example, the requirements for the maintaining and auditing of trust accounts.

The following persons or classes of persons are excepted from the definition of "settlement agent" in and for the purposes of the Act—

(a) banks;

(b) building societies;

(c) trustee companies;

(d) legal practitioners.

The Government considers that persons dealing with members of the above categories are already adequately protected.

It is proposed that the composition of the settlement agents supervisory board will be such that it will consist of five members: one as chairman; a person experienced in commercial practice; a legal practitioner; and two licensed settlement agents elected by the body of settlement agents. The board will be assisted in the carrying out of its functions by a registrar and inspectors appointed under the Public Service Act. These officers will have the power to aid the board in matters of inquiry. The board or registrar may request the Commissioner of Police to make an investigation or inquiry. The settlement agents supervisory board will have the power to cancel or suspend a settlement agent's licence, and also to fine or caution a licensee.

It will have power to hold an inquiry, to summon witnesses, and administer oaths. It will have power to attach conditions to licences, and to fix the maximum amount of remuneration for services rendered by licensees. A licence, once granted, is not subject to annual renewal. All that is required is an annual certificate.

In addition, it is proposed that settlement agents must maintain trust accounts into which they must pay all money received by them as such agents, and those accounts must be audited annually by an approved auditor. The board is given power to cause the trust account of a settlement agent to be audited whenever it considers it is in the public interest to do so.

If the auditor reports a defalcation to the board, the District Court, on the application of the board, may suspend the settlement agent and authorise the board to appoint a supervisor of the settlement agent's business and so permit it to continue. This will ensure that clients are not jeopardised by the premature closing down of the business.

It is also proposed that a settlement agent will not be entitled to receive any fee for his service unless he is not only licensed, but also has a valid appointment in writing to act from his client before

he renders any service. The appointment cannot be contained in an offer and acceptance form.

It is, at present, not unusual for an offer and acceptance form to contain an authorisation for the appointment of a particular settlement agent, sometimes to act for both parties. Such an authorisation may go unnoticed by the parties at the time they enter into the agreement for sale and purchase, but they are nevertheless bound by it. The Bill ensures that this will not happen in the future. The Bill also contains a provision that a settlement agent may not act for both parties to the transaction.

The Bill has provisions to ensure that settlement agents are completely independent of land agents, legal practitioners, and finance brokers. For example, a land agent, land salesman, legal practitioner or finance broker who stands in a "prescribed relationship" to a settlement agent must not receive any reward or fee for referring any business to that agent. If such a relationship exists, he must not procure the execution of any document by which a person authorises a settlement agent to act. If a prescribed relationship exists between a land agent or land salesman and a settlement agent, the settlement agent is not entitled to receive any fee for his services in respect of a land transaction negotiated by the land agent or land salesman.

The Bill directly limits the types of settlements a settlement agent can perform. He will be able to act on a settlement only if—

(a) the total consideration for the transaction was cash—he would not be able to act if the deal involved an exchange of properties, for example—;

(b) the cash consideration was no more than $100 000;

(c) the land is under the Transfer of Land Act;

(d) the land is residential land in fee simple;

(e) the land is not the subject of a strata title;

(f) the land is not an undivided share in land;

(g) the whole of the land is a lot or lots within the meaning of the Town Planning and Development Act.

There are also significant restrictions proposed in the type of transfer document which a settlement agent will be able to draft. For example, it cannot be one which of itself creates or reserves any encumbrance, easement, or covenant.

In actually arranging a settlement, an agent is to be restricted in what he can do. The purpose of this is to ensure that he performs only routine, clerical tasks, and does not become involved in "the administration of law" within the meaning of the Legal Practitioners Act.

Upon making the necessary searches, the settlement agent must forthwith report to the party on whose behalf he acts of the results of those searches. He must direct the attention of that party to the fact that, as settlement agent, he cannot give advice on the legal significance of the information. The settlement agent cannot proceed to finalise the transaction until he receives written notice from his client to do so.

One point of interest in this connection in the Bill is that, if the land transaction has been negotiated by a land agent, the functions of the settlement agent must not include adjusting the rates and taxes unless that function is delegated to him by the land agent, and paid for by the land agent. This is because the Land Agents Act places this responsibility on the land agent, and the REIWA fixes the commission to take this into account.

I believe that a seller of property should not be obliged to pay twice for this service.

A further proposal is that a fidelity reserve fund be established from fidelity reserve fees, interest accruing from investments of funds in the deposits account, interest accruing from the investment of the fidelity reserve fund, and all other moneys lawfully paid into the fidelity reserve fund. The object of the fund is to accumulate money for any guarantee fund established by the board for the purpose of compensating persons who suffer pecuniary loss by reason of defalcation by a licensee who has been granted an annual certificate.

A settlement agents deposits trust is also to be established, along the lines of the legal contribution trust for lawyers.

Every licensee is to deposit to the credit of the trust a prescribed percentage of the lowest balance of his trust account. Every licensee is to maintain to the credit of the trust an amount not less than a prescribed percentage of the sum of the lowest balance of his trust account or accounts, and the amount standing on deposit by him to the credit of the trust. This would not apply where the lowest sum of the balances of the licensee's trust accounts, together with any amount standing on deposit by him with the trust, is less than $2 000. The board is required to invest all moneys so deposited with the trust with a bank in the State or on loan to the Treasurer.

All moneys accruing from investments are to be credited to an account called the "trust interest account" and are to be applied firstly in payment of the costs and expenses of administering the trust; the balance is to be divided equally between the fidelity reserve fund and the Law Society. The funds paid to the Law

Society are to be applied to the legal assistance fund for legal assistance, pursuant to the Legal Contribution Trust Act, and for a proportionate cost of administering that fund. In the provision of legal aid by the application of the funds paid from the "trust interest account", preference is to be given to persons having appointed a licensee to arrange or effect settlement who are seeking relief against the licensee in respect of matters arising out of the acts and defaults of the licensee in the performance of his functions.

The applicant must otherwise be eligible to receive legal aid under the Legal Contribution Trust Act.

The Bill contains 113 clauses, and the provisions I have outlined are its main features. I have not mentioned the many provisions which deal with matters of detail. The Bill as a whole has been designed to ensure that the public is properly protected, both as to the money entrusted to settlement agents, and in respect of the duties the agent is authorised to perform.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr Bertram: Before the Minister resumes his seat, would he indicate when he expects the debate to be resumed?

Mr O'NEIL: The member can ask for the debate to be adjourned for one week; I imagine that would be agreed to.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bertram.

BILLS (3): MESSAGES

Appropriations

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Forests Act Amendment Bill.
2. Settlement Agents Control Bill.
3. Veterinary Preparations and Animal Feeding Stuffs Bill.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [5.24 p.m.]: The Bill now before us will amend the Firearms Act of 1973 in three ways. I want to indicate that, generally, the Opposition is in agreement with the provisions of the Bill but there are some minor matters on which I will comment.

The Minister explained that the owner of a licensed rifle or firearm, who wished to visit Western Australia from another State, must obtain a temporary permit or a licence for the firearm involved. The Minister went on to say that provision caused some difficulty because a person crossing the border from one State to another could be involved in travelling some considerable distance in order to obtain a permit or a licence in that particular State. As has been pointed out, members of gun clubs wishing to visit this State experience some difficulty because of the existing provisions of the Act.

I understand that similar legislation has already been introduced in Victoria, and some of the other States. The Bill provides that the Commissioner of Police will be able to issue a permit to a bona fide organisation, such as a shooting club or a hunting party wishing to bring firearms into Western Australia. However, the permit will be issued for a period of seven days only. We do not consider a period of seven days to be sufficient.

Subclause (3) of clause 2 reads—

> An interstate group permit issued under this section shall not be granted for any period in excess of seven days.

Mr O'Connor: If the Opposition is unhappy with that provision I would be prepared to listen to any proposal for an amendment.

Mr T. H. JONES: That provision has brought forward the strongest criticism. Members of a shooting club who wished to travel from Queensland to Western Australia would be involved in considerable expense. If these people are permitted to stay in this State for a period of seven days only, they could be deterred from visiting our State. The members of the club might desire to take the opportunity to tour Western Australia, either the south or the north of the State. However, if they have a firearm permit for a period of seven days only, they will be considerably restricted.

The Opposition considers that the minimum period should be for one month. Perhaps the Minister might agree to go half-way with our suggestion, but I am sure he will realise that a period of seven days is far too restrictive. A shoot could easily take a week to complete. For that reason, we consider that a period of one month should be allowed when a permit is issued. After all, permits will be granted to bona fide clubs only on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police. I would assume that before such permits are issued the bona fides of the applicants will be taken into account. The Commissioner of Police would not issue a permit to the members of any club if he considered they were irresponsible people who were not interested in the sport of shooting.

We consider the restriction of seven days on a permit to be far too severe. Visitors from Queensland will be involved in considerable expense in coming to Western Australia, and to restrict them to a period of seven days will react against tourism in this State. We are trying to attract tourists to Western Australia but legislation such as that now proposed will restrict any person wih a firearm permit to a stay of seven days.

The Opposition feels that one month would be a more suitable period and that this provision would benefit the clubs concerned and also tourism in the State. I hope the Minister will give some consideration to the proposition we have advanced. I have not placed an amendment to this effect on the notice paper, but I believe in this instance common sense will prevail.

I understand that only one State has similar legislation but other States are looking into the matter. We feel that the provision for a seven-day period is far too restrictive.

The Opposition is in agreement with the second amendment contained in the Bill. Everyone is aware of the problem of farmers who fail to relicense their firearms. A farmer who has had his firearm confiscated is put to great inconvenience, and this applies particularly to orchardists who rely on their licensed firearms to control vermin. I have received numerous complaints about this matter, and no doubt other members who represent country areas have received similar complaints. A farmer is put to a considerable disadvantage when his rifle is confiscated due to his oversight in not renewing the licence.

The Minister indicated that fines imposed under this Act range from $1 to $150, and some people have been gaoled for three months because of their failure to renew their licences. The Minister told us also that during the past six months 857 fines were imposed totalling approximately $20 500. The Bill provides for an automatic fine of $20 when a firearm is not relicensed within three months of the date of expiry of the licence. Where a person does not wish to admit the offence, he may elect to go before the Court of Petty Sessions.

We believe this is good legislation. The Government knows that we do co-operate on occasions, and this is one of those occasions. Farmers have been concerned about the confiscation of their firearms and I have had many letters from fruit growers in the south-west about this matter. Members know that I represent the largest fruit-growing area in Western Australia, and as a consequence I am concerned about the quality of fruit coming onto the market. The quality of the fruit can be affected if farmers do not have firearms to destroy vermin.

The only other point I wish to make is in relation to the amendment to section 24(6)(b) of the Act. The Minister told us that prosecutors have declined to proceed against offenders because it has been necessary to prove that the police have been misled. The proposed amendment is to insert the words "or attempts to wilfully mislead".

As I indicated to the House, the Opposition would like the seven-day period extended. Apart from this, we support the measure.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.34 p.m.]: My colleague, the member for Collie, has indicated the attitude of members on this side of the House to this amending Bill. Our only disagreement is in regard to the seven-day provision for visitors into the State.

While this measure is before us, I would like to draw attention to several instances that have occurred when people have failed to relicense their firearms in the specified time. This has caused many problems and as my colleague pointed out, there have been 857 convictions resulting in fines totalling $20 500 in the past six months. This system is to be replaced by an automatic fine or the right of an offender to be heard in a court. I would prefer to see a system instituted whereby licence holders could be notified within one month of the expiry date of the licence, as happens in the case of motor vehicles. In the past this provision has caused some concern to normally responsible citizens who perhaps put their firearms away for the winter months and in the ordinary hurly-burly of life forget that the licence needs renewing. In many instances the first notification they receive that their firearms are no longer licensed is an order to surrender their firearms or to forward their licences.

I have here three letters referring to three such cases, and I took each one up with the appropriate authority. It appears that relicensing is not possible through a clerk of the court or a police station, but I believe it would be of great benefit if licenses could be renewed in this way. The Police Force labours under many difficulties and in any situation that is at all abrasive with the community, I feel an attempt should be made to remove the cause of the problem. I believe the Minister will agree with me about that. I do not know what administrative difficulties would be involved in regard to sending out notification of the expiry of a licence. If some additional costs were involved, I am sure this would not be objected to in view of the problems that would be avoided.

We believe that the whole administration of gun licences could be vastly improved by firstly, notification of expiry date, and secondly, facilities to renew licences in country areas. Surely some method could be devised to overcome the problem.

Mr O'Connor: There are a certain number of problems involved. Would you consider that it would be reasonable for the cost of a licence to be increased by $1 to cover this?

Mr H. D. EVANS: First of all, I am not quite sure of the administrative problems in providing notification as happens with motorcar licences. I should imagine it is quite reasonable to draw such a comparison.

Mr O'Connor: It costs about $4.50 for the work involved in sending out motor vehicle licences.

Mr H. D. EVANS: So the figure would be $4.50?

Mr O'Connor: Approximately.

Mr H. D. EVANS: What about the renewal of gun licences in country areas? In the past country police have performed very good work in this regard. Perhaps a country policeman would see someone he knew in the town and the policeman would say, "Your gun licence is due; what about it?" Many people appreciated this service and it led to a good relationship between the constabulary and the community. However, if firearm licensing is to become strictly impersonal, the relationship will suffer accordingly. I feel it is worth preserving such a facility to cultivate an atmosphere of this kind, and it would be much appreciated by the community. I do not know whether the cost of $4.50 would apply in relation to notification of renewal of a firearm licence.

Mr O 'Connor: I am not sure about that. I believe it could be less than the cost involved with motor vehicle licences, but I am not sure.

Mr H. D. EVANS: I put those two suggestions to the Minister, and I would appreciate his examining them to see whether they are practical as I believe it is desirable to see them implemented.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Police) [5.40 p.m.]: I would like to thank members—particularly the member for Collie—for their co-operation and general support of the Bill. As the member for Collie has been so co-operative, I indicate it is my intention also to be co-operative. He referred to the time limit in connection with the issue of a permit. I am quite happy to allow this to be amended in the Committee stage; however, I would ask that the period be extended to 14 days rather than one month.

Not only do we have people coming to this State with gun clubs, but also we have other people coming here from the Eastern States; therefore I would prefer to see permits limited to a period of 14 days. A person will still have the opportunity to apply for an extended permit, and the commissioner could approve that.

I am not keen on having too many guns coming into this State from other States for any great length of time, and I am sure the member for Collie would not like to see it. I think his request is reasonable, and I am happy to co-operate with him.

I will ensure that the points made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are investigated. I am not sure what it would cost for the work involved in sending out renewal notices for firearm licences; however, I am aware that at the moment local authorities receive $4 for every motor vehicle licence renewal they handle, and some are claiming that the amount is insufficient and are asking for an increase. I do not think it would cost $4 to handle a firearm licence, but I will have the matter investigated.

The reason I referred to a fee of $1 earlier is that I would be quite happy to pay that amount each year in order to have a notice sent to me. If it could be done for that amount, I am sure most people would accept it. As I said, I will have that matter looked at, and I will have the other points investigated also. I thank members for their co-operation and support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 17A added—

Mr T. H. JONES: The Minister indicated that he would be prepared to amend proposed subsection 17A (3) to extend the period of a permit from seven to 14 days. I appreciate the reason that he wanted it to be seven days in the first place. In my opinion he is worrying more about individuals, as distinct from organised clubs. Often members of organised clubs save hard for some time in order to make a visit to this State, and when they come in a body of 20 or 30 they may wish to stay for a while. In that case I would like him to give consideration to extending the period beyond 14 days in the case of bona fide organised clubs, and extending it to 14 days in the case of individual shooters.

Mr O'CONNOR: Most of the clubs that come here for a shoot remain here for only a few days. I do not know of any club which has remained longer than a week. I know the clay pigeon shooters recently held a shoot for four or five days; even that one did not last more than a week. I feel the suggested amendment will cover bona fide clubs. However, if the member so wishes I am prepared to have this matter discussed and, if necessary, to have an amendment moved in another place.

Mr T. H. Jones: I would like that.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am happy to do it.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 5 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

STOCK DISEASES (REGULATIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.47 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill, as the Minister explained, is to ensure that not only can we handle eradication and control measures of outbreaks of stock diseases, either enzootic or exotic, but also preventive measures. The danger of exotic stock diseases entering this country cannot be overstressed. Our livestock industries in total represent many millions of dollars, and with improved communication there is an increase in travel, bringing with it an increased risk of having an exotic disease introduced to our country. If something like Newcastle disease does hit us, it could result in total devastation of the livestock industry, and poultry would suffer very greatly indeed.

This Act was amended in 1974, and at that time a number of points dealing with the desirability of legislation of this kind were made. Subsequent to that we have had a number of visits to our north-western coast by fishermen, who in many cases are unauthorised. They bring with them certain livestock, such as cats and probably birds, and as a result we face a danger which has been fairly continuous for longer than we care to realise.

In these times one can travel by plane from somewhere in South-east Asia directly to one of the capital cities of Australia in a matter of only a few hours. It is not an exaggeration to say that a person could be walking in an infected street in a South-east Asian country, and then within a matter of four hours be in a position unwittingly to introduce a disease to this country which could cause millions of dollars worth of damage.

It is rather interesting to note that upon his return from overseas, Mr Anthony was required to remove his shoes for a short time while they were treated, to ensure they were not contaminated. This serves to illustrate that the vigilance which is necessary in this area can never be abated, although it is probably not as stringent as it could be. In many parts of the world, stricter regulations apply. For instance, I understand that when one is travelling from England to Ireland, it is necessary to walk through a disinfectant footbath, which prevents the spread of some disease by this method.

Of course, once an outbreak occurs, it is possible to bring it under control only at tremendous cost, because it involves not only the slaughter of suspect cattle but also compensation payments to the farmers involved. The loss to a country such as Australia, which is dependent upon the export of its animal products, would be very considerable should such a disease enter this country. Therefore, anything that can be done to prevent the outbreak of diseases of this kind should have the support of this Parliament. It is a matter which affects the entire community and is a responsibility which should be taken very seriously.

The Western Australian Department of Agriculture has facilities which would be equal to any in Australia. Excellent work is carried out at its research unit and its stock diseases house—although that is probably denigrating it; it is a very modern clinic which applies the latest technology to stock diseases. It provides for the quarantining of any suspect animal, as well as for the living in of the veterinary officers concerned. In that way, while it is possible to get all manner of laboratory equipment and provisions into the quarantine unit, the suspect animal and the officers concerned are excluded from all contact with the outside world, and anything emitted from the clinic is totally destroyed. It is a comfort to know this is part and parcel of the agricultural services of this State.

At the same time, however, such a facility can start to be effective only when a disease is suspected. It may even be too late at that stage to prevent a serious outbreak.

The precautionary preventive measures alluded to in this Bill will assist to make more secure the industries to which I have referred. The essential part of the Bill is contained in clause 6, which seeks to amend section 14 of the parent Act and in that way to give it its full application and authority. I understand that the powers for preventive action are not present in the existing Act and, obviously, it is desirable to include them.

Probably, this amendment is aimed in the first instance at the feeding of swill to pigs, though no doubt other situations are envisaged, probably even to the precautionary action of the mandatory bathing of all shoes worn by people entering Australia.

The provision for the treatment of swill fed to pigs was introduced in Western Australia following the outbreak of swine fever in 1942. At that time, there was a possible association between the feeding to pigs of infected scraps of pig meat mixed up in the swill and the outbreak of the disease. From that point, legislation relating to the treatment of swill came into effect.

Under that legislation, licences for the treatment of swill were issued to approved plant and the requirement was that the swill or waste food should be boiled at 100° C for two hours, which was considered sufficient to kill any bacteria which could be a potential hazard. This method of treatment has continued ever since, and it is regarded as being an effective safeguard.

It is not possible to assess the results of such treatment because there is no virus in this community against which we can judge its effectiveness. However, it has been shown in a number of countries that this method is successful in reducing the incidence of diseases.

Recently, however, it has been felt in Australia that the method of treatment is not really good enough because of the difficulties in enforcing the regulations. Members will appreciate the practical difficulties with which inspectors charged with the administration of the Act are confronted. They cannot tell whether or not swill has been treated; or, it may have been boiled for only half an hour or an hour and at a lesser temperature than that prescribed. It is almost impossible to say whether a treatment plant is effective in its treatment of waste food.

As a consequence, all States have agreed either in principle or in practice to make effective the provisions contained in this amendment; in some instances, a move has been made to introduce complementary legislation. It will still be possible to treat swill by autoclaving or by turning it into a dry feed by an evaporation and heating process. Of course, this would entail the establishment of more costly plant than the type operating at present. In special cases, it will still be possible to utilise meat scraps for feeding to pigs by the employment of the boiling method.

I understand that in Western Australia, some 18 swill feeders still hold licences to operate, 10 of whom are in the metropolitan area and the remainder in the country. This represents a considerable decline in the past two years, from the then current figure of 146 licences issued. This drop has been due to several factors.

The principle that is enunciated in this amendment—that of enabling protective and prohibitive action to be taken in the matter of stock diseases—is a most worthy one and one that we certainly support. In view of the fact that it is to be on a national basis and to involve national agricultural policy, it further merits our support.

There are other aspects to which I feel a colleague will draw some attention because they affect his district rather closely and entail the economics of some of the pig breeders in his area. On that basis and the situation as I have explained it, I give this measure my support.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [6.01 p.m.]: I rise to support this piece of amending legislation with a view to putting to the Minister some of the problems that have been brought to my notice by a constituent of mine who has a small farmlet in the Gidgegannup area. He has expressed some concern that with the probable and suggested abolition of the use of waste food, commonly referred to as pig swill, he will find himself in an economic situation in which he will no longer be able to sustain his venture into the industry. He runs about 400 pigs at any given time on his property, and of course it is merely a venture concerning the purchase, feeding, and resale at the appropriate time. The concern is that if the waste food is not available he will be placed in such an economic position that he will not be able to afford to purchase other food to take the place of the waste food, and the venture will then have to go out of business.

On the 12th August I asked some questions of the Minister regarding pig swill. My questions were prompted by a letter I received rather than the introduction of this amending legislation. I asked—

> For what reason was the use of pig swill being fed to pigs discontinued?

The answer was—

> Swill feeding of pigs is recognised throughout the world as the principle means of introducing and transmitting several very serious exotic animal diseases.

I take note of the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I agree that we must endeavour at all times to ensure that none of these exotic diseases are introduced into this country. It was for that purpose that I asked the question because I felt that we were again taking the old sledge hammer to crack a peanut. I have some concern as to whether it can be shown with any degree of certainty that for a number of years there has been any type of exotic swine disease which would cause this great concern. I then went on to ask—

> In the last 20 years has there been any outbreak of pig diseases that could be directly attributable to the use of pig swill?

The answers were—

> (2) Yes.
>
> (3) (a) Vesicular exanthema during 1952-1960 in the United States of America involved the destruction of 220 000 pigs, and an estimated cost of $39.5 million.

We do not want that situation to occur in Australia. I recognise that and I want to come back to it later. The Minister also mentioned swine vesicular disease in the United Kingdom. I think that is generally known as swine fever. Of course, we do not want that either. In the

United Kingdom there have been 250 separate outbreaks up to 1974. That disease has existed in England for many years and its control and eradication is costing millions of dollars with loss of trade for those people in the industry.

I find myself unable to say with any degree of surety that we have a problem that requires such far-reaching eradication measures. In the United Kingdom in 1967-68 foot-and-mouth disease was eradicated at a total cost of $200 million. The only evidence of swill fever in Australia in the last 20 years was during 1959 to 1962 and that was probably introduced by means of swill feeding.

The probability of such things happening worries me. I believe that by this piece of legislation we are taking a sledge hammer to crack a peanut. The mere assumption that something may happen should not mean that all waste food to be fed to pigs should be suspect. I think I would be irresponsible if I did not go along with the thought that there are certain waste foods which should be controlled most rigidly to ensure that the spread of exotic diseases does not take place in our State. I refer to outlets such as the wharf area where overseas ships come in with waste food to dispose of. My understanding is that that waste food is collected and destroyed at a disposal unit which is situated on one of the moles and the general population does not come into contact with it.

We could find that irresponsible people returning from overseas may bring in pig meat of some kind which could have an infection. We hope our Customs officers are able to overcome that problem. Where do we look in the area of waste foods which could cause exotic disease in this country? Naturally we will have to look at the question of waste food from international airlines which travel from those countries where such diseases are evident. Again I feel that this could be controlled. I do not know why it cannot be controlled at the source. I understand that at the airport there is already a means of disposal for those waste foods. In the last 20 years there has been no evidence of the introduction of an exotic disease, except probably in New South Wales.

I do not want it to be thought that I am not concerned about this problem. My colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has adequately expressed that concern. I agree with his remarks but I believe we should look at the question of the small pig farmer who will not be able to sustain his venture in the future because he just cannot afford the replacement of the waste food which is now at his disposal by any other form of food. He will just go out of business. In this modern country of ours, when we have all sorts of rural problems, it does not seem to me to be on to say to small industry, "We are sorry, merely because of the probability of introduction of disease we may have to shut you down and you will no longer be able to undertake the feeding, rearing, and disposal of 400 pigs so that you can make a profit."

I ask the Minister whether he can assure me that the Act in the future will be able to be relaxed when it can be shown that people are treating swill in accordance with the present regulations by making sure that the necessary temperature, which is 100° C, is reached in the treatment and virtual pasteurisation of a particular waste food. I cannot see why pig swill cannot still be available, under strict supervision, to those people who can show to the Department of Agriculture that their viability will be in question. It is for those small farmers that I make this appeal tonight. Of course only one has approached me but I have no doubt there are others in the same position.

Whilst I agree that we should keep this disease out and that most rigid controls are necessary, I cannot accept the probability that, after 14 years of freedom from this particular disease, we now need the action that is contemplated in this amending legislation. In fairness to those small farmers who may be subjected to the loss of an income because this waste food will not be available to them in the future, it should be considered whether the regulations that will be brought down need to be a blanket cover which says, "Sorry, you will not be able to use that food, notwithstanding the fact that you can prove to our satisfaction that you are conscious of your responsibility and that you treat the food in the proper way."

In the main, where does this waste food come from? I do not think anybody goes to the airport to pick it up. He would not be allowed to do so. I do not think people go to the ships to get waste food because it is all destroyed in an incinerator on the wharf. Where else could they obtain this possibly contaminated food to feed the pigs? We are free of the disease and have been free for 20 years. I can assume that it is not here now otherwise we would have evidence of it amongst the herds of swine at present in Western Australia and in Australia as a whole.

The questions I asked covered the international scene and the answers indicated the rare occurrence of these diseases outside those countries which are riddled with them, such as the United Kingdom. I feel that this legislation is a little too much to ask of the people for whom I make this plea tonight; and I ask that they be given some consideration. I hope the Minister can show some evidence of his

concern for them and that when the appropriate time comes they will not be forced out of business by a piece of legislation or by regulations which, I repeat, are like using a sledge hammer to crack a peanut.

Sitting suspended from 6.13 to 7.30 p.m.

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [7.30 p.m.]: The Bill before us is rather important. Reference has been made by previous speakers to the problems which could be associated with the banning of swill feeding of pigs. They have also mentioned the dangers of exotic diseases being introduced into our State. It is realised that some measures must be taken to prevent this occurring.

The banning of swill feeding of pigs was brought to my attention when I was Minister for Agriculture, and after discussing the implications at some length with Ministers in other States and also with the industry in Western Australia, I spoke with a number of pig breeders who came to see me on several occasions to express their concern about the effect the banning of swill feeding to pigs would have on their industry. Due to their representations I twice deferred the application of the ban.

Since then the matter has been thoroughly researched and it has been decided that it would be desirable to ban swill feeding. I was sympathetic towards the pig breeders and their problems. In some areas the pig breeders had the appropriate boilers, and if they are operated at the required temperature for a certain time, the swill is rendered suitable for feeding. The problem arises when the boilers do not operate evenly all the time and when they are not watched closely enough to guarantee that the swill is rendered safe. There is always the risk that some of the waste or scraps may be spilt and not put in the boilers and in this way the disease could spread. I was very sympathetic, as I have said, and I appreciated their point of view.

However, one has to listen to those experts involved in the administration of the legislation covering stock diseases. They have weighed up the situation, having considered the proposals previously presented and those which have been presented since.

Perhaps one is rather reluctant to agree that the banning is necessary, but on the advice provided by those people who have studied the subject thoroughly, it has been considered desirable to have this matter under legislative control and the ban imposed. I agree with the Bill before us and believe that the inclusion of the preventive measures mentioned in the second reading speech by the Minister is desirable.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [7.36 p.m.]: The Bill before us certainly does not ban the swill feeding of pigs, but there is no denying that it is designed to be a vehicle by which regulations can be promulgated to allow that to be done. One would be foolish if one tried to convince people otherwise.

The subject under discussion is serious. The Bill has been fairly well covered by the members who have spoken and I thank them for their contributions. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is well versed in the situation, mentioned services provided by the Department of Agriculture, and various hazards we have experienced, including the outbreak of swine fever in 1942. As he said, although it was never clearly established, it is fairly well accepted that the outbreak was the result of an infected ham bone or residue of pork or some such pig meat.

Australia has been singularly lucky in its comparative freedom from exotic diseases, but we would live in a fool's paradise if in these days of quick transport and massive movement of people around the world, we considered ourselves to be immune for all time. There is no doubt that people are, in fact, carrying treated pig meats from other countries, and while the efficiency of the Customs Department is not being questioned, there is no doubt there are times when some of these meats are introduced into Australia.

The question has been asked, and may well be asked: How would this affect the animals of Australia? It needs only one piece of affected meat to get into swill which is not properly treated for trouble to occur. Under the present regulations we rely upon the integrity of the swill feeder to ensure that the swill is boiled at 100° C for two hours. If this is not done, the boiling is ineffective and sterilisation does not occur.

It would be irresponsible of this Parliament not to take steps to protect the livestock industry in Australia. As was pointed out by the member for Mt. Marshall, this matter has been under discussion for some time and accord has been reached between the Australian Agricultural Council and all States to regulate to ban the feeding of swill to pigs, and Western Australia is the last State to come into line.

The member for Mt. Marshall also stated that he did in fact twice postpone the introduction of regulations. However, I believe the time has arrived when preparation must be made for the promulgation of regulations concerning the banning of swill feeding.

The people of Western Australia would be faced with an impossible situation—engendered by this Parliament—if we did not heed this aspect of animal health. It has been estimated that 60 per cent of the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in Europe are caused by food residues. It has also been estimated that an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia—which would undoubtedly prohibit the export of meat for at least 12 months—would cost us in the vicinity of $3 000 million in the loss of export earnings.

As was pointed out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, not a great number of farmers feed swill these days. However, I do acknowledge that those who do will be disadvantaged. By disadvantaging those few we will ensure the safety of the livestock industry throughout Australia.

The member for Swan asked for some assurance regarding a swill feeder in his electorate. Unfortunately I can give him no such assurance. The Government is very conscious of the fact that some people will be adversely affected.

Mr Skidmore: He will go out of business.

Mr OLD: It will be an unfortunate situation for those affected, but it will provide insurance for the livestock industry of Australia. As for the particular swill feeder going out of business, I suggest the member for Swan should advise his constituent to contact the Department of Agriculture regarding an alternative method of feeding.

Mr Skidmore: He already has contacted the department.

Mr OLD: Alternative methods of feeding are available, and some people who have changed over are still making money. The feeding of swill to pigs is a hit-and-miss operation, in any case, because there can be no balanced ration and it is impossible to gauge the amount of protein being fed to the animals.

A very important aspect in the control of exotic diseases is the compensation involved. If we were unfortunate enough to have an outbreak of an exotic disease in Western Australia—and Victoria recently had an outbreak of Newcastle disease—we would be covered by an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government and the other States. Under that arrangement the Commonwealth will pay 50 per cent of the compensation, and the other States will contribute according to the stock population of the particular animal affected. If we did not impose a ban on the feeding of swill, and we were unfortunate enough to have an outbreak of swine fever—or something worse—we would be placed in the invidious position of having to go to the Commonwealth and the other States to ask for assistance after having undertaken to ban the feeding of swill and being irresponsible in not implementing that ban.

I repeat: We are concerned for those who will be financially disadvantaged. I can only offer the assistance of the Department of Agriculture in an attempt to overcome the problem which those people will experience as a result of the banning of swill feeding.

I commend the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 16A added—

Mr SKIDMORE: I am most reluctant to raise again the question of relief being given to the small type of farmer who will find considerable difficulty in obtaining a substitute food in order to keep his enterprise viable. The Minister said he regretted it was unfortunate that those people could not be assisted in any way; they would have to accept that if they were forced out of production that was part of the total protection of the industry. The Minister said those people were expendables. However, I cannot accept that.

The Department of Agriculture has advanced a very slender argument in claiming that this State faces a major catastrophe with the introduction of exotic diseases simply because the present legislation could not control such a situation. The answers to my questions have indicated there is no evidence of the introduction of any exotic disease during the last 20 years.

I do not consider myself to be irresponsible, and I certainly do not believe the Government is irresponsible. However, I do not question the matter of responsibility; I raise the point that if the small pig farmer has to be the sacrificial goat why cannot some protection be given to him? Are the small farmers to go to the wall for the benefit of the big producers who can afford to make the necessary changes and alterations in their systems of feeding?

A small pig farmer will not risk his business or livelihood by feeding swill which has not been treated properly. He would be aware of the problems facing the industry in which he was involved and he would be careful not to use waste which was contaminated. It would have to be a real coincidence for contaminated meat to get into the waste food he used.

One would assume an individual came off a plane with a piece of diseased meat carrying the virus which contaminated the swine herds in this State. It would have gone into the individual's waste bin and have been collected by the normal authority and buried at the local tip. The possibility of the introduction of an exotic disease under those circumstances is a thousand to one.

I find I am unable to say the Minister has shown any degree of sympathy. He sympathises but says, "I'm sorry, but you are going." I do not believe that is good enough. I do not see why a responsible person operating under these conditions with a small number of pigs—400 in the case I mentioned—cannot be given some dispensation. A blanket cover will kill the incentive.

The Minister suggests that my constituent go to the Department of Agriculture. Of course, he has been there. He is a responsible pig breeder and wants to find out how he can overcome the difficulties. He was told very little could be done and it was a Commonwealth decision that swill must not be fed to pigs.

I understand a number of extensions have been granted as from the 1st September. That is small comfort to these people because they have been told they can overcome the problem by providing a prepared feed. Because of the very stringent controls in the industry which makes pellets and so on for feeding to pigs and other stock, the animals would have a very well balanced feed and would probably be better off as far as the production of pig meats is concerned, but we must take into consideration the economics of providing a cheap, readily available feed No person would knowingly run the risk of causing disease in his stock, which the Minister suggests would occur because the situation cannot be controlled by inspection. Nobody would be so irresponible with his own herd, and the argument falls down. It is wrong to assume that would be the situation.

I accept the fact that we must have responsible legislation but again I voice my objection to the callous attitude of the Government when it says, "Sorry, there is nothing we can do. You cannot stay in the primary industry of producing pig meats. You will have to go to the wall because people who are bigger than you can afford prepared feed." That is a remarkable attitude in this day and age when primary producers are in dire need of assistance from Governments. I do not know what action has been taken in the other States—I am speaking only about this State—but if that is the hardened attitude of the other States I condemn it as I condemn the attitude taken here.

I do not believe a primary producer should be faced with going out of business because the Government says there has been one probable case in 20 years. It has been suggested one ham bone or one piece of meat could have caused trouble but no definite evidence has been given. None of the scientists or analysts could say, "This is the piece of meat or the ham bone which caused the problem." It could have caused the problem; it got in somewhere. But to make a blanket cover in regard to swill is dishonest to my mind. It puts people into the category of irresponsible pig breeders who do not worry about whether their herds are exposed to exotic diseases. I cannot understand it. The heartless attitude of the Government is evident.

I did not ask for an assurance that something would be done. I thought I expressed the hope that if it were possible there would not be a blanket cover and that the regulations might permit the feeding of swill under very special circumstances. Let us look at that proposition.

We are talking about 10 licences in the metropolitan area and eight licences in the country. The holder of one of the metropolitan licences could be the person to whom I referred. It would be necessary to patrol 10 metropolitan licences in connection with the feeding of swill. The licensees cannot get swill from places which are contaminated. They do not get it from the wharves or the airport. The only possible way contamination could be introduced is through an individual, and that individual's rubbish would be disposed of in the normal way. That may be the way exotic diseases were introduced in the past and perhaps that is how the ham bone came in, but I will not accept that as a positive theory, any more than the Minister or the department can advance a theory of probability.

I think the Minister should have another look at the matter to try to ensure that the small producers are not in doubt as to where they are going. I will not go along with this provision. I make my protest well known. I do not believe we will be acting irresponsibly in granting a dispensation to responsible primary producers. If the Government's attitude is that all the pig breeders are irresponsible, I hope primary producers will bear it in mind in the future.

Mr OLD: I can only reiterate that we are sympathetic, despite the accusations by the member for Swan that we are hard-hearted and have no sympathy for these people.

I inform the member for Swan that many people are feeding their herds with feed stuffs other than swill, and some of those people do not grow their own grain. In my electorate there are people who are raising pigs and feeding them on grain and additives. They do not grow grain and they are able to carry out their enterprises successfully and make money out of them. I suggest to the member for Swan that his constituent see the Department of Agriculture.

Mr Skidmore: He has been there.

Mr OLD: The member for Swan assures me his constituent has been there.

Mr Skidmore: I do not assure you; I make the statement.

Mr OLD: I ask the honourable member to let me have the name of his constituent in order that I may ensure he has been to the department and find out what advice he was given.

As for exempting people so that they may feed swill, it is just not on. If we did that we would be back to square one. It would have to be policed. We would need the consent of the other States of

the Commonwealth to share in the compensation scheme. We would need an efficient inspectorial service, for which the producer would have to pay. Overall, I think it would pay producers to utilise another type of feed.

I do not appreciate the fact that the member for Swan accused me of having no sympathy for the producer. That is quite erroneous, and he knows very well it is. I reiterate that it is irresponsible to say pig breeders should continue feeding swill because it has not been proved at any time that swill has caused an exotic disease. We cannot allow it if there is any chance at all of swill causing an exotic disease. The member for Swan puts it at the low odds of a thousand to one. If the odds were five million to one it might be worth taking a chance, but on his assessment of a thousand to one I completely reject the proposition.

Mr SKIDMORE: I rise to take the Minister to task again. Apparently he is critical of my inability to comprehend betting odds, which he obviously understands. Probably I should have used the expression "five million to one".

Mr Old: Don't steal my thunder!

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not a betting man, so probably I used a wrong equation. However, whether or not it was a reasonable betting proposition, I used the phrase to indicate that there is very little chance of these diseases being introduced as the Department of Agriculture has suggested. If the diseases can be introduced to this State so easily, either we have been extremely fortunate over the past 20-odd years or our Customs officers have been doing an excellent job in controlling the situation.

I sense that the Minister feels I am irresponsible in raising such an issue. He is entitled to express that opinion, but I assure him that is not the case. In my opinion, throughout my entire speech I demonstrated a responsible attitude to the whole question. I said the Government is doing the right thing, but I suggested there should be a relaxation of attitude in regard to some primary producers who are in difficulties.

The Minister told us that some people in his electorate are managing to feed their pigs without this swill, and that these were not people who produced grain. I could say also that I know people in Eneabba who have fed pigs for years without the use of pig swill. However, these people operate under a different set-up and they can mix their own feed. We should compare like with like and the Minister should have regard for the small producers rather than validate his argument by referring to certain producers in his own electorate.

I felt I should make these additional remarks in order to clear up the matter so that the people of whom I have been speaking will know that I have not been acting irresponsibly. In the years to come others will be able to judge whether or not I have acted irresponsibly. The Minister is aware that the small producers will be sacrificed with the introduction of this provision.

Mr MOILER: I would like to rise to support the member for Swan. I listened to his contribution and I believe he put forward very sound and reasonable arguments. The previous Minister for Agriculture, who obviously knows his facts, has told me that the last outbreak of swine fever was in 1942. During the war swine fever was introduced by the American forces by way of ham brought into the country. The only reason for this rigid requirement in relation to pig swill has been concern about the outbreak of swine fever.

I was surprised at the figures presented by the member for Swan when he told us there were 10 piggeries in the metropolitan area and eight in country areas. The Government talks about federalism and the fact that we should not be forced to toe the line just because Victoria and New South Wales decide to do something. Surely it is reasonable for this State to give some latitude to these 10 industries in the metropolitan area and the eight in country areas. I ask the Minister to re-examine this legislation in an endeavour to introduce something more reasonable. If these piggeries do not utilise the pig swill, we will then have the problem of disposing of it by some other method, and this will add a further cost burden to the State. It would be quite easy to police the sterilisation of the swill.

Mr Old: We would have to have one man for each farm to police it.

Mr MOILER: I see no reason for one inspector to each farm.

Mr Old: If it is to be policed an inspector would have to be present at a dozen piggeries throughout the metropolitan area whenever swill is cooked.

Mr MOILER: Had the Minister listened he would know that there are 10 piggeries in the metropolitan area. Obviously the member for Swan knows more about it than he does.

Mr Old: I would challenge that, but carry on. Tell us how you would police it. This will be interesting.

Mr MOILER: The Minister may be interested to know that pet foods coming here from other States are manufactured from condemned carcases. This manufacture would not be permitted in Western Australia, but such pet foods can be introduced from other States.

Mr Old: They have been sterilised.

Mr MOILER: They are sterilised in the same way as pig swill could be sterilised.

Mr Old: How?

Mr MOILER: I do not intend to go into it here.

Mr Old: I'll bet you don't!

Mr Blaikie: You can't.

Mr MOILER: I will put up a theory, and perhaps the Minister will tell me why it will not work. A number of piggeries have boilers and the swill could be boiled for a certain period of time and it would then be sterilised. Can the Minister dispute that?

Mr Blaikie: It would depend on how it is handled.

Mr Old: When does the inspector see it? It has to be boiled for two hours at 100° C. You said we could introduce an inspectorial service.

Mr MOILER: This could be organised so that swill went into the boiler at a certain time and came out at a certain time. It is as simple as that.

Mr O'Connor: That is simplifying it!

Mr MOILER: If an inspector found any pig food that had not been sterilised, the person operating the piggery would lose his licence immediately.

Mr Old: What evidence would an inspector have unless he stayed around for two hours?

Mr MOILER: An inspector could obtain samples of food from a piggery at any time. If it were found on analysis that food had not been sterilised, the owner of the piggery would lose his licence. It is as simple at that.

Mr Old: Simple all right!

Mr MOILER: Some veterinary officers from the State attend meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council, and these officers have their own occupation in mind. They return from the conferences and bring back ideas such as this regardless of the overall effect it will have in Western Australia.

Mr Blaikie: Have you ever heard of exotic diseases?

Mr MOILER: Yes.

Mr Blaikie: How are they transmitted?

Mr MOILER: In a number of ways. The member for Vasse can get up later and dispute what I am saying. He can then explain everything about exotic diseases, if he feels he is such a full bottle on them. In the area represented by the Minister for Agriculture the pigs are fed on local grain, and there is no problem in those areas.

Mr Old: Is that a fact?

Mr MOILER: Yes. I should imagine that would be so; I see no reason that it would not be so.

Mr Old: Most are in intensive feeding sheds.

Mr MOILER: Fair enough, they may well be; but they are grain fed and the grain is probably grown in the area. The same applies in the Merredin area and in other parts of the wheatbelt; it is quite simple to feed pigs on grain produced in the area. However, the simple fact is that a bureaucratic department—the Department of Agriculture—has brought forward a measure to bring us into line with what the other States propose to do. This may well be a reasonable proposition in other States, but it is quite unacceptable to Western Australia in the rigid manner in which it is proposed to introduce it. It could be varied in the manner suggested by the member for Swan so that it is of benefit to Western Australia.

Mr SKIDMORE: It has been suggested that the disposal of this waste will be undertaken using the normal facilities of shire councils in both metropolitan and country areas, whereas previously the waste would have been taken away, either treated or untreated, and disposed of by being fed to animals.

What will we do with this not inconsiderable amount of waste? Many tons of it must be disposed of daily. If the Perth City Council is involved, it will deliver the waste to the Midland tip, where it will be buried at some future time; and it will be considered to have been adequately disposed of.

Mr Hartrey: What about stray dogs?

Mr SKIDMORE: Yes, and what about country areas where waste could be disposed of in that way but not covered? I do not want to denigrate country shires, but I would hazard a guess that their disposal methods would leave a little to chance. I have observed the tipping of waste at Midland, and I can inform the Minister that the landfill operation there is taken down below the water level of the river.

Mr Nanovich: It shouldn't be.

Mr SKIDMORE: I agree, but I can assure the member that it is, because I can see water at the bottom of the excavation. The Perth City Council probably removes waste from all the restaurants in the City of Perth, and this will finish up on the Midland tip and ultimately be buried—a very safe way of ensuring protection against exotic diseases! It will not even be treated; it will just be buried, and this is supposed to make it safe from stray dogs, seagulls, etc. I suggest one could count 2 000 or 3 000 gulls in the vicinity of the Hertha Road tip, and they pick up waste food and fly off with it. Where does it finish up? By this means it is distributed far and wide; yet the Government will not allow primary producers to pasteurise it, on the ground that the pasteurisation cannot be policed.

I would like the Minister to answer the question I have asked in this place on a previous occasion regarding the disposal of this waste. The answer given at the time was that no action was being taken. The member for Rockingham has since

raised the issue, and I see still nothing is being done. Who is being irresponsible? I suggest primary producers would be responsible enough to treat this waste to ensure that their pigs' feed is not contaminated; but the Minister thinks they are not that responsible and that he should allow the distribution of this waste far and wide, by allowing it to be dumped on a tip without pasteurisation or any other form of control.

With regard to the Midland tip I am worried that if the river rises two or three feet—as it can overnight—this waste could float across the flats and into the river. What degree of control will the Minister have in those circumstances?

Mr OLD: I feel I should make a couple of small points. The disposal of swill has been investigated by the Department of Public Health, and the Bill was delayed until that department was satisfied that swill could be disposed of properly and hygienically. I suggest the Department of Public Health is in the best position to say whether or not that is possible.

With regard to policing the sterilisation of swill, the member for Mundaring was not very convincing. Often swill is boiled in long trough-type containers, and it is not unusual for one part of the trough to be boiling while the other parts are not. Unless there is complete and continual surveillance there is no way of knowing the swill has been properly treated.

The member spoke about federalism and about being pushed around by Commonwealth and State Governments; I suggest that it was the Minister in the previous Government who first agreed in principle to the banning of swill in this fashion.

Mr MOILER: I would like to answer one or two points raised by the Minister. I was challenged earlier regarding the fact that it would not be possible to sterilise pig swill properly. The fertiliser one buys from abattoirs has been sterilised. It is produced from a waste product and therefore is the same type of product about which we are now talking. What is at issue is the degree to which the material should be sterilised. We should simply say to the operators, "This is the standard you must achieve, and if you do, you will be given a certificate to enable you to operate."

Mr Old: The Bill already contains such a provision to enable a man who is prepared to do it properly to obtain a licence.

Mr MOILER: The Minister stated that the Public Health Department claimed huge amounts of swill were being disposed of properly and hygienically. But he did not say how it was being disposed of. Newspaper reports indicate this material is being dumped at rubbish disposal sites. I concede that some local authorities may cover this waste in the correct manner, but in other areas it may not be covered properly.

Mr Old: You have no regard for the Public Health Department.

Mr MOILER: The Public Health Department does not cover the waste material.

Mr Old: Is any policing being done by health officers?

Mr MOILER: Little or none. Their time is not taken up in policing such activities. If this swill is not disposed of properly at the local council rubbish tips, is it not conceivable that the very problems the Minister hopes to avoid by this legislation may arise by the inefficient disposal of the waste product previously fed to pigs? Could not the disease of which the Minister is so afraid be spread by some other method?

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.25 p.m.]: The purpose of this Bill is one to which nobody could take exception. The Minister pointed out that the existing legislation provided for a maximum period of only 30 days within which time a claim for compensation for losses as a result of tuberculosis or brucellosis in stock—these being the two main diseases for which compensation is paid—could be lodged. I know of a number of instances where such applications were lodged after the prescribed time had elapsed, but this was in no way due to irresponsibility on the part of the individuals involved. The producers concerned experienced considerable difficulty in their efforts to persuade the Minister to exercise his prerogative. This has happened on a number of occasions; indeed, the situation may become even more exasperating as abattoirs become operative in areas far distant from the metropolitan area.

The only purpose of this measure is to increase from 30 to 90 days the time in which an owner must lodge his application for compensation. The Opposition applauds the legislation.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [8.26 p.m.]: As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, this indeed is a very simple measure. As he is well aware, there have been times when—especially in the case of northern meatworks—station owners have not received their account sales in time to lodge an application for compensation within the

prescribed period. This has created an administrative problem, and this measure will simplify the procedure. In addition, the Minister will retain the prerogative to grant the payment of compensation after the 90-day period has expired.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL EMPLOYEES' HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

MR T. J. BURKE (Perth) [8.30 p.m.]: This is a small but quite important measure. When the legislation was first introduced on the 4th October, 1973, the then Minister for Housing (Mr Arthur Bickerton) referred to the fact that efforts had been made in post-war Western Australia to foster enterprise outside the metropolitan area. This was, I believe, the prime motivation behind the legislation.

He went on to say—

> The basic concern is with the smaller enterprise without substantial backing, whose limited capital resources and repayment capacity are required for plant and equipment . . .

He also said that if they had to provide housing for their employees they would find themselves in a fair amount of difficulty. He indicated, as the Minister and other members are aware, that there are other measures which provide for housing for people such as this but none was provided specifically up to that date.

In introducing the legislation the then Minister pointed out that he felt the legislation accommodated those employed by someone in the rural areas who had to provide housing for employees to promote or develop his business.

The debate was resumed by the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Des O'Neil) who had previously been a Minister for Housing. He spoke at length. He prompted a response from Mr Bickerton so I shall read part of the speech because I think it is worth while. It pre-empts the piece of legislation we have before us tonight. On the 10th October, 1973, Mr Bickerton said—

> Probably the legislation will need to be amended from time to time to fit into a more modern concept. However, one of the problems we encounter at the present time, as I know the Deputy Leader of the Opposition realises, is the number of small industries which wish to commence outside the metropolitan area and, even though they may be viable under some circumstances, they find that by the time they supply housing for their employees the proposition is no longer viable.

It has become apparent—this is obviously why the present Minister has introduced this amendment to the Act—that the Act does not encompass all the requirements that it was felt needed to be met. In his second reading speech the Minister pointed out to the House that the provisions of the original legislation are twofold: firstly, to provide from the limited resources of the authority accommodation for people in the areas that I have specified; and, secondly, to underwrite lending to companies to provide accommodation for their employees.

I have not researched this matter thoroughly enough to ascertain exactly what prompts the Minister's statement, but he said that it is felt that, to date, the legislation does not provide authority beyond the purchase of land. If this is a fact I think the Opposition would be happy to support legislation which seeks to implement the intention of the original Act which was to provide accommodation—not just a piece of land on which to build, but land and housing—for employees of decentralised industry. If that is what the Minister is seeking we are happy to support his legislation.

However, the Minister went on to comment on the fact that the legislation as it stands does not provide for the development of land to bring it to subdivided residential use. We are happy to support that also on the understanding, of course, that the subdivided land is provided for people who are employed in decentralised industry. We do not want to see the Government or the Treasury underwriting subdivisions in country centres for the sake of profit on the part of certain people who might indulge in that sort of exercise. It is rife in the metropolitan area, as members are no doubt aware, and we do not want to see it happening in the country, let alone happening under the auspices of the Treasury, particularly as the Treasury, under this legislation, is going to meet the cost of default.

The only other point I wish to raise with the Minister is that he referred to only three cases in his second reading speech. He said that this matter was brought to his attention by a particular case and that the authority presently has before it two other applications. On the surface that does not look like sufficient reason to bring legislation before the Parliament and I hope it is not the only reason the Minister has brought the legislation here. We appreciate and will not decry the need to provide for the sort of case that brought the matter to the Minister's attention. The Minister was able to provide for that situation under the

Housing Loan Guarantee Act. Perhaps the other two which are presently before the Minister can also be provided for and I hope the Minister can assure the House that our time is not being wasted in the interests of one, two or three people. With those few words I am prepared on behalf of the Opposition to give general support to this legislation.

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Housing) [8.35 p.m.]: I thank the member for Perth for his remarks on the Bill. As he quite rightly indicated, it is a small piece of legislation but, indeed, it is very far reaching. The original purpose of the parent Act was exactly as he described it. As I indicated in my second reading speech, all we are now seeking to do is to define more clearly the role of the authority, but more especially to enable it to do what it was originally intended it would do. Those were the points which the then Minister mentioned in his second reading speech when he introduced the original legislation.

To enable the specific purposes to be more safely and adequately fulfilled, the amendments in the Bill will put beyond doubt the power of the authority to do what was originally desired it should do. What we are seeking is related to the aspects of the Treasury's guarantees.

I want to comment on two or three other points raised by the member for Perth, on which he has sought some clarification. I would define the operating area of authority as the nonmetropolitan area rather than the rural area. Two of the regions in which this authority has already constructed houses are in remote parts of the State. I am referring to the regions where the authority has constructed a number of houses in centres for mining operations. In fact, this is a nonmetropolitan region, rather than a rural region, if one implies that "rural" means "agricultural".

It is certainly not only the small industries which are assisted. Although the Minister of the day who introduced the original legislation made reference to this aspect, considerable attention has been paid by the authority to small industries, in the sense that it might be the provision of a house for a mechanic employed at a garage at Carnamah. The capital resources of the proprietor would be invested in the business and in what is required to run it, and he might not be in a position to find the extra money to provide accommodation for his employee.

We have devoted considerable attention to that aspect. However, the authority has not been established just for that purpose. The authority is now receiving much more attention from larger businesses; consequently we are seeking to amend the Act, but the amendments are still within the framework of the original concept.

The next two aspects are compatible with the legislation. There is the question of funds for land development. The only funding that will be carried out under the terms of this amending Bill will relate to dwellings built by the authority. The next question relates to the size of the two housing projects to which I made reference in my second reading speech. One project is for the construction of 20 houses, and the other is for the construction of 40 houses.

The project for 40 houses will satisfy the housing needs of a meatworks, and land development aspects are associated with the 40 houses which the authority will be building.

The project for the building of 20 units relates to an application from the northern part of the State. Again, this is associated with a completely decentralised industry. In this case no land development costs are involved at all; however, in the case of the meatworks project some land development costs are. Quite clearly my remarks will put at rest any fears that the land development undertaken by the authority might be connected with the funding of extraneous schemes or housing projects.

I thank the member for Perth for raising the points he has raised. I agree with him that the original intent of the Minister of the day who introduced the original legislation was that the authority should serve the decentralised industries of the State. I am quite confident that this amending Bill will be able to implement that much better.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Housing) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Title—

Mr T. J. BURKE: I overlooked one point in my second reading speech.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): The two clauses of the Bill have already been agreed to. Is the honourable member speaking to the title of the Bill?

Mr T. J. BURKE: I am speaking to the title. When the original legislation was introduced in 1973, two speakers from the then Opposition and one speaker from the then Government took part in the debate. One was the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition who formerly had been a Minister for Housing, and the other was the member for Roe. In that debate reference was made to farm housing. I am sure the Minister would have read the debate which took place at that time, and would have been involved in the discussions which brought this amending Bill before us.

I am interested to know why as a Minister and a member of the National Country Party he did not feel the necessity to include amendments to encompass the needs of farmers and rural interests. If the Minister can allay my concern I will be grateful.

Mr P. V. JONES: I shall answer the honourable member's comments in the same way as I answered those put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when we were discussing the Rural Housing (Assistance) Bill. At the time he asked the same question as to why we were introducing a completely new housing authority—namely, the Rural Housing Authority—instead of encompassing its functions within the existing bodies. There were several reasons for that. At that time I answered the question which is similar to the one now posed by the member for Perth.

The second reading speech of the Minister of the day who introduced the original legislation clearly defined the functions which this authority would carry out. The section of the community to which the member for Perth has referred is already encompassed by a separate housing authority which is covered by a special Act and which has separate powers under its own legislation.

One of the reasons for setting up the authority is to give it power to involve itself in semi-governmental borrowings. There is also the question of the establishment of each authority. The one in question is a board with a membership that is directed towards the aims and objectives I have outlined. Similarly the Rural Housing Authority operates in that direction also. By no means have we avoided encompassing the needs of the rural section of the community; in fact, we have given it the specialised treatment it deserves.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

POLICE

Drugs: Display

THE SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson): For the information of members I would remind them again that there is a small display in the corridor near the post office, and that it might be of interest to them. If they have not seen the display they might like to take the opportunity to have a look at it. However, I do not want to denude the numbers in the Chamber; I am merely making this announcement to remind members that the display is there.

ALSATIAN DOG ACT REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 11th May.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.47 p.m.]: At the onset I would like to make it clear that I have no intention of opposing the Bill; as a matter of fact I go along with its provisions. Personally, I admire the German shepherd as an animal. I can remember a German shepherd which was a mascot of an Air Force squadron, and it had amassed some hundreds of flying hours. That was as fine an animal as one could possibly find.

I am aware of the problems which confront the German Shepherd Dog Association, and I have been sympathetic towards them. Of course, one of the problems is to obtain animals of a sufficiently high standard to rejuvenate the stock in this State. The association considered that the standard was falling below that in other parts of Australia, and certainly it was below world standard.

I am also aware of the problems which confront the pastoral industries, and I am aware of the responsibilities of the Agriculture Protection Board and the dedicated and dogged service it has given over the years.

On a number of occasions the member for Maylands and the member for Perth, as well as the German Shepherd Dog Association, made an approach for a review of the existing legislation. I have been sympathetic towards the approaches of the German Shepherd Dog Association and the owners of these animals, but when I was in a position to do so I firmly and continuously rejected the suggestion that the Act be repealed, or that there should be any major modification of it. I adopted that view not through a lack of sympathy for the people concerned, but rather from a sense of responsibility to the pastoral industry. I might add that view was supported by the Agriculture Protection Board, the Farmers' Union, and the Pastoralists and Graziers Association.

To their credit my colleagues accepted—rather grudgingly I will admit—the recommendations I submitted. Now I find that the policy of the APB is consistent. However, the Act is no longer acceptable because it has been rejected and in its stead we have the present Dog Bill which replaces or supersedes the Alsatian Dog Act. The provisions of the Act will be superseded by what appear to be rather nebulous controls—indeed if any—and these controls to this point have not been indicated and their administration has been in no way made clear. I believe there is justification for the questions asked and the queries which have been raised, and they should be answered.

It is probably applicable and apposite to begin by outlining briefly the history of the Alsatian Dog Act and some of the

experiences which have been encountered up to date. This information may be of value to the House.

Initially the Act was introduced with one thing in mind, and that was to restrict the possibility of Alsatians—including part breeds—mating with dingoes, because it was feared that the progeny of such a union would have the intelligence and strength of the Alsatian as well as the natural cunning of the dingo. It was for that reason that legislation was ultimately introduced. It was introduced as a result of a Select Committee of inquiry set up by the Legislative Assembly at that time. That Select Committee concluded that the dog was a menace to the pastoral industry. It did endeavour to establish the origins of the dog itself, but there does not seem to be any authorative concensus which might help resolve the overall guesswork which has come into the entire question.

Some authorities claim that Alsatians were crossed with wolves from time to time to retain the natural ferocity and it was also claimed that the first dogs registered with the Verein für Deutscher Shäferhund —the German Shepherd Dog Club—were in fact half wolf, but there was an element of conjecture in this regard.

Other evidence submitted to the Select Committee of the Assembly related to the temperament of these animals, but nothing conclusive was really proven about it. It was recognised that the Alsatian is a very intelligent breed of dog and some people feel it is savage by nature while others believe it is savage as a result of training. In defence of the dog I could say there has been a great deal of prejudice, which it would be hard to justify, created in the public mind, and the image the animal has acquired is probably undeserving in many regards.

Legislation was passed in 1929 as a result of the inquiry and the main or salient points of that legislation as outlined in the second reading debates are rather interesting. It was pointed out that every organisation connected with rural or agricultural pursuits supported the findings of the Select Committee and supported, among other recommendations, the prohibition of further importations of the animal, and sterilisation of those already within the State.

The possibility of these animals running wild and breeding with dingoes was an ever present fear and financially it could severely affect the pastoralists in Western Australia. The conditions in Australia were contrasted with those in other countries where Alsatian dogs could be bred without restriction. It was demonstrated that the large spaces, and opportunities for dogs to become wild and to avail themselves of the opportunity to breed with existing dogs did not exist anywhere else and this made Australia rather unique as far as world circumstances were concerned.

The Australian conference of Ministers in that same year of 1929 resolved to ban the importation of Alsatians into Australia and this rather supported the contention of the Western Australian legislation. It is rather interesting, too, that the graziers' Federal council supported the recommendations of the Select Committee, as did the WA Canine Association.

In the course of the debate a large number of Press items were recounted at some length and all in all they presented a picture of a rather fearsome animal. One can only presume that the major ones were verifiable, but to some extent no doubt this was where the German shepherd derived at least part of its reputation.

Over the years and up till the formation of the APB the Act to which I have referred was administered by the Vermin Control Branch of the Department of Agriculture, and since the formation of the APB its control has rested with that body.

Prior to the amendments of 1962 one of the most serious problems confronting the administration was the supervision of the entry of sterilised Alsatians into Western Australia, because it was difficult to obtain evidence to indicate the sterilisation had been carried out. It was necessary to obtain from a magistrate an order for the destruction of unsterilised dogs, and because of the difficulties surrounding this aspect and the increasing number of Alsatians being brought into Western Australia it was necessary to seek amendments to the Act so that some of the weaknesses as they were seen could be overcome.

In April of 1960 the then Minister for Agriculture reported that there had been an increasing number of Alsatian dogs coming into Western Australia and that people were taking advantage of the weaknesses in the administration to bring them into the State. This led to the ultimate introduction of the amendment which was assented to on the 11th December, 1962.

Under this new provision people were not permitted to bring Alsatians into this State unless they were first sterilised and this, of course, made the administration of the legislation more readily controllable. A certificate of sterilisation from an approved veterinarian had to be produced, and on arrival in Western Australia the dog was registered and a tattoo was placed on its ear.

This registration system has been an effective means of control and it eliminated many of the weaknesses which the previous administration had faced. It was considered by the APB that had it not been for this legislation there would have been a large build-up of these animals in this State.

The popularity of the breed has increased considerably. I took the trouble to ascertain the figures and I was told that at the beginning of 1975 there were just

over 2 000 dogs registered in Western Australia. The latest figure which I have confirmed today is 3 600 so it will be appreciated that the animals are here in considerable numbers, and are here to stay.

As far as the probability of breeding with dingoes is concerned, the CSIRO has undertaken some research into this matter and while the evidence and the findings which have been brought down are not conclusive the trials which have been carried out do indicate it is quite probable that Alsatians would breed with wild dingoes. As I mentioned, the several tests which were carried out were not conclusive. On the first occasion, an Alsatian dog was placed with two dingo bitches but the dingoes contracted coccidiosis and succumbed to it before the pups were produced. At the second trial a dog was mated with a dingo bitch but there were no offspring, and it was subsequently established that the dingo was sterile. There does not seem to be any disparity between the behaviour patterns of Alsatians and dingoes and it is felt there is no reason that interbreeding could not take place.

It has been found, however, that other dogs such as the Dobermann and blue heeler have successfully produced offspring, and that the animals themselves mate quite readily. The pups are quite distinctive as a result of the crossbreeding.

The problem is not just one of Alsatians breeding with dingoes, but of wild dogs which breed with the true dingoes. That is the situation as it exists and it does raise a number of questions, not the least of which is the administration of the present Dog Act, which has been the legislation used over the years. It is probably fair to say that the traditional attitude of the Agriculture Protection Board has been one of opposition to the introduction of Alsatians. From an administrative point of view, it is presupposing to say that the dingo is an undesirable adjunct to the pastoral industry.

The APB considers that the Alsatian Dog Act should be repealed; there should be no half-way measure. Breeding under controlled conditions would be too difficult to police. The fair and conscientious administration of the Act has been something of a compromise, and I do not think the APB has departed from that line. The conditions which have been suggested—if breeding is to be permitted in this State—cover a wide range. It would be necessary for the animals to be inspected, and the stud dogs would have to be held at some Government controlled institution. There would need to be screening in the dispersement of pups because it would have to be accepted that they could find their way to any part of the State. There has been no indication of what controls are required or are necessary.

Those are some of the problems which I consider should be replied to by the Minister. I have listed several other possible conditions which may be examined but I think members will appreciate the solution will not be a simple matter. As a starting point, it might be fair to ask: What is the truth with regard to Alsatian dogs? Just where do they fit into the picture? Is it a desirable guard dog which should be encouraged? The intelligence of the Alsatian dog is rather remarkable as is shown when trained dogs are demonstrated. On the other hand, will Alsatian dogs cause a great deal of havoc and economic loss in the pastoral areas of the State?

I am not prepared to attempt to answer those questions. The member who introduced the 1929 Act put forward a horrific picture to the Legislative Assembly. He adopted a particular attitude and I have no doubt he made a very careful choice in the material he used. He probably overstated his case, but he convinced the Government of the day that legislation should be introduced. I think it is fair to ask whether the menace or the threat which was referred to at that time has abated. Has the nature of the animal changed to any marked degree, and have any more modern surveys been carried out upon which a reasoned opinion could be based with some authority?

Incidentally, the present Act covers only Alsatian dogs. It could be asked whether the Alsatian should be singled out for this particular treatment. The German Shepherd Dog Association has long taken the view that if Alsatians are to be penalised and treated as something extraordinary, why should not other breeds be treated in the same way.

Mr Harman: The association is a very commendable organisation.

Mr H. D. EVANS: The Dobermann and Rhodesian Ridgeback are two dogs which would be in the German shepherd dog class.

Control of the dogs will now be placed under local governing authorities and that raises further questions. The local governing authorities will be required to carry out functions which predominantly have been carried out by the State Government. When a matter extends beyond the limitations of local governing authorities the only organisation which is in a position to handle it is the State Government. Whether the State Government is handing the authority to local governing authorities rightly or wrongly, and under what terms and conditions, is not clear. The introduction of control measures will be by regulation and it is in this field the initiative of the Minister is shown, normally. The Governor-in-Council promulgates the regulations, initiated by the Minister, and generally they are binding.

If the matter is left to by-laws which are initiated by the various shire councils, having regard to the fact that there are something like 137 country shire councils in Western Australia, we could expect a

disparity in the by-laws, and this disparity will cause an impossible situation as far as control is concerned. Even though some States have a set of by-laws governing dogs, they may vary as to whether they are limited to Alsatians or whether they include other species. If in this case by-laws can be promulgated by the various shire councils, we could have not only differing conditions pertaining to a particular situation but also a number of species covered by the by-laws of the shires throughout the State. The alternative is to formulate uniform by-laws which would apply to local governing authorities, generally, or to a specified group of authorities.

I think that leaves a very large question mark. I quoted clause 52 (3) (c) of the Bill which was read a third time in this House earlier today, and I refer to the Minister's explanation in *Hansard*.

I do not think it is good enough to leave the issue unresolved in this way. There is an obligation on the Government not to leave to the local governing bodies the opportunity to bring into being a multiplicity of by-laws and regulations which will necessarily lead to confusion. If there is to be some control, it must be determined to what extent and in what way the control will be exercised and precisely how the administration will operate.

I think the Government has an obligation to the primary producers' organisations in the State, and their attitude should be recorded so there is no room for misapprehension.

I understand the executive of the Farmers' Union had a look at the legislation and could not reach a decision whether or not to support the Bill. As a compromise—whether commendable or not is not for me to say—the executive referred the Bill to the various branches and suggested they contact the Minister and make their views known. The Farmers' Union declined to make a firm organisation decision and left the matter at that. Perhaps it abrogated its responsibility. However, that is its internal domestic affair.

Neither the executive nor the vermin committee of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association discussed the measure. That association had the matter considered by various individuals in the organisation, several of whom are on the Agriculture Protection Board. I believe they did not discuss the Bill as such but rather the principles involved in it. As I understand it, the association accepted the views of and the compromise suggested by the German Shepherd Dog Association.

So it appears those primary producers' organisations have changed their stand with regard to the Alsation Dog Act and have come round to the way of thinking of the German Shepherd Dog Association. If that is so, I would think the Government has the opportunity to introduce an amendment, although I would like more clarification than has been given up to this time of the way it is proposed to do that.

On that basis I am happy to support this measure but I think the Government should be more explicit about the administrative details, the principles, the extent of controls it intends by way of regulations, the form the regulations will take, the extent of control which will be exercised by the local government authorities, and how the control is expected to work. Firstly, what is it that is expected to work? And secondly, how will it work?

The principle is acceptable but many questions remain unanswered. I do not think the Government can hand over the responsibility to local authorities without giving any indication of its intentions. The State Government still has a responsibility in this regard if it has made up its mind in the matter. On that basis, I support the Bill.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [9.16 p.m.]: I am very pleased to be here this evening for what I hope will ultimately lead to the repeal of the Alsatian Dog Act. I must say at the outset that lovers of this dog in this State call them German shepherds. If anyone goes to the German shepherd club and calls the dog an Alsatian we know immediately he is on the wrong side. During the xenophobia which took place during World War I in Britain, where even the King of England changed his name so that it did not sound too German, some people chose to change the name German shepherd to Alsatian. In recent times, people who have these dogs in Western Australia have gone out of their way to avoid that term. In fact, people have told me they like German shepherd dogs but they are scared of Alsatians. That is about the level of knowledge of some people in this State in regard to this very fine animal.

Since 1929 there has been in this State legislation which caused all dogs of this breed to be sterilised. In 1929 legislation was introduced on a national basis to prevent entire German shepherd dogs coming into Australia. A year ago I presented to this House a petition containing approximately 2 500 signatures which expressed the concern of many people in the State at this very discriminatory legislation. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, from time to time many members have taken up the cause of trying to have the legislation repealed. He referred to the member for Perth and the member for Maylands.

I am aware that the member for Maylands made an approach to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he was the Minister for Agriculture, and I am

aware that he did not approve that application. I understand the member for Floreat, who is the present Minister for Industrial Development, also made an approach to the then Minister for Agriculture which was rejected.

Since I have been in this Parliament I have approached two Ministers for Agriculture on this question. I was told by the member for Mt. Marshall when he was Minister for Agriculture that he was prepared to listen to the views of the German Shepherd Dog Association. He told the representatives of that association and me that if we could get some measure of agreement from the Pastoralists and Graziers Association and the Farmers' Union he would consider the matter very carefully. They way he spoke, it seemed to me that he would consider it with a view to relaxing if not repealing the Act.

Representatives of the German Shepherd Dog Association met representatives of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association and the Farmers' Union who agreed to a relaxation of the sterilisation clause, among other things.

Those associations support the idea that local authorities should make their own judgment in regard to whether or not entire dogs should be allowed into their own particular part of the State. As I felt in the past I would be unable to obtain the total repeal of this Act, I sought less than that at various times. I believed that we were attempting to obtain something better than we had, although not the ultimate. I will refer later to clause 53 of the Dog Bill which was passed here today and I will make some comments about that clause specifically. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states—

> German Shepherd... working dog developed in Germany from traditional herding and farm dogs... noted for intelligence, alertness, and loyalty, the German sheperd is valued as a companion and watchdog. It is used as guide for the blind and also serves in police and military work.

This is the dog that is so maligned in Western Australia—the best guide dog for the blind in the world.

The Guide Dogs for the Blind movement in Australia commenced in Western Australia, but subsequently the association was forced to shift its training headquarters to Victoria. Because of the restrictions on the importation of German shepherds, the association was compelled to use Labrador retrievers to guide the blind. However, most people involved in this type of work believe that the German shepherd dog is better suited to the task. I expect when discriminatory legislation such as we are now discussing is removed, we will see in Australia, as in other parts of the world, that the first choice for a dog to help the blind will be the German shepherd dog.

Everyone would love to have a companion which is affectionate and obedient.

Mr Hartrey: But we can't get her!

Mr CLARKO: Everyone would like to have a companion who is loyal, devoted to its master, of perfect temperament, and admired by others. Everyone seeks a companion like that. Would not other members like a bitch like that—or a dog? Now if one owns a German shepherd dog, that is exactly what one has. Such a dog is the most intelligent, loyal, and devoted companion that one could find. Anyone who owns a German shepherd dog is always sure of a kiss—although we must be careful because these dogs have very long tongues.

Both political parties have long gone out of their way to back local products, and yet we can never get a locally-made German shepherd dog—they cannot be "made in the West"!

Throughout the world the German shepherd dog is used widely in police work, and not in the aggressive attacking way that critics of this breed would have us believe. German shepherd dogs are used to find people who are lost.

Mr Bertram: And for catching POWs.

Mr CLARKO: I am sure the honourable member knows that such facts were used in a critical way by the Minister when he introduced the original legislation in 1962—I am not suggesting the honourable member is using this fact in that way. When the Minister introduced the Bill, he spoke of German shepherd dogs catching POWs and guarding top security installations during World War II. He did not refer to the fact that this breed of dog is renowned for finding lost children and sick people.

Mr Hartrey: Which do they prefer to do—find little girls or POWs?

Mr CLARKO: While the German shepherd dog is maligned by almost everyone, I am sure the honourable member would not malign it. It is a magnificant dog. I have already mentioned the work done by this breed in helping the blind, but I have not referred to the fact that the dogs are now being used to find people who may be lost. In Switzerland we find the German shepherd is replacing the Saint Bernard in searching for people who are lost. It is this breed of dog which is used to search for bombs hidden by terrorists.

It has been claimed in the Press that in 1972, 45 passengers and seven crew were saved when a German shepherd sniffed out a bomb placed in a Boeing 707. When these dogs are trained they can sniff out drugs which have been hidden to escape detection on entry into a country.

My youngest daughter told me about an article in the Press stating that two dogs —one a German shepherd and the other a Labrador retriever—were taken to an area near Sydney where it was suspected that drugs were hidden. She was very pleased to inform me that it was the German shepherd dog which had found the drugs.

Of course, many breeds of dogs can be trained to this work, but the German shepherd dog is believed to be the best. This breed is being used for rescue work in mountainous countries. It is used by the armed forces, not just to protect ammunition dumps but also for other beneficial purposes.

I spoke recently to the Minister for Police who knows of my interest in the subject. He told me that while in New Zealand he spoke to the Commissioner of Police and also the Minister for Police. The German shepherd dog is widely used by the Police Force in New Zealand and our Minister for Police is interested to know whether we could use these dogs in Western Australia to search for people who are lost, and to sniff out drugs, etc. Recently we saw a photograph in the Press where some Africans in Soweto were being driven back by German shepherds on leashes. I do not believe this is the proper use of these dogs. All dogs can be trained to work of that type, but it is unnatural to use them in that way.

Why do people pick on the German shepherd for discrimination? Perhaps it is because of its strength, its size, or perhaps it is feared because of its intelligence.

Mr Bertram: It is not very pleasant to walk onto premises and find a couple of these dogs rushing at you.

Mr CLARKO: That is true, but the legislation is discriminatory in that it picks out one breed of dog. I do not wish to name any other breed because that would be discriminatory also.

Mr Bertram: What do you think of the fox terrier?

Mr CLARKO: On occasions when I have been door-knocking I have found some specimens of this breed more frightening than bigger dogs.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the breeding of dingoes with German shepherd dogs. Although some trials of such matings have been attempted there is no substantial evidence of any success. In fact, on some occasions the dingoes have fought with the German shepherd dogs.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is not quite right.

Mr CLARKO: Generally speaking there is no scientific evidence—and I invite the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to correct me if I am wrong—to prove that dingoes and the German shepherd dogs have been mated together in different situations or on a regular basis. According to information given to me by the Department of Agriculture no-one can show us a pup and say, "This is the result of a German shepherd and dingo mating". In a few cases we are told nothing happened, in one case it was thought that something happened, and someone else heard of something happening at some other time. As far as I can ascertain, the CSIRO is not prepared to come out with an authoritative statement that such matings have been successful on a regular, continuing, or normal basis. In fact, such a cross-mating has never been fully substantiated by research. If we consider other States of Australia where there are entire German shepherd dogs, we cannot find a significant number of cases of this cross-breeding or that the progeny of such cross-breeding had been detrimental to farm livestock.

What has happened is that German shepherd dogs in Australia have become inbred. We had no German shepherds coming to Australia between 1929 and 1972. This means that in the rest of Australia where breeding continued there was a tendency to lower the quality of the dog. In Western Australia the only dogs we could receive were in the main air freighted here. Obviously if one is a breeder in the Eastern States and one has a litter of puppies of which some must be sterilised, one would keep the better dogs for breeding and have the poorer ones sterilised and sent to Western Australia, which would receive second best. As far as I am concerned, it is not good enough for Western Australia to receive second best, whether it be in connection with German shepherds or anything else.

I have here a newspaper photograph showing a German shepherd with Doug Rupe, who belongs to my Lions Club. Doug Rupe is blind, and he has just returned from the olympiad games for the disabled in Canada. I point out that Australians won more medals at the olympiad for the disabled than they did in the recently concluded Olympic Games. Doug Rupe has run 60 metres in 7.6 seconds, which is a fast time. He has been able to achieve this no doubt because of his own innate ability, but also because his German shepherd is able to train with him.

I have another, more attractive, photograph which shows former Miss Australia (Miss Randy Baker) with a German shepherd dog. In the dog's mouth is a large letter with a big red cross on it to advertise the door knock for the Red Cross. When I look at that photograph I know which subject in it is the more attractive —and I acknowledge that Randy Baker is also attractive! Again we see a German shepherd dog doing good work and raising money for charity.

If members would like another example, I have another newspaper photograph showing a German shepherd with a little

magpie. I will read the article associated with it; perhaps some members may find it necessary to use their handkerchiefs! It is as follows—

> Four weeks ago, Maggie the Magpie was having a rough time on Nedlands Golf course. Unfriendly birds were attacking her, part of her claw was gone, her feathers were ruffled and the top of her skull was exposed.

That happens to a few members here! It continues—

> Along came Shah the german shepher, being walked by his master. He showed great interest in the injured bird, who was taken to Shah's home.
>
> Since then the two have been inseparable friends. With Shah as protector, Maggie has made a great recovery.

If ever one wants a first-class photograph that will appeal to the hearts of everyone, one should get a photo of a child; but if one cannot find a photo of a child, one should get a photo of a German shepherd. Those who know German shepherds know they are noted for their affection and loyalty and for their ability to get on with children.

Mr Bryce: Can we anticipate what will be on the front of your pamphlet at the next election?

Mr Bertram: What has this to do with the Bill?

Mr CLARKO: It has a lot to do with the Bill, because I am trying to show that this is discriminatory legislation which in various forms has been on the Statute book of this State since 1929. For 47 years it has discriminated against what is possibly the finest dog in the world.

If members care to look up the *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences* they will find it has a section on dogs, and it gives six particular facets which are regarded as the most outstanding facets a dog should possess. The German shepherd is the only dog that appears in each category. About six dogs are chosen in each of the six categories, and the German shepherd is the only one that has each of the six prime characteristics.

What is the legislative position in Australia? In Tasmania there is no legislation and German shepherds are allowed everywhere. In Victoria the same situation applies. In New South Wales, German shepherds are allowed everywhere, although in some areas only sterilised dogs are permitted. New South Wales has probably the largest collection of sheep of any part of the world. Australia has more sheep than any other country in the world, and New South Wales has more sheep than any other part of Australia; but even in that State German shepherds are allowed everywhere, and are required to be sterilised only in some areas. This occurs in the greatest sheep-breeding area in the world, with no significant ill-effect as far as I can ascertain.

As I have already said, German shepherds are allowed everywhere in Victoria; and again this is a major sheep-producing part of the world. In South Australia German shepherds are allowed everywhere except in pastoral areas, Kangaroo Island, and the District Council of Hawker.

In Queensland these dogs are allowed everywhere, except in 54 out of approximately 131 shires. In the Northern Territory, German shepherds which are sterilised are allowed everywhere, and unsterilised dogs are allowed in the main centres of Darwin, Alice Springs, and Tennant Creek.

Western Australia is the only State or Territory in Australia in which one cannot have an entire German shepherd. As far as I can ascertain, this is the only place in the world in which an entire German shepherd dog is not permitted to be kept.

Mr Bertram: What is the position in Canberra?

Mr CLARKO: There is a lot of barking going on, but I do not know whether there are any bites these days! I certainly will not bite.

As I said earlier, in Western Australia we receive puppies from litters in the Eastern States. These puppies are flown in by aeroplane, and this raises the cost. If anyone cares to read last Saturday's newspaper they will see advertisements for these dogs asking $175. Generally it costs between $200 and $300 to buy one of these dogs, and the likelihood is that we are getting reject puppies from litters born in the other States.

I do not wish to go through in detail the testimonials I have here from various people involved with German shepherd dogs; but I do believe the existing Act which is to be repealed by this Bill is long overdue for repeal. I am sure the Minister will explain to us, as was requested by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, why clause 53 of the Dog Bill provides that the Minister may require certain breeds of dogs to be sterilised. I am sure the Minister would not make such a decision lightly, and that the matter would be carefully considered. I hope that in this State no local authorities will too rapidly jump into the pond and ask for sterilisation when there is no evidence to indicate it is needed.

I hope the legislation receives a fair trial and that we see what is happening in the various parts of the State before we seek any regulation along those lines. If that course is adopted—and I hope it is—I believe those of us who know German shepherds and who believe the

present Act is discriminatory because it picks on one breed of dog and not on others purely because of its ability, will share the joy of this moment; and I say that without trying to overstate the case.

I conclude on this note: The German shepherd dog is the most loyal and reliable dog, and those of us who have one are very proud of them. I do hope everyone will have an opportunity to see the German shepherd in its entire state in Western Australia in the very near future. I ardently support the Bill.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Local Government) [9.39 p.m.]: I would like to thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Karrinyup for their support of the legislation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me to respond to a number of queries, and I note that the member for Karrinyup is a very enthusiastic supporter of the German shepherd dog. I would like to say firstly to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the Government has a serious responsibility to bring down regulations that will acknowledge the situation where there is a potentially dangerous dog. It is not the Government's intention to repeal the present Act until such time as the regulations are prepared and presented to Parliament, at which time Parliament will have the opportunity either to reject or accept the regulations.

Mr H. D. Evans: But you will take a blank cheque and fill it in later.

Mr RUSHTON: I repeat that the Government does not intend to proclaim this repealing legislation until the regulations have been prepared and debated in Parliament. This will give members a considerable say in what actually takes place in the future. The Government regards this as a serious responsibility.

It also is part of our policy to acknowledge local government and to grant it added responsibility and decision-making power. What I am suggesting to members is that I am fully committed to consult with local government and the Agriculture Protection Board to obtain their advice relating to the regulations which are to be prepared.

It has been suggested that each local authority may have its own separate regulations. That is not the intention. Rather, we will seek their advice on the subject, in an attempt to prepare regulations which acknowledge difficulties which might arise in different parts of the State.

I trust that if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition reads again my second reading speech and clause 53 of the Dog Bill, and puts them together with the few remarks I am making now, he will have confidence in the fact that the Government is approaching this task seriously in an attempt to meet the requests which have been made.

Once again, I state that it would be impertinent of me to prepare regulations prior to the House expressing an opinion as to the form those regulations should take. I did not know what would be the attitude of the House, although I have been very pleased at the response towards the Dog Bill and this repeal Bill. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Karrinyup do not oppose the legislation; they have adopted a responsible attitude towards the preparation of regulations and the administration of this responsibility.

I do not hold out to the member for Karrinyup that the repealing legislation will be proclaimed within three or four weeks; it will take some time. However, a start has been made. The Government has responded to a request, and we see this legislation as a responsible approach to the question of discrimination. It is generally understood these days that potentially dangerous dogs are not confined only to one breed. This will be a rather exacting task, and one which the Government intends to approach seriously.

The attitudes which have been expressed to this legislation and the associated legislation have been very encouraging. In particular, the attitude of the Canine Association of WA from which I have received some very pleasant letters—as I am sure have other members—typifies the reaction of people when they are consulted in the preparation of legislation and are given plenty of opportunity to react to that legislation. Some people look upon this as not very serious legislation, but we have taken it seriously, and I believe the people most concerned have responded. I thank members who have contributed to this debate, and trust they accept the comments I have made.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 10th August. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Thompson) in the Chair; Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 5 had been agreed to.

Clause 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 24 amended—

Mr T. D. EVANS: I move an amendment—

> Page 4, lines 5 to 9—Delete paragraph (a).

The purpose of moving this amendment is to defeat most of the provisions of clause 7 so that the existing law under section 24 (2) of the Liquor Act shall remain intact as it is.

Section 24 (2) deals with Sunday trading. It deals specifically with the hours during which hotels and, by reference to section 35, licensed clubs may trade on Sundays. The position at present is that in a prescribed area the Licensing Court is given power, having regard to the special circumstances on which it may be convinced, in country areas to allow five hours' trading on a Sunday. In the metropolitan area, whilst the time factor is four hours, the court is still given power to vary those hours so that no more than four hours are exceeded on any one Sunday in two sessions.

Later provisions of clause 7 seek to draw artificial boundaries in Western Australia by an Act of Parliament, one area being known as the inner zone which will encompass that part of the State within a radius of 160 kilometres from the GPO, Perth. In that inner zone licensees will be permitted to trade between the hours of 11.00 a.m. on a Sunday morning to 1.00 p.m. that afternoon, followed by a break, reopening at 4.30 p.m. and closing at 6.30 p.m. with no right at all vested in the Licensing Court to vary those hours. The purpose behind this part of the Bill appears to be to standardise the hours in the metropolitan area.

Whilst there may or may not be merit in this provision the linking of the metropolitan area to country areas up to 160 kilometres of Perth can have no merit at all. Beyond the 160 kilometres we come to the outer zone. Licensees in that area will still be required to trade between those specified hours of 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and 4.30 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. But on the application of a licensee the Licensing Court will be given the power, in the outer zone, to vary those hours but only so as to provide in total four hours' trading on Sunday. There must be at least a three-hour gap in between.

The distinction between the inner and the outer zones is that in the outer zone beyond 160 kilometres from Perth the Licensing Court will be given a discretion. Within the inner zone there will be no discretion at all. The effect will be that in the outer zone hotels which until now have normally enjoyed five hours' trading on Sunday will lose one hour. Those hotels within the present prescribed area but beyond the metropolitan area—I mention places such as Collie and Picton which now will come within the inner zone—will also have a loss of one hour's trading on Sunday.

I have received a whole host of telegrams basically from licensees of hotels in my own area but there is also one from the Railway Hotel in Northam and one from the John Jones Esperance Motor Hotel also protesting at the loss of this one hour on Sunday.

Mr O'Neil: Where did you say Collie was—in the inner or the outer zone?

Mr T. D. EVANS: In the inner zone, being within a radius of 160 kilometres.

Mr T. H. Jones: It is half and half.

Mr T. D. EVANS: Under the existing law in a prescribed area the Licensing Court is given a discretion, having regard to the special circumstances in a certain district, not only to vary the hours but also to extend them to a period of five hours. In the metropolitan area at present the Licensing Court still has a discretion to vary the hours. Under the new legislation within 160 kilometres of Perth the Licensing Court will have no power to vary any hours at all. This seems to be a vote of no confidence in the Licensing Court. In this Chamber last week I tabled a petition containing 1 084 signatures. These people complained that in the outer and remote areas this legislation would interfere with a great deal of recreation time of many people and would seriously affect the tourist trade. Also in the goldfields the Australian Hotels Association at present would probably be the second biggest employer of labour. At this time when the goldfields are going through hard times it would be a further blow if the retrenchment of bar staff were to result from the passage of this legislation, even if it is not immediate.

Mr T. H. JONES: I support the remarks of the member for Kalgoorlie. In my view the Minister has not proved to the Chamber why the zones should be drawn up in this manner. I understand that according to a certified map the town of Collie is to be cut in half; half of the hotels will be in the inner zone, and the other half in the outer zone. The member for Swan has a certified map from the Department of Lands and Surveys; I do not know whether the Minister's map has been certified.

What a sad state of affairs that is! The Minister has not proved to my satisfaction why the 160 kilometre area, and the zones, should have been designed in this way. It seems that somebody drew a ring on a map. If a hotel happens to be inside the zone it is all right, but if a hotel is outside the zone the Licensing Court will determine its trading hours.

The worst feature is that whoever drew up these amendments in the Bill has not given thought to the needs of the people in the country. Members of the National Country Party opposite should be getting to their feet to safeguard the interests of the people they represent.

I am sure they know that in the wintertime the football matches do not finish until 5.00 p.m. The Sunday session will be half over before the football match

is ended; therefore the spectators at football matches will have a reduced period to patronise the hotels.

This is not in the interests of the country people. I challenge members who represent regions in the outer zone to say that will not be the position with the passage of this Bill. Football clubs in the outer zone with licences will be treated in exactly the same way as the hotels.

The Minister has not put forward any firm or valid reasons for the drawing up of the two zones. There has been nothing wrong with the past practice of leaving this to the Licensing Court to determine. Has the Licensing Court failed us in the past? I know of no problems existing in the country areas where the Licensing Court has defined the zones.

I point out again that the Minister took only 17 minutes in his second reading speech to deal with all the amendments in the Bill—not just those relating to the hours of trading on Sundays. The Government should give some consideration to the interests of country people. How does the Leader of the National Country Party feel about this matter? Are the hotels in his electorate happy with the situation?

Mr Old: I think they are outside the zone.

Mr T. H. JONES: If they are they will be some of the lucky ones.

Mr Old: You asked me and I have let you know.

Mr T. H. JONES: Would the Minister be happy if the hotels in his electorate were in the inner zone? I know how the member for Murray feels about this proposition in the Bill, but he remains very silent. I wonder how other members with hotels in the outer zone feel about this? It seems that someone from the Department of Lands and Surveys drew two circles on a map.

Mr O'Neil: Only one circle.

Mr T. H. JONES: Who drew that circle? Was it recommended by the trade?

Mr O'Neil: It was drawn by the Minister for Justice who is in charge of the Liquor Act.

Mr T. H. JONES: Does the trade go along with this proposition in the Bill? Probably the hotels at Waroona, in the electorate of the Minister for Justice, are happy with it. Did the Minister ascertain whether the Australian Hotels Association was agreeable to this proposition? In view of the circumstances is it not desirable that the Licensing Court should determine the trading hours? Many good reasons can be advanced as to why different trading hours should apply to different areas. Admittedly there is room for manoeuvring in the outer zone, but there is no room for manoeuvring in the inner zone.

Let us take the case of a hotel located one mile from the border of a zone. The person who owns a hotel within a few miles of the border of the outer zone would be able to apply to the Licensing Court, but the owner of a hotel within the inner zone would not be able to do anything about the matter.

I am making a plea on behalf of country people. I refer specifically to the people who attend football matches. In respect of this legislation we should leave politics aside and get on with the serious business of the country. This legislation is supposed to be dealt with by members according to their conscience. If we have any conscience at all we should think about the interests of the people in the country who attend football matches. Under the proposals in the Bill they will be denied half a session at hotels on Sundays.

The whole proposition is ill-founded. I do not know of any case where the three-hour sessions have disadvantaged the people. The Minister has not adduced any strong argument for a change in the hours. If the Licensing Court considers that the three-hour session has operated reasonably, why is there a need for change? I oppose this legislation very strongly. The Minister has not given us reasons to support a change.

Mr HARTREY: The eloquent speech of the member for Collie could be well summarised in one of the classic phrases he used, "Leave politics aside and get on with the serious business of the country." We are now dealing with one of the most serious businesses in which the country is interested; we are dealing with the Liquor Act, football, and similar matters that are of vital interest to our constituents. In a sense that might sound somewhat sarcastic, but it is an elementary truth. That is the reason I have always understood that any amendments to the Liquor Act would be a matter of conscience on the part of individual members, and they would not be bound by their parties.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn, the lead speaker for the Opposition, stressed time and time again in his contribution to the debate that we on this side were not bound by any party rule on this subject. I always understood that the Liberal Party and the National Country Party espouse the same principle, and for a very good reason.

The reason is that when we start to fool around with the established habits, the pastimes, and the recreation of the community we run into stormy waters. One thing which a person should not do in politics is to put up an argument which cannot advantage him, and which will arouse animosity among those who can possibly be of serious disadvantage to him.

If the drinking of alcohol is a grave social evil it should be stamped out; but if it is simply a harmless, enjoyable, and convivial bond of good fellowship among males and females—although I think this predominates among the males—why attack it in this thoughtless and almost unpremediated way? What does the Government think it will gain?

I appeal to the good sense of the Government and of members who hope to be here after the next election—although I will not be amongst those—that as they have the right to a conscience vote they should exercise it in voting on this amendment.

No reason has been advanced to support the idea that we would be holier or happer if on Sundays, the Lord's day of rest, we shed one hour of our recreation and conviviality. Why should we do that? Has the Lord told us to do that? I have not heard any message from high above on this subject! Has anybody advocated the change on the grounds of public morality or other values we stand for?

Mr Bertram: You will be excommunicated.

Mr HARTREY: I do not think the College of Cardinals will be affected by this debate. There is no reason at all for interfering with the existing trading hours. If we were advocating that the existing hours be increased, such a move might give offence to sincere and honest persons and might stir up some animosity among people who do not want such an alteration. However, that is not the position. We do not want to extend the hours, but we do not want the hours to be diminished.

There has been no movement in the community for the change to be made; there has been no agitation on the question; there has been no attempt to influence members; and no petitions have been presented to this Chamber. A petition has been presented to each of the two Chambers recently which bore a number of signatures, but no great effort has been made to arouse enthusiasm against this change in the law. Had that been done, I am sure one could have obtained without any trouble a petition with 18 000 or even 25 000 signatures of people in the metropolitan area.

The outer areas would have been even more enthusiastic. Let me read some of the telegrams which are, admittedly, actuated by personal interests. The telegrams are all from hotelkeepers in the outer area, some from my constituency, and others from the constituency of the member for Kalgoorlie. What is wrong with that if their arguments are sound and they submit good reasons why this change should not be made? What is wrong with these people sending the telegrams in their own interests? Have they no right to voice their opinions in this Chamber? I think they have. It seems unreasonable that merely because people are in the trade they should be criticised when they send telegrams. The following is addressed to the member for Kalgoorlie—

> The 30 members of the Goldfields sub branch of the Australian Hotels Association bitterly oppose the proposed amendments to the Liquor Act regarding Sunday trading stop We strongly urge Parliament to leave Sunday trading facilities on the Goldfields unaltered seriously considering the unique isolation of this large inland community together with the facilities we endeavour to provide and foster for the growing tourist trade.

That tourist trade really is something that has to be given serious consideration, especially on the goldfields. The member for Kalgoorlie quite rightly said that at present the liquor trade is the second largest, if not the largest, employer of labour on the goldfields. That is a sad state of affairs in a goldmining town, but it is a fact we must consider.

Last Saturday in Kalgoorlie we appealed to the Federal Government to give us a break on the goldfields. Tonight we are appealing to the State Government. Last Saturday in Kalgoorlie the State Government was highly spoken of, and the message the Premier sent to Kalgoorlie was greatly appreciated. He said that he and his Government had done what they could to save the goldmining industry, but that the State could not do it on its own. Therefore the State Government was doing what it could to obtain Federal Government help.

The Government parties are held in high esteem on the goldfields at the moment. Why kick the goldfields in the teeth tonight and destroy the goodwill the Government has achieved? There is no reason for it. If this action had been taken in response to strong pressure from metropolitan constituents, there might be some justification for it. The Government might then lose the member for Murchison-Eyre, but would retain members from several other electorates in the metropolitan area. However, this is not the case. There has been no pressure for this to be done. Lord knows from whence the suggestion emanated. I do not think it was from the Minister in charge of the Bill. He is not a wowser by any means and I am sure he can see no justification for the step being taken. I hope he is going to say that we do have a conscience vote on this legislation.

Mr O'Neil: I have said a thousand times that we do have a conscience vote on this.

Mr HARTREY: I am glad to hear that because I have had my doubts at times. The following is another telegram which has been received—

> Understand new Licencing Act amendments will restrict Sunday trading to maximum of 4 hours as against

present 5 hours stop We in Esperance expect large influx of tourists on completion Eyre Highway I deplore reduction Sunday hours which can only lead to reduction in services to tourism stop The seasonal nature of business in resort areas such as Esperance necessitates longer Sunday trading hours to cater for the tourists in summer with discretion to reduce trading hours in the off season appreciate any action you can take . . . John Jones Esperance Motor Hotel.

That is a reasonable and well presented petition and the mere fact that Mr Jones's livelihood somewhat depends upon the tourist trade ought not encourage us to reject it, but rather to adopt it.

The Railway Hotel beseeches the member for Kalgoorlie as follows—

> We look forward to your support in retaining present Sunday trading hours.

Joan Percy of the Federal Hotel, Kalgoorlie, says—

> After 26 years of hotel trading in Kalgoorlie I would like to oppose any alteration in Sunday trading hours for this district.

Another famous hotelier on the goldfields (Mr Larcombe) sent the following—

> I'm deeply concerned to hear of Government's decision on proposed amendment to Liquor Act regarding Sunday trading hours on Goldfields. My family has been associated with hotel industry on Goldfields for over 40 years. Industry's going through its worst period in that time with the state of Goldmining Industry in competition from clubs, liquor stores and liquor store outlets this would be yet a further damaging blow to Government policy on the centralisation and hotel industry on a whole. Hoping you can table this telegram and bring this matter to attention of Parliament.

It is brought to the attention of Parliament and I hope it will receive favourable consideration. Another telegram reads—

> We strongly oppose any change in the Sunday trading hours of this area stop Would Parliament please consider the effect on this isolated community and the expected growth in tourism at Norseman with the sealing of Eyre Highway . . .
>
> John Hanbury, licensee Norseman Hotel.
>
> John Nelson, licensee Railway Hotel Norseman.

I do not think I need to bore members with other appeals. I do not speak in any impatient or partisan sense. I try to speak calmly in a friendly and convivial mood. Nevertheless, the provision under consideration is a serious one and should be dealt with without any political or other partisan sentiment. There is no public demand for the amendment and there has not been a great deal of public resentment against the present provisions of the Act. The amendment has not been engendered by people of one political persuasion or another, or of one economic class or another.

It is not a question of a conflict between employer and employee. It is simply a social question upon which the bulk of the community is not divided. About a quarter of the voting population of any Australian State would vote against the liquor trade. It would vote to restrict it or even abolish it.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has two minutes.

Mr HARTREY: Of the voters, three-quarters have always favoured giving a fair go to the people for whom the liquor trade caters. It would be wrong and foolish of us to vote for the amendment in the Bill which has nothing to recommend it and is not demanded.

Mr SKIDMORE: The clause proposes, amongst other things, to insert new subsections (2d) and (2e). Proposed new subsection (2d) refers to zones and it is to this provision I wish to raise objection and support the amendment.

I am aware that, sometimes, it is necessary to establish a proper and legal document to signify distances between given points. A map with a line drawn on it would not be accepted by a court. The general procedure is that a map must be certified by the Surveyor-General as being a certified document. I approached the Lands and Surveys Department requesting a map showing an arc of 160 kilometres from the GPO, and I have that map with me tonight.

I do not know why a distance of 160 kilometres was chosen, but I understand the Minister for Justice decided on that distance. Unfortunately, it was a bad choice. The map which I have, and the covering certificate, have been signed by the Acting Surveyor-General and countersigned by two officers.

The line on the surveyed map runs right through the middle of Collie. That means the hotels in Collie will have a variation in hours, according to whether they are in the inner or the outer zone. That is stupid, and is a ridiculous provision to find in a Bill before Parliament. I have approached members of the public who could possibly have to determine inner and outer zones in the future, and I do not know that they are happy about this provision.

I also notice that Darkan is in the outer zone, Williams is in the inner zone and Narrogin is in the outer zone. I estimate that those towns are approximately

18 miles apart. The point I make is that Williams, in the inner zone, will have inflexible hours for trading whereas Narrogin, some 18 miles away, will be able to vary its hours. A sporting team from Williams could possibly be entertained in Narrogin, because of the flexible hours, whereas on the occasion of a return event the Narrogin team could not be entertained in Williams.

Mr Coyne: It would be a dry argument.

Mr SKIDMORE: That is so. Another instance involves my own home district, and I refer to Tammin and Kellerberrin. Tammin will be in the inner zone whereas Kellerberrin will be in the outer zone.

There is a tremendous sporting interest between the towns of Tammin and Kellerberrin and the sporting teams will experience the same disadvantages I mentioned with regard to Williams and Narrogin. It is just too stupid to prescribe that there will be an inner and an outer zone, and that the dividing line will be 160 kilometres from the GPO.

The towns of Dowerin and Wyalkatchem are in much the same situation. Cadoux, a short distance away, will be in the outer zone. I am not referring to the smaller towns, only the major ones. Many more small towns would be involved in the same way.

We have the same situation with Wongan Hills and Ballidu and with Bindi Bindi and Miling. I am not sure whether Bindi Bindi has a gallon licence, but there is a considerable distance between Miling and Moora. I do not know that Moora and Coomberdale would be happy because Coomberdale is just outside and Moora is inside.

Mr Taylor: Is Brunswick inside?

Mr SKIDMORE: Brunswick is inside. For some strange reason, 160 kilometres is the magic distance from the GPO, Perth. It has inherent problems when it goes through the middle of Collie. The other point on which I raise the greatest objection is the differences between adjacent country towns. The amendment sought by the member for Kalgoorlie will get rid of that clause and pave the way for some of the other amendments in the area of disputation. We will virtually finish up with what we have under the present Act.

The clause in the Bill makes nonsense of the licensing law. It draws a circle with a radius of 160 kilometres from the GPO and removes the right to vary the period from five hours to four hours in the outer and inner zones. I believe the amendment moved by the member for Kalgoorlie should be supported overwhelmingly. This clause demonstrates the sheer stupidity and hypocrisy of the people who merely plucked a figure of 160 kilometres out of the air, without any idea of the total results.

Mr O'NEIL: I am concerned at the information supplied by the member for Swan concerning the location of the arc on the map which he says has been certified. I have a map which was prepared for the Minister for Justice and which clearly indicates that the arc does not pass through the centre of Collie. On that count alone it is necessary for us to examine the situation.

But I want to get back to the basic reason for having two zones—an outer zone, in which the periods when drinking may take place on Sundays may be varied, and an inner zone. As I mentioned during my second reading speech and at other times, there is great concern in the community regarding the misbehaviour of certain people, especially during Sunday sessions. There was considerable comment in the media and in letters to the editor that the Government should try to do something about an unruly element, particularly in metropolitan hotels. The member for Collie has also mentioned that some time ago—

Mr T. H. Jones: It has happened only once during the life of Sunday sessions.

Mr O'NEIL: That may be so, but on a number of occasions groups of gentlemen on motorbikes took it into their heads to visit country towns and terrorise the people in those towns.

Mr T. H. Jones: They could do so during any hours.

Mr O'NEIL: I am trying to explain why the line is drawn where it is.

Mr T. H. Jones: Does the line make any difference where the bikies go?

Mr O'NEIL: If there is a considerable number of hotels in one town and they can adjust their hours freely, there can be a longer drinking period than there would be normally.

Mr Moiler: What happens on a Sunday?

Mr O'NEIL: I am talking about a situation which existed and which everyone knew about at the time the legislation was drafted. A considerable number of people in this community were asking the Government to initiate legislation to endeavour to control the situation. I want to make it quite clear, as I have done a dozen times, that the Government is responsible for the introduction of the Bill but members may vote on it as they like.

Mr Bertram: We are taking you seriously.

Mr T. H. Jones: We will see how many do.

Mr O'NEIL: I would like to take a wager —which I am not permitted to do—that everybody on the Opposition side of the Chamber will be on one side of the Chamber when any vote is taken.

I want to explain why the line appears at 160 kilometres from the GPO. It includes the town of Collie in the inner zone. It includes the town of Bunbury.

Mr Skidmore: Not on my certified map.

Mr O'NEIL: I have just said the honourable member's information is different from mine, and after I have given my explanation we might report progress and look at the situation. But I have been implored by members of the Opposition to explain why the line is where it is.

Mr Skidmore: I am listening.

Mr O'NEIL: If members look at the major towns in the inner zone where there is no latitude in respect of trading hours, they will find they include the towns where difficulties had occurred at the time the legislation was drawn up. Outside the zone, of course, any licensee is entitled to apply to the Licensing Court, not to increase the number of trading hours on Sunday but to vary the periods when they may occur. The member for Collie said football clubs were in the same boat. I suggest all members of the Committee must be fully aware of what we are talking about. Currently section 24 of the Act, which this clause proposes to amend, says among other things—

> Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, an hotel licence authorises the licensee to sell and supply liquor, on the licensed premises—

It is a hotel licence, not a club licence. Later on it says—

> . . . between such other hours, on a Sunday as the Court may authorise—

Then it goes on to qualify those hours. So we are talking about a hotel licence. The member for Collie said clubs were in the same boat.

Mr T. H. Jones: I thought that initially.

Mr Skidmore: I suggest the Minister have a look at clause—

Mr O'NEIL: We are talking about the amendment moved by the member for Kalgoorlie, which relates to section 24 of the principal Act.

Mr T. H. Jones: You are missing a clause.

Mr O'NEIL: Am I right, Mr Chairman? Am I talking to the amendment moved by the member for Kalgoorlie which relates to section 24—hotel licences?

The CHAIRMAN: Indeed you are.

Mr H. D. Evans: You are in an unaccustomed rattled state tonight!

Mr O'NEIL: I have endeavoured to explain the reason for the position of the line. I can appreciate that there are some difficulties and members are concerned because in their view some towns will be disadvantaged as compared with others. I am concerned that the certified map which the member for Swan has differs substantially from mine.

Mr Skidmore: I did three of these exercises and I finished up with Bunbury in on one, Collie in on one, and Collie out on one.

Mr O'NEIL: I have said I am concerned. May I suggest at this stage we report progress and ask leave to sit again?

Mr Bertram: Pull the Bill out.

Mr COYNE: I wish to support the amendment, and in doing so I support also the remarks of the member for Kalgoorlie and the member for Boulder-Dundas. Being representative of the goldfields community, I have been aware always of certain privileges extended to the goldfields people.

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: On a point of order, Sir, did I understand the Minister to say that he sought leave to report progress?

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister cannot move at the conclusion of his speech to report progress; someone else might do it. I have given the call to the member for Murchison-Eyre. If it is the desire of some member to move to report progress, he may do that at the end of the speech by the member for Murchison-Eyre.

Committee Resumed

Mr COYNE: I would like to finish my remarks. My understanding of this provision is that the goldfields community generally will suffer a loss of one hour's drinking time. I understand that in the outer zone the hours can be varied.

In the four goldfields communities I represent, drinking as a social amenity has been a privilege for as long as I can remember, and certainly I would not like to see the concessions enjoyed by such people for all these years taken away from them suddenly. I have not received many representations from people to support this provision, and for that reason I want to make my stand plain: I do not want to see these concessions removed. All the townships in the area I represent are well and truly outside the 160 kilometre zone, and I can see there will be serious disadvantages to these communities with the loss of this drinking time. I support the amendment.

Mr Skidmore: I will tell the Minister privately how I wanted to help him.

Progress

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

VETERINARY PREPARATIONS AND ANIMAL FEEDING STUFFS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th August.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.45 p.m.]: This is to a large extent an administrative measure, and it seeks to rectify a

somewhat untidy situation which has developed in regard to two existing Acts.

Since 1953 veterinary medicines available for open sale to the general public have been subject to registration under the provisions of the Veterinary Medicines Act. This Act involves and governs the registration of such products in respect of labelling, confirmation to formula, sale, description, and storage. The Act provides also for an advisory committee to consider the acceptability of products for which registration is sought, and it should be pointed out that the operative word there is "advisory" and the role of this committee is purely a recommendatory one, and its recommendations need not necessarily be adopted by the Minister.

The registration of feeding stuffs for sale as stock food comes within the ambit of the Feeding Stuffs Act which was introduced in 1928. It is considered that these two Acts should be brought within the compass of one piece of legislation and in this way the provisions can be updated to meet modern sophisticated foodstuffs which can involve components of veterinary medicines as well.

The formulae under which foodstuffs are compounded now are a far cry from the formulae of previous years. More and more attention is being given to the residue in foods for human consumption, and this includes meat products and various foods derived from one form or another of meat. Mercury could be an illustration of a residue left in foodstuffs by certain components, although I believe it would be fairly unlikely to find mercury in such circumstances. However, grain feeding could result in a build-up of some particular residue in an animal product derived from meat sources.

Because of this situation, greater control is indicated. The trend in animal foodstuffs is towards upgraded formulae and more modern techniques. In the poultry industry we find a very considerable variation in the formulae used for foodstuffs, and probably this industry was one considered when the particular Acts were regarded.

A further matter is that there has never been any real control over what have been termed "veterinary ethicals". These involve the group of drugs and compounds which will be available for sale to veterinarians but not to the general public. Veterinarians in turn may prescribe and sell these things, and may prepare them for sale for mass medication. Poultry flocks provide an instance where mass medication can sometimes be prescribed, and there is a possibility that when this is done there could be some undesirable drug effect. That possibility aroused the consideration of the Department of Agriculture in the preparation of this measure.

This Bill makes it mandatory for all preparations to be registered, and there will be total control over the entire range of veterinary compounds that are available to the public, and also those that are restricted to veterinarians only. The committee that is to be formed will be composed and representative of the whole range of those who are involved in the industry, those within Government sources, and those who are in any way connected with stock feeds and their manufacture. They will have the opportunity to express views and to bring down recommendations. The committee will give a general overview, although it will have no actual powers and will be dependent on the Minister in respect of whether the Government undertakes any action recommended to it in this way.

This Bill repeals the Veterinary Medicines Act, 1953-1963, and the Feeding Stuffs Act, 1928-1951, and it updates the regulations made under those Acts in relation to veterinary medicines and animal feeding stuffs. In essence the Bill is to streamline the operation of those two Acts. It can be readily appreciated that the overlap has become greater in each succeeding year, and what was once regarded as a drug has now become part of a preparation of a particular stock feed.

The Bill also makes provision for other minor matters such as the appointment of a registrar responsible to the director for implementing the detailed regulations made under the legislation, the appointment of inspectors, the setting of standards for packaging, labelling, and advertising, and the warranty in connection with veterinary preparations and feeding stuffs. These are all administrative details which are covered by the Bill.

I do not think any aspect of the measure can be viewed in a critical light. It certainly does bring under the control of the Minister the full range of what the present two Acts cover. It may be argued that the control is excessive, but I do not think so in view of the drugs and compounds with which the Bill deals.

On that basis it has the support of the Opposition.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [10.55 p.m.]: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his remarks in support of the Bill. He is very familiar with the requirements of both Acts which are being repealed—the Veterinary Medicines Act and the Feeding Stuffs Act. Both those Acts are designed to cover various aspects of agricultural activity, and as time has progressed so some of the products covered by the Veterinary Medicines Act have been used not only for therapeutic reasons but as feeding stuffs for accelerated growth. This has posed a problem wherein it has become necessary in some cases to register a product separately under each Act. In an

endeavour to overcome this anomaly a decision was made to repeal the two Acts and to combine them in a new Act.

At the same time there has been some tidying up of the Acts; and under the new Act it will be necessary to register all veterinary products. An evaluation will be made of all products, whether veterinary or produced for animal feeding stuffs, as to their potency, purity, and adulteration with pesticides or chemicals. In fact, this will provide a guarantee to the consumer or user regarding the purity of the product and its correctness of labelling.

Premises on which veterinary products are manufactured will have to be registered, and this will provide a further safeguard regarding the purity of the product.

An advisory committee will be formed on which the industry will be represented. and the committee will undertake the duty of advising the Minister on the various aspects of the administration of the Act. Whereas at present there are separate registrars—they are not full time but employees of the Department of Agriculture—now their duties will be combined and we will have one registrar who will be responsible for the registration of products.

Inspectors will be appointed, and they will have the usual inspectorial authority. It will be their duty to ensure that the requirements of the Act are carried out.

The Bill has been in the pipeline for some time. I consider it to be a desirable Bill; it is an administrative measure more than anything else. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, it is virtually a tidying up exercise and, at the same time, one in which the situation has been updated.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

COUNTRY TOWNS SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Leader of the Opposition) [11.02 p.m.]: As the Minister indicated, this is a small Bill which gives the Government power to take over company-owned sewerage works which have been constructed in the various closed towns built mainly as a result of mining operations. This seems to be a sensible procedure. No doubt over the years we will see a number of such Bills, as other towns become open, and the companies concerned approach the Government to take over the management of the sewerage installations. This will apply particularly where a company town becomes integrated with other people associated with the various services and general infrastructure of the town.

Under these circumstances, the Opposition sees no reason to object to the Bill. It is the type of amending legislation which represents sensible action on the part of the Government. I believe the example given of the town of Wickham to be a good one, and I feel such legislation is of advantage to the people of this State. Accordingly, I support the Bill.

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [11.04 p.m.]: I apologise to my leader for being absent from the Chamber when this Bill was brought on. As he indicated, the Opposition supports the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition has adequately put the case on behalf of the Opposition, and I rise merely to express my apologies and to indicate my support of the Bill.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Water Supplies) [11.05 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its co-operation in getting this Bill through the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 11.06 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 18th August, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (18): ON NOTICE

1. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

Breathalyser Tests

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Police:

(1) Will the Minister admit that spot breath tests of motorists are taking place by the Road Traffic Authority?

(2) If the answer is "No" will he explain why a motorist, who had not been drinking, but who had called at a shop next to the Darling Range Hotel at approximately 10.15 p.m. on Wednesday, the 4th August, 1976, was subsequently stopped by an RTA patrolman and asked to take a breathalyser test,