

not have the result which I fear it might have. The author of the Bill sees my fears as a possibility, but he thinks the legislation will have the opposite effect.

Because this Bill is an experiment, and because there is an increase in child delinquency, I am prepared to give it a trial. If it does not work then we will have an opportunity at some future session of Parliament to adopt something else. On that basis I support the measure, but I again warn the community that the cost of child delinquency is growing steadily. It is time that parents, children, and the community generally took stock of the situation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson.

House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 2nd November, 1967

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Police), and read a first time.

QUESTIONS (16): ON NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION

Dismissals in Private Employment: Appeals

1. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) Is he aware of *The West Australian* Press comment of the 14th March, 1967, that—

(a) all British workers dismissed for disciplinary reasons might soon have the right of appeal to a special labour court or tribunal;

(b) this right of appeal existed in most other industrial countries of the world;

(c) in many this appeal was through industrial courts?

(2) Since Government and semi-Government employees have machinery to provide for appeals, will he consider legislation to grant right of appeal to employees in private employment through recourse to an industrial arbitration commissioner or other competent authority or individual?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(1) and (2) I have not seen the article to which the honourable member refers. It is considered

that the rights of both employer and employee in the matter of hiring and firing are adequately catered for under the various industrial awards and agreements existing in this State.

2. *This question was postponed.*

GERALDTON-CARNARVON ROAD

Bitumen Drums: Disposal

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

Will he prevail upon the Main Roads Board to conform to anti-litter injunctions by bulldozing, burying, or otherwise disposing of the big piles of bitumen drums along the Geraldton-Carnarvon road?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The bitumen drums which are in dumps alongside the Geraldton-Carnarvon road have a market value. More than 12 months ago considerable quantities of them were sold to various interested buyers, but to date they have not taken possession of them.

Having regard to the considerable delay in removing the drums, the Main Roads Department proposes to warn the purchasers that unless they are removed in the near future the department will cancel the sale of the drums and dispose of them elsewhere.

4. and 5. *These questions were postponed.*

RING ROAD SYSTEM

Northern Leg: Lease of Land

6. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it a fact that a start has been made to lease back land held for the northern leg of the inner ring freeway?

(2) If "Yes," what is the reason for such action?

(3) What is the length of time for which leases are being agreed upon?

Narrows Interchange: Letting of Contract

(4) Is consideration being given to the letting of a contract for the construction of the Narrows interchange?

(5) Is it the intention to let such contract prior to the general election?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Many properties have been acquired by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority along the line of the northern leg of

the inner ring freeway. Pending the clearing of the land for road purposes the properties are rented or leased to interested persons.

- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Where land has been acquired which contains a factory type of building or other substantial improvement, then generally a five-year lease is granted. Houses are rented on a week to week tenancy.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) No; except that the first subcontract for prestressing of structures of the value of \$794,223 has already been let.

ROLEYSTONE SCHOOL

Additional Classroom

7. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will an additional classroom for Roleystone Primary School be provided this financial year?
- (2) If "Yes," when is it expected the room will be available for use?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
 - (2) Anticipated by the end of February, 1968.
8. *This question was postponed.*

CROSSWALK AT KELMSCOTT

Approval

9. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Police:

Understanding that a traffic/pedestrian conflict count through Kelmscott by the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott confirmed a figure above the minimum laid down before the installation of a crosswalk is considered—

- (1) Has approval been given for the installation and when will work commence?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "No," what further facts are required before approval is granted?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) It is known that the traffic counts conducted by the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire Council revealed a conflict higher than the minimum laid down. However, when those counts were checked by the Main Roads Department it was found that, if pedestrians and vehicles were counted within the limits applicable to this type of study, the minimum was not

reached. Therefore, before approval for a crosswalk is given there must be a considerable increase in vehicular-pedestrian conflict. It is stressed that the provision of crosswalks where vehicular-pedestrian conflicts are low is highly dangerous to pedestrians.

CORRIGIN HIGH SCHOOL

Headmasters: Appointments

10. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Who have been the appointed headmasters of the Corrigin Junior High School since the school was made a Class I junior high school?
- (2) What was the duration of each appointment?
- (3) Of each duration, what percentage of this period was actually spent in active office at the Corrigin Junior High School by each of the appointed headmasters?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Mr. A. P. Latham.
Mr. A. E. Jones.
- (2) Mr. Latham—1964-65.
Mr. Jones—1966-67.
- (3) 1964-65: Mr. A. P. Latham seconded to Cunderdin. Mr. B. Cohen appointed relieving headmaster over the whole period. 1966-67: Mr. A. E. Jones. 1966 Mr. Jones on long service leave followed by secondment to teachers' college. Mr. B. Manassis appointed relieving headmaster over this period. 1967 Mr. Jones took up his appointment at Corrigin.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Pneumoconiosis, Bronchitis, and Silicosis: Claim Forms

11. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is he aware that the form issued to claimants for workers' compensation under section 8(1)(d) of the Workers' Compensation Act by the Pneumoconiosis Medical Board states, *inter alia*, "N.B. Where disablement first occurs on or after 14/12/1964 chronic bronchitis in association with silicosis is deemed to be pneumoconiosis"?
- (2) Is he further aware that section 8(1)(c) of the Workers' Compensation Act states, *inter alia*, "Where, after the coming into operation of the Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1964, a worker becomes disabled from earning full wages, by reason of

suffering from chronic bronchitis in association with silicosis?"

- (3) Does he not consider that the information contained on the form in respect of bronchitis is incorrect and misleading?
- (4) Will he give consideration to having this wording on the form altered to conform with the provisions of the Act as set out in section 8(1)(c)?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No.
- (4) If the honourable member could indicate in what manner the form misleads, consideration to alteration will certainly be given.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Payments

12. Mr. McPHARLIN asked the Minister for Transport:

What is the amount of road maintenance tax paid by—

- (a) primary producers using their own vehicles;
- (b) contract carriers hauling primary products;
- (c) contract carriers hauling superphosphate from works to farms;

for the period the 30th September, 1966, to the 30th September, 1967?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) \$53,478.
- (b) and (c) Returns submitted by carriers show the mileage operated, but do not indicate either the type of loading or the names or occupations of persons for whom goods are carried. For this reason, the information asked for in questions (b) and (c) cannot be ascertained.

SOUTH KENSINGTON OCCUPATIONAL CENTRE

Domestic Science Facilities

13. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Education:

Has it yet been possible to make finance available to extend the facilities for the teaching of domestic science at the South Kensington Occupational Centre?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Yes; money has been allocated for this work to commence this financial year.

SCHOOLS

Group Classes

14. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) To what extent is it necessary to group classes at State schools?
- (2) Can he give an indication as to how widely this practice is used?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (i) To allow the organisation of progressive modern teaching techniques such as team teaching, cross grading, and unit progress in all schools.
- (ii) To allow the organisation of remedial class groups and specialised teaching groups particularly in larger schools.
- (iii) To permit effective organisation of class 2 and 3 schools.
- (2) There are 1,061 grouped classes. This figure is exclusive of one-teacher schools, special classes, and native schools.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Additional Storey

15. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

Is the new front section of Parliament House building capable of carrying another storey should additional accommodation become necessary at some time in the future?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

An additional accommodation floor to the new front section of Parliament House was not allowed for in the architectural and engineering design of this section.

SCHOOL CHILDREN

Allowances North of 26th Parallel

16. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Education:

Further to my question 1 of the 3rd August, 1967—

- (1) Did he read an article in *The West Australian* of the 27th instant as follows: "Independent Schools put Fees up," in one case, \$30, in the other \$25, per term?
- (2) Would he ascertain and inform the House what the fees per term at these schools were in 1946 when the away-from-home allowance was £30 per annum; in 1947 when the living-away-from-home allowance was £50 per annum;

num; in 1965 when the living-away-from-home allowance was £80 per annum?

- (3) In view of the steep increases in the school fees over the past few years, how can he conclude that the present away-from-home allowances substantially cover the difference between the cost of living at home and that of living away from home?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Fees are not uniform in all independent schools. A typical example is—

1946—Tuition, \$22.75; tuition and boarding, \$75.

1947—Tuition, \$22.75; tuition and boarding, \$75.

1965—Tuition, \$124.00; tuition and boarding, \$292.

- (3) The living-away-from-home allowance is related to costs of board in hostels. The living-away-from-home allowance has risen with living costs. In May, 1965, the maximum allowance was increased to \$200 per annum. Between 1946 and 1965, the basic wage rose by 308 per cent.; the living-away-from-home allowance by 333 per cent.

QUESTIONS (7): WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE

Unlicensed Firearms: Return of Mr. Stokes' Rifles

1. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Police:

I preface my question by informing the Minister that I regret I have not had time to give him notice of this question; I only received the information myself at about 1.45 p.m. today. My question is further to those asked by the members for Dale and Swan in regard to rifleman Mr. Tom Stokes. A letter was forwarded to the Commonwealth association for State riflemen, and advice received indicates that the State authority acted outside its jurisdiction in suspending Mr. Stokes. It has only power, I believe, in regard to expulsion. In view of that, and the information in this morning's Press, will the Minister take immediate steps to see that Mr. Stokes's rifles are returned to him immedi-

ately? He has not had an opportunity since the 9th October to defend his position and he has been informed that he is still a member of the Perth Rifle Club, and as such is entitled to have his rifles.

The SPEAKER:

Order! I think the question is "Will he have the rifles returned to him?" Is that correct?

- Mr. TOMS: That is part of it, but it is necessary for me to give a fuller explanation in regard to the time-lapse. I feel I should give the Minister all the information so he can either make a determination now or get the information as soon as possible. I therefore ask the Minister: Will he, in view of the information now supplied, contact the Commonwealth association, if he is not conversant with the particular rules, and take immediate steps to have the rifles returned to Mr. Stokes?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

I must admit that my only knowledge of this matter has been gained from what I have read in the Press. I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the commissioner; nevertheless, the commissioner must have had just cause or reason to take possession of the rifles. I am not in a position to say, at this stage anyhow, that the rifles will be returned to Mr. Stokes. There must have been some reason why the police took this action, and I will endeavour to find out that reason. Whether or not it was at the request of the rifle association, I do not know. However that is as far as I can go.

RAPID TRANSIT TERMINAL

Midland

2. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Railways:

Can the Minister advise the House the latest position in regard to the rapid transit terminal based at Midland which will in part service the adjoining hills area?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

A tender has been let for the contract for the rapid transit terminal at Midland. Seventeen tenders were received. The lowest tender was for \$394,249 submitted by Jaxon Constructions of East Perth and a tender has been let to that company.

SEALING OF EYRE HIGHWAY

Press Announcement

3. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Works:

Is the Minister aware of the statement made in the South Australian Parliament yesterday concerning that Government's intention of proceeding with sealing of part of the Eyre Highway and possibly allocating funds in 1968-69 to begin the Ceduna-Penong section?

Being aware of our Government's high priority in completing our section in December, 1969, which it considers of the utmost importance to the nation and Western Australia—

- (1) Will the Government continue to press for a Commonwealth grant to speed up completion of the sealing of the whole of Eyre Highway?
- (2) When is a fresh approach to the Commonwealth Government expected to be made?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

I would like to thank the honourable member for giving me a copy of this question just before the House sat.

Mr. May: You prepared it for him?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: On the contrary. I have read the Press statement to which the honourable member refers and in regard to the two-pronged question he asks, I will combine them and say it must be understood that the State's authority ends at the Western Australian border. It is true that it is hoped to complete the black top to the border at least by December, 1969. In effect, whilst our duty and responsibility ends at the border, our intense interest still lies with that section between Penong and the Western Australian border. It should be understood that Western Australia joined with South Australia in a combined approach to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance from that Government to complete this stretch of the road. However, in its wisdom, the Commonwealth Government has declined to assist and says it is the responsibility of the South Australian Government. The State Government will continue to play what part it can in trying to interest in the appropriate way the Commonwealth Government to assist in the early completion of what will be the final 300 miles of road in South Australia.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Commission's Report: Receipt

4. Mr. TONKIN asked the Deputy Premier:

Has the Government received the report of the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the *Daily News* articles concerning the Totalisator Agency Board?

Mr. NALDER replied:

I have not any knowledge of the receipt of this report up to the present time.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

Enrolments and Printing of Books

5. Mr. LEWIS (Minister for Education): Yesterday the member for Gascoyne asked a question without notice about the delay in the issuing of correspondence lessons. Some reference was made to a suggestion that this delay was due to the Government Printing Office. I promised to make further inquiries, and I have been informed that the delay was due to the sudden illness of the person within the Education Department responsible for preparing the maths papers. This caused some delay in preparation. The printer was not responsible for the delay. Two or three weeks is considered by the department not unduly long to wait for the printing of work of this kind.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE
MEETING*Principal Architect: Presence*

6. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Works:

Would he endeavour to arrange for the Principal Architect to be present next Tuesday evening when the meeting is held in this Chamber for members of Parliament to consider the aspects of the Parliament House surrounds? This request is made in case there are any questions which require to be answered and which this officer could answer in preference to officers of the Main Roads Department.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

I will give some thought to this request. It will be remembered that on a previous occasion when we met in this Chamber to discuss the closure of Harvest Terrace some of the principal officers of several of the departments concerned were present in the Chamber. Since that time references have been made to their presence in a manner which has not pleased

me particularly. In fact, I do not think many people would be pleased about these references. However, I will give consideration to the request. I am not at all sure that the Principal Architect would be in a position to answer any questions which the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Town Planning, or I could not answer.

Mr. Tonkin: How would the Minister know that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It might put the Principal Architect in a somewhat invidious position.

EXPLOSIVES SHIP

Fire: Details

7. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Minister for Works): The other day, the member for Pilbara asked me a question about a fire which occurred on the explosives ship, *Rosita*, in Port Hedland harbour. He asked whether or not I had information about this matter.

I wish to advise him, and other members of the Chamber, that the Harbour and Light Department does not allow explosives ships into harbours under its control unless a permit has been issued by the Chief Inspector of Explosives, and, as I understand the position, an inspector of the Explosive Department is present at the port.

On this occasion, Mr. Grieve, the second in command to the chief inspector, was present at Port Hedland besides Inspector Whiteman and also the Manager of the Harbour and Light Department. These three people were all present at the time. I advise that all the necessary precautions were taken, such as barricading the wharf, and a watchman being present at all times. For the further information of the member for Pilbara, I advise that apparently the fire started in the room of a member of the crew, and it was very quickly put out.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. May, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. Rowberry (Warren) on the ground of ill-health.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [2.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [2.29 p.m.]: There is one matter to which I wish to refer at this stage. During the debate on the second reading, I made some references to the amount of wine which is being introduced into Western Australia each year and bottled locally, and then sold in hotels and other places. I refer to the actual statement I made on the 11th October, 1967, which appears on page 1379 of *Hansard*. It reads as follows:—

Most members will know that a tremendous quantity of wine is introduced into this State from the Eastern States. It is brought over in bulk and bottled by hoteliers here. As a consequence, cheap wine is being dumped in the State, bottled here, and then sold in competition with the better wines which are produced locally. As a result, many of our producers find it virtually impossible to sell their products to hotels and similar establishments in the metropolitan area, and throughout Western Australia. They have to find their own markets, and they have been successful in doing so.

I made this statement principally for the reason that I was aware that over 1,000,000 gallons of wine are brought into Western Australia each year, but my statement produced an immediate rebuke from the chief executive officer of the local branch of the Australian Hotels Association. In *The West Australian* dated the 13th October last he was reported as follows:—

The chief executive officer of the Australian Hotels Association, Mr. P. Fermanis, said the association was not opposed to wine saloons being granted a licence to sell food.

The statement made in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday by Mr. Grayden (Lib., South Perth) that hotel keepers bought wine in bulk from the Eastern States and bottled it locally was not true.

No. A.H.A. members were involved. Mr. Grayden's statement was sweeping and could not be substantiated, he said.

I admit I used the term, "hoteliers" lightly because I had in mind other establishments in addition to hotels. I used the term because I knew 1,000,000 gallons of wine were being imported into the State each year and were being bottled locally, and much of this wine was subsequently finding its way into hotels and other similar establishments. That was the first reason why I made the statement.

The second reason was that, as the member for South Perth, I represent an electorate which has only two hotels. For many years the publican of one of those bottled wine in South Perth and, to the

best of my knowledge, at that time he was the vice-president of the A.H.A. He bottled the wine in a shop in Mends Street near his hotel and this shop was visited by members of Parliament whilst the wine bottling was in operation. The publican bottling the wine sold it under his own brand.

Mr. Hawke: Not to members of Parliament.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Being the member for the electorate in which this practice was going on for many years, and because the publican in question made no secret of what he was doing, but sold the wine to the exclusion of other brands, I took it for granted that this was common practice. I hope, as my statement is based on fact, the A.H.A. has given instructions to its members that they should not indulge in this practice but that the publicans should follow the instruction's to the letter and not merely put up a front.

It could well be that the publican I have referred to was conducting the wine bottling business in his brother's or in his father's name whilst he ran the hotel. That may well have been so. Nevertheless, I repeat that the publican made no secret of the fact that the wine bottling shop was his business; and there are many witnesses who could come forward to corroborate that fact. I do not want to mention the publican's name and, further, I have no criticism to offer against what he was doing, because it was perfectly legitimate.

I simply wish to point out that 1,000,000 gallons of wine were being brought into this State each year and were being bottled locally. I used the term "hoteliers" in the knowledge that this practice had been going on for so long. The publican in question has since left South Perth but is conducting a hotel in another part of the State, and I understand he is still bottling the same wine. I have raised this matter again merely to reply to a statement made by the chief executive officer of the A.H.A.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Council with amendments.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [2.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is quite brief, but it is of importance to many people. When a body is cremated at a licensed crematorium the ashes must be deposited within the crematorium grounds, unless the Commissioner of Public Health grants permission for their removal. This is provided in section 7 of

the Cremation Act. The Act itself was introduced in 1929 and was modelled on the then existing English legislation.

Cremation legislation of the mid-nineteenth century was extremely cautious. The practice was opposed by strong elements in the community and the apparatus employed in those days was not as efficient as it might have been. There was, therefore, a substantial reason for demanding that no remains be removed from the premises without the approval of a health authority.

We have two licensed crematoriums in Western Australia. These are at Karrakatta and Fremantle. Both are supervised by the Public Health Department. They are conducted on rigidly controlled lines and have efficient and modern equipment.

The law requiring the administrator to obtain a permit from the Public Health Department, before removing ashes, has been reduced to an exercise in red tape which, in the opinion of the Public Health Department ought to be removed.

This Bill therefore amends section 7 of the Cremation Act, so that in future the authority controlling a crematorium may deliver ashes to the administrator of an estate, without reference to the Public Health Department. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Toms.

COUNTRY TOWNS SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Water Supplies) [2.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Although this is only a small Bill, the whole purpose behind its introduction is of considerable importance. As most members are aware, there are many country towns in this State which require sewerage schemes, but because of the heavy demands on loan funds the Government has not been able to provide all the schemes that have been requested. Indeed, in some of the smaller country towns where sewerage schemes have been started, the Government has not been able to keep pace with the development of those towns. From every point of view this is not a satisfactory state of affairs, and in an effort to tap all the loan resources available to the State the Government has decided to encourage local authorities to construct and to operate sewerage schemes in suitably sized towns under their control. There are three basic reasons for this policy, and they are as follows:—

The first, as I have said, is the desire of the Government to muster or harness all the loan resources available to the State as a whole.

The second is to encourage local authorities to accept a still larger degree of responsibility for the improvement of living conditions in the towns within their boundaries.

The third is that sewerage undertakings lend themselves to operation by local authorities, since these schemes are, of necessity, confined in their operations to comparatively small areas; i.e., townsites.

The introduction of these schemes does enhance the value of town properties, and it also generates better living conditions. This in turn creates a favourable climate for further amenities.

A careful examination of the present position has been made by senior officers of the Treasury and the Public Works Department; and, following their recommendations, the Government felt that unless the loan resources available to local authorities were utilised, there would be little likelihood of any major expansion in the provision of sewerage services to country towns in the next few years.

It is not the intention of the Government to abrogate its responsibilities in assisting local authorities, either in the physical construction of town sewerage schemes, or in providing finance to assist them to make good the deficiency between income and expenditure.

At present the situation is that the General Revenue Fund provides, overall, approximately 75 per cent. of the interest and sinking funds of country sewerage schemes, and it is proposed that under the new policy the Government will subsidise local governing authorities to assist them to make good deficits which may be incurred in obtaining sufficient revenue above operating costs to provide for interest and sinking fund charges. The Government will be prepared to finance such deficits up to 75 per cent. of the cost of the interest and sinking fund charges on the scheme when the maximum rate is charged, although it is hoped that through discussions between the shire councils and the officers of the department, in the majority of cases a deficit of 75 per cent. will not be incurred.

Additionally, the Public Works Department will provide general supervision, both in the construction of the sewerage scheme and in its operations, although it is expected that local authorities will engage consulting engineers to design and construct the various schemes; it is then expected that the local authorities themselves will be capable of carrying out the normal running and maintenance activities.

As I have more or less implied, before any such scheme is commenced there will be close consultation between the officers of the Government and the particular

local authority to ensure that the scheme will be economically viable.

This proposed amendment to the Country Towns Sewerage Act is for the purpose of ensuring that where, under the Local Government Act, a local authority is already raising revenue to the maximum allowed by that Act and such revenue is being fully expended, it will be able to raise rates to cover the costs of running the sewerage scheme, up to the maximum amount allowed in the Country Towns Sewerage Act.

In effect it means that where a local authority runs a sewerage scheme it will be able to raise sewerage rates instead of this having to be done—as at present—by the Public Works Department.

In conclusion I feel that two points should be emphasised. They are—

(1) No local governing authority will be forced to construct and maintain a sewerage scheme, if it does not wish to do so; and

(2) those towns which already have a sewerage scheme provided and run by the Public Works Department will be encouraged to take over that scheme.

As members are aware, the local authorities can raise loans up to \$300,000 each year, so that towns which have sewerage schemes at present run by the Public Works Department will, if they take over the respective schemes, be in a better position to carry out expansion work at a greater rate than the Government is able to do at present, in view of the heavy demand the Government is experiencing for loan works of all kinds.

It is felt that nothing but good can come from this new policy, as it will enable those towns wanting sewerage schemes to obtain them sooner than would otherwise be the case; it will enable local governing authorities to play an even greater part in the life of their communities; and it will release some pressure on State loan moneys which are required for other urgent developmental works. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Sewell.

FAUNA PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st November.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Murray) [2.57 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words in support of this Bill which I consider to be a very good one in every respect. There is a growing awareness of the very urgent need for further protection and conservation of the wildlife of this State. This is evidenced by numerous newspaper articles; by letters to the Press; by programmes shown on television; and by many other means.

Not only is a growing awareness evident within this State, but worldwide there is a growing interest.

The danger of wildlife becoming extinct is brought home to people more forcibly because of the large-scale developments that are taking place throughout the State. Large areas of land are being cleared, and the people are wondering what is to happen to the wildlife which roams over these areas. Large-scale and rapid development of land has upset many of our animals; and over the last 200 years since we occupied Australia I think that eight species of our marsupials have become extinct; and, further, many other species are in danger of becoming extinct.

One might ask why there is a desire to preserve the wildlife of this country. There are a number of reasons why that should be done. Firstly, the wildlife should be preserved for recreational purposes, because our wildlife provides endless scope for the activities of photographers, bushwalkers, campers, picnickers, and animal lovers. Further, there is an economic aspect in that many of our animals help to destroy pests. To an extent in the early years, some of our wildlife was used as food. The value of the skins has also been very important. In the early days of this State, farmers and others augmented their incomes by the catching and trapping of animals for their skin value.

Then there is the tourist value. Visitors from overseas, after hearing of the unique and wonderful wildlife of this country, make special visits to the State to see the fauna for themselves. This is very important. Then there is the educational aspect such as the study of science in schools. This starts with nature study. Scientists need animals in their natural surroundings in order to study the various problems which confront agriculturalists and to carry out research in connection with medical science. In another place it was mentioned that the quokkas on Rott-nest Island have been of great assistance to the medical profession in connection with a certain disease.

There is a further point, perhaps as important as any of the others I have mentioned; that is, our native animals are so much a part of Western Australia. Our wildlife and native flowers are world famous; they are part of our heritage, and it is extremely important that we should do all we can to preserve them so they will survive for ever. If we do not take sufficient precautions for their preservation, I feel that perhaps in 100 or 200 years many of the species that are common today may not exist.

Decimation of our wildlife is caused by a number of factors such as hunting, shooting, trapping for skins, and poisoning for pests, and by predatory animals, such as foxes, and so on. All of these things

have had a great impact on the destruction of our wildlife. I am well aware of the impact that the common rabbit had a few years ago. First of all, this was because of the close manner of its feeding habits which resulted in whole areas being eaten out. This ruined the natural environment of other animals and also the cover of the countryside.

In order to combat the rabbit as much as possible, farmers laid long trails of phosphorous poisoning—miles in many cases—which, in itself, caused much decimation amongst birds and other animals. The main thing to guard against is the destruction of the natural environment or habitat. Native animals require this for food, water, and cover; and, once it is destroyed, fauna are exposed to other animals and to circumstances with which they cannot cope.

I feel the future of the conservation and preservation of our wildlife must be bound up with good wildlife laws backed by the proper enforcement of them, together with skilful administration. In regard to reserves and sanctuaries, skilful administration will not only allow our wildlife to be preserved, but will allow numbers to be increased, yet not sufficiently to become a menace by eating out the reserves on which they will be held.

The Fauna Protection Act, which this Bill seeks to amend in many ways, was based to some extent on the Gaming Act of 1912. This Act, itself, was largely based on the Statutes of the British Parliament and, as its name suggests, the idea at that time was to preserve animals in order to keep a sufficient number to enable people to shoot for food and for general sport. One can quite imagine that in 1912 there would be an abundance of animals. It would have been comparatively easy to indulge in the recreation—as some people call it—of hunting and game shooting. However, in 1950, with the passing of the Fauna Protection Act, a further big step forward was taken.

The Bill before us is much more important, because not only does it embody the preservation and protection of our wildlife, but it will assist animals to rehabilitate themselves and increase in numbers by the provision of sanctuaries for rehabilitation purposes. All in all, it is a very progressive measure. One of the sections of the Fauna Protection Act is to be deleted. I refer to the one in which reference is made to the priority of certain other Acts of Parliament over the Fauna Protection Act. While perhaps there has been no conflict in this matter with the Vermin Act, the Zoological Gardens Act, the Fisheries Act, the Whaling Act, and maybe others, the inference is that those Acts are of more importance and the Fauna Protection Act is only of secondary consideration. This, of course, is not true;

and I am pleased the provision is to be deleted from the Act. There is no intention of putting the Fauna Protection Act ahead of those other Acts, but at least it will be placed on the same level. This will enable matters to be fully discussed with the various departments, and no doubt an amicable solution to problems will be obtained as they come forward.

It is intended to increase the size of the authority from six members to 10. It is also intended to increase the number of *ex officio* members from three to four. This has been done because it has been found that further advice will be necessary in connection with the many problems that will have to be taken into account. The four *ex officio* members are the Director of Fisheries and Fauna, the Chief Warden of Fauna, the Chief Vermin Control Officer, and the Conservator of Forests. The Chief Warden of Fauna is a very capable officer and I understand he has recently been sent overseas to consider the latest ideas in regard to sanctuaries, parks, gardens, and such things, and to obtain first-hand information which will be of value to this authority.

It is necessary that the Chief Vermin Control Officer should be an *ex officio* member of the authority. From time to time problems must come up with regard to animals being vermin, and becoming a menace to farmers, pastoralists, and others in different parts of the State. The opinion of that officer will, at all times, be most valuable because he will be working in close co-operation with the Agriculture Protection Board.

Another member of the authority will be the Conservator of Forests. He is also a scientist and, naturally, in his position as conservator he is aware of the need to control bushfires and prevent the burning of the natural habitat of the fauna so that it is not unduly damaged. This is extremely important in the development of sanctuaries and his advice in this connection would be of great moment. Five million acres of forest come under the jurisdiction of the Conservator of Forests and quite a number of animals must live in an area of that size.

The Forests Department has developed numerous roads and tracks through its forests, and such roads and tracks will be a feature of a number of reserves. Here again is an aspect which the Conservator of Forests will bring to the conference table for the benefit of the rest of the members of the authority.

It has been decided to increase the number of *ex officio* members from three to four. The Director of Fisheries and Fauna will be appointed as the chairman of the authority. As members would know, Mr. Fraser is the Director of Fisheries and Fauna, and I understand he is to retire in the not too distant future. I would like to pay tribute to the splendid

work he has done in Western Australia as Director of Fisheries and Fauna in this State. Although he is not a scientist he has been an extremely able administrator and a very keen and practical man. I believe we have been fortunate in having his services for so long.

Two zoologists and a taxonomic botanist will also be appointed to the authority. It is very pleasing to see that a botanist is to be appointed, because with animals living within the sanctuaries it is necessary to study the flora—which provides cover for the fauna—and also to study the eating habits of the animals so that the native flora can be preserved. Taxonomy is a particular science and is used primarily in this section of botany. I think it is good that a scientist with this ability is to be appointed. The appointment of the two zoologists speaks for itself.

Some comment was made that, perhaps, there were not enough country interests on the authority. One of the appointees will be a farmer whom I know very well. He has had wide experience in Western Australia over many years, and he was in the northern part of the State as a jackaroo and worked on many stations. He was also a member of the C.S.I.R.O. At the moment he has a large property in the Pinjarra district and he has other interests in the Midland area. He is a very practical and able type of man and I feel that as a member of this fauna conservation authority he will be a great asset. All in all, I think the authority will be an able one and we can look to it for a great deal of progress and a great deal of expert advice.

The Minister will be guided largely by the advice of the authority, not only in the management of the reserves, but in many other ways regarding the general conservation of wildlife in the State. The authority will contribute very largely to better conservation methods in the future.

Another item is the classification of sanctuaries, and the working out of plans for the development and rehabilitation of these sanctuaries. Such plans will be presented to the Minister for his approval, and I think the authority will be capable of presenting such plans. We know that many different types of reserves will be involved requiring a great deal of work, but I think the authority will be able to deal adequately with the situation.

I would like to refer to the Tuttanning sanctuary, which I had the pleasure of visiting last year. It is the first of our smaller developed sanctuaries and is situated some 15 miles east of Pingelly. It is a 3,000-acre sanctuary right in the heart of a well-developed agricultural area. The sanctuary is in its natural state and is well fenced. There are numerous roads through it which have been constructed by the conservation authority.

The sanctuary contains many different types of wild life, which live in excellent conditions in the area. I have spoken to many farmers in the district and they have not complained, but have been proud and very pleased to have a sanctuary of this type within their area. It has been in existence for two or three years and has proved a great success. I understand it will form guide lines for the development of further sanctuaries within the State.

I hope that in the development of additional sanctuaries consideration will be given to placing them nearer to where there are more people so that the people will be able to avail themselves of the opportunity of seeing the wildlife in its natural habitat. I think that such sanctuaries would prove to be a great tourist attraction in many districts.

It is interesting to know that 1,000,000 acres may be set aside in the Kimberley area, or some other remote part of the State. This is very necessary and it indicates that the administrators are looking to the future. I feel there is room for many more reserves such as the one which exists at Tuttanning, but they should be situated closer to more settled areas.

If the sanctuaries are run as well as the one at Tuttanning, I feel they will prove very popular. As the Minister pointed out, some sanctuaries could be situated where there are swamps and lakes, and at different times of the year they could be opened to picnickers, tourists, and others who wished to partake of the pleasures of recreation in those areas without disturbing the animals.

After a while animals become used to people, and a typical example of this is the Kruger National Park in South Africa. That park is world famous, and it amazes the thousands of tourists who visit it when they find they can go to within a few feet of many of the wild animals of the jungle without disturbing them to any great extent.

I have been told that one of the rules for anybody travelling through the Kruger National Park is that on no account can he get out of his car. I can quite understand that, as wild elephants cross the road in front of cars. They are oblivious of the cars, and the drivers have to stop to allow them to cross. The same applies to lions. Although we do not have these types of animals in Australia, I believe that with kangaroos and other species—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: We have tortoises.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Yes. With kangaroos and other wildlife, the average person is quite prepared to go out of his way to allow them perfect freedom.

While talking of sanctuaries, I notice that the Director of Fisheries and Fauna is to be the chairman of the new conservation authority, and the thought occurred to me that it may be possible to have

marine sanctuaries set aside in reef-enclosed areas where people could skindive and take photographs of marine life, coral construction, and the reefs, without being worried about skin divers shooting at fish with spear-guns. Many of the inshore reefs in certain parts of Australia—I understand this applies particularly to areas 20 miles north and south of the Sydney Heads—have been fished out by skindivers; and it could happen, and to some extent is happening, with the close inshore reefs along the Western Australian coast. I hope that some consideration can be given to the setting aside of certain areas of reef-enclosed water to allow people, for the sheer love of it, to skindive to take photographs and enjoy watching marine life in its natural habitat.

One of the clauses in the Bill deals with publicity, the erecting of notices, and the issuing of booklets giving information about various species of wildlife and about the reserves. I think this is a good idea because many people do not know where the reserves are or what types they are; nor do they know what they are or are not allowed to do on them. I hope numerous well-prepared notices will be displayed so that they will be easy for people to read and be properly informed regarding their rights on different reserves.

Not many people who travel backwards and forwards from Rockingham and Mandurah have noticed that there is a wildlife reserve along the side of the road. A notice is stuck on a tree, but I doubt very much whether many people are aware that it is there. The printing on the notice is very small and it instructs people that they are not permitted to shoot on the reserve and advises them what they are and are not allowed to do. However, to be able to read it one has to stop the car, walk up to the notice, and stare at it. In my view notices regarding reserves should be placed on conspicuous places; the printing should be large and legible; and full details should be set out on them.

Another clause of the Bill refers to the setting up of a conservation trust fund, and this is a desirable provision. Money for the fund will be obtained from a levy on duck shooters, or the licenses issued to duck shooters. However, a license will cost only a nominal amount—\$2. It is difficult to know just how many duck shooters there are, but it is estimated that the number could be around 8,000. However, it is anybody's guess. The duck shooters themselves have been most co-operative and have stated that they are quite willing to co-operate with the authority when it is established to preserve and protect wild ducks and wildlife generally.

A sum of \$2 for a license is not a large figure, but I hope these licenses will be

easily obtainable and that they will be available in many different places so that if a person wishes to obtain a license he will be able to go to any local township or convenient place and get one. I think this is very necessary.

The fund will be used for research into what we call our wetlands, and in the provision of cover, such as trees, and shelter for the protection of wild ducks, so that we will be able to have a duck shooting season every year. If this sort of preservation is not undertaken perhaps in a few years ducks, like a number of other wild fowl, could easily become extinct. It is not that shooting has such an effect, but other factors must be considered. In my view overdrainage has done much to destroy the natural habitat and environment of our native wild fowl, and it has played a big part in reducing the numbers of these birds.

In 1949, in the United Kingdom, the Nature Conservancy Board reserved many thousands of acres for natural reserves for wild fowl and other wildlife. One of these reserves is at a place called Slimbridge, and I understand that on that reserve there are 149 different types of ducks or wild fowl. These sanctuaries are carried on with money obtained from levies, bequests, and donations, and I understand that \$80,000 a year is obtained from these sources. Approximately 100,000 tourists travel through the areas every year. Very little shooting is allowed in any of the reserves, but people like to go to these places to see the ducks and other wild fowl in their natural environment. This scheme has been a tremendous success. In my view, too, sanctuaries such as are envisaged for Western Australia would be a tourist attraction in many areas.

Reference has also been made to licenses being required for meat processors. This provision refers mainly to kangaroo meat processors, and I understand the shooting of kangaroos for this purpose is on a fairly large scale—nearly 3,600,000 lb. of kangaroo meat was processed last year, and in certain areas this processing could increase. Apparently it has been thought desirable to provide for licenses for processors in order to get some liaison between the committee and the kangaroo shooters. We must realise, too, that when rules and regulations are made there must be a strict enforcement of them if they are to be of any value.

As regards penalties, those that were inserted in the Act in 1950 were based on a basic wage of \$14. Today the basic wage is in the vicinity of \$34 and it is only natural that present-day penalties should be increased by the same proportion as the basic wage has been increased since 1950.

In 1959 the authorities in South Australia and Western Australia were most

concerned at the large number of birds being trapped or caught and exported to different parts of the world particularly the United Kingdom. In that year it was estimated that something like 400,000 birds had been trapped in the two States, the intention being to export them overseas. It was estimated that out of the 400,000 probably only 100,000 would arrive at their destination alive, because there is a very high mortality rate among these birds when they are caught and transferred from place to place.

In 1959 the Commonwealth Government took strong action to prevent this sort of thing, and the State has also followed that line. The penalties for this type of offence have been increased steeply, mainly because of the high prices these birds are fetching on the European market. While high prices prevail, they will provide an incentive for people to break the law in one form or another. I am sure the authority will watch this situation very carefully. Although I think the penalties are necessary, I hope it will be possible to provide more education in this direction in our schools, and among the public generally, so that we can ensure the preservation and conservation of our wildlife.

If more education were given in this direction, it would not be necessary to invoke the penalties quite so often, because people would take an active interest in the conservation of the wildlife of the State. This is a community effort and, as citizens, we should really get behind the committee and give it all the support possible. The matter is extremely important.

The preservation of our fauna is something that we should be proud to hand down to generations in years to come, particularly as it relates to the natural fauna and the wildlife of the State. The members of the board will comprise a band of keen, practical, and competent enthusiasts, and, together with the members of this House and the public, generally, I feel they could do a great deal to preserve and conserve the valuable wildlife of our State.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [3.33 p.m.]: I have listened with very considerable interest to the general support which has been given to this legislation. It also has my support, because I think the principle contained in the Bill is excellent. A matter has been brought to my notice, however, with which the member for Dale is familiar, which has caused me to doubt the sincerity of the Government in this matter. According to the information supplied to me, steps were taken to have a fauna area declared in the Victoria district. It seemed that this had the approval of those whose business it would be to give consideration to this matter.

All of a sudden the proposed decision was countermanded, the reason apparently

being that it was desired that a certain lake in the locality should be used for boating. So it becomes a question of whether it is more desirable to have a fauna reserve or to provide an area where for a part of the year only—just for a few months—some people can go boating.

Mr. Lewis: Which area is that?

Mr. TONKIN: I will be specific so that the Minister will know. The lake to which I refer is Lake Erindoon near Enneabba. Apparently no decision can be reached as to whether this should be preserved as a fauna sanctuary and as a research centre for the University Zoology Department, or whether it should be used as a water skiing lake. This is the question to be determined.

Up till now the decision is that it shall be used as a water skiing lake, and that we should forget the area as a sanctuary or as a research centre for the Zoology Department. I know certain Ministers have been made familiar with this position, because I have a letter which indicates that this information was supplied to The Hon. W. S. Bovell, Minister for Lands; to The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, Minister for Fisheries and Fauna; to the Shire Clerk of the Carnamah Shire; and to the Professor of Zoology at the University of Western Australia.

The story that has come to me is that, at the beginning of the current year, contact was made by Professor Main of the Zoology Department of the University of Western Australia with certain people, one of whom was Mr. McCormack, who has a grazing area in this locality.

I am informed that Professor Main made the suggestion himself—and he ought to know what he is talking about, because he has been engaged for 10 years in research work on both the rare species of kangaroos and the various kinds of pests which are likely to attack them. He has also done research on the euro, the tammar, the quokka, and the short-necked tortoise.

Professor Main explained that one of the shortcomings of his work—particularly with the study of grey kangaroos—has been the inability to find a study area where large numbers of such animals can be regularly found, marked, and studied over a period of years, without interference by shooters who would disturb the animals and make the scientists' findings doubtful.

Professor Main enlisted the co-operation of the gentleman who had this property, and he and his fellow scientists were relieved to find that gaining access to the land holdings for the purpose of studying the animals mentioned, together with other fauna—namely ducks, swans, ibis, and other water fowl frequenting the various lakes on the property—would provide an excellent opportunity for undisturbed research.

Accordingly, the scientists proposed, and the owners of this grazing lease agreed, to have the whole of the property gazetted as a sanctuary under the Fauna Act, which would give the scientists a guarantee of a long-term research opportunity in an undisturbed area.

It seems to me that here was a unique opportunity for a fauna sanctuary to be declared where this study could proceed with definite value to the State—if any value is to be found in having fauna sanctuaries. A letter I have here, which comes from a firm of solicitors, states—

Our clients showed and the scientists convinced themselves that the fence lines had already been cleared and that there was no likelihood of roads and other developments which would make it easy for shooters to enter the area. It was also ascertained that the animal population to be studied was available in sufficient numbers to make the area an ideal research proposition for years to come.

Shortly after these initial arrangements had been made between the parties concerned, it was found by Dr. Main at the occasion of a visit to the area that earth-moving equipment had crossed the cleared fence line and removed clay soil from one of the naturally cleared grassy study areas and that an access road had been constructed to the N.W. side of Lake Erindoon. Of all this, our clients had not been notified, nor was their permission sought.

It was subsequently found that the road had been constructed by the Carnamah Shire Council for the purpose of allowing sport enthusiasts to gain access to Lake Erindoon to use its waters for water skiing. It is understood that the sportsmen concerned had previously been using Lake Arrowsmith situate to the north of the property concerned for the same purpose.

Now I am informed that the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee and the fauna department were in favour of the proposal to have this area, characterised as an ideal area, gazetted as a fauna reserve. Apparently the Carnamah local authority approached someone with some pull, and so the matter went no further.

That brings me to the question: How sincere is the Government in connection with this matter? Is boating for a few months of the year to be of more importance than preserving as a fauna reserve an ideal area? If it is, let us declare that gazetting fauna reserves is of secondary importance to other matters.

Mr. Bovell: You know, the member for Albany was complaining yesterday about people being pushed out.

Mr. Hall: I will, during the Committee stage, complain a lot more, too, on clause 12.

Mr. TONKIN: This matter has been prominently before the Minister for Lands, who has just interjected. It would have served us better in this discussion if he had indicated why he is prepared to go against a recommendation of the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee and the Fisheries and Fauna Department.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not all recommendations are accepted.

Mr. TONKIN: You're telling me!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There you are. What are you growling about?

Mr. Nalder: From one who knows!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Consideration is given to all these things. Do not get excited about it.

Mr. Graham: But the wrong decision is then made. You do not add up straight.

Mr. TONKIN: This is a very simple question. It could not be simpler.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is quite right.

Mr. TONKIN: On the one hand, the bodies whose job it is to make recommendations to the Government in connection with this matter, approve the idea. It is regarded as ideal for the purpose, not just a makeshift or something that might do if something better cannot be found. This is regarded as being ideal, so why is it not gazetted? Because someone wants to sail a boat on the lake.

Mr. Lewis: Is there any indication as to what alternatives could be ideal in the same area?

Mr. Nalder: Don't get too logical, now.

Mr. TONKIN: With all the research facilities available to the Minister—

Mr. Lewis: You are telling the story.

Mr. TONKIN: I know I am, and I will tell it in my own way.

Mr. Lewis: That is fair enough. I do not quarrel with that. I thought you might give us some information while you had the opportunity.

Mr. TONKIN: I will give the Minister what information I have. This was considered to be of such importance that the firm of Unmack & Unmack had a letter composed for the purpose of making known the situation to the various persons concerned.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.4 p.m.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister for Education asked me earlier if there was any alternative area which might be utilised for boating. In this correspondence, I found that Lake Arrowsmith has been so used, and it is suggested it could still be used.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think the Minister meant any alternative area used for the other purposes.

Mr. TONKIN: I see. Of course, alternative fauna reserves are to be found all over the State. The question arises whether there is one which possesses the special characteristics which this one apparently possesses, and which would do the job just as well. Frankly, I do not know; but I would like to know.

It seems that the Carnamah Shire Council had definite intentions about this matter. It entered into certain negotiations and the lessees of the property were advised that they should not be negotiating, but that the matter should be left to the other interests which were concerned. The letter goes on to say—

Since this development has begun, certain negotiations took place with the Carnamah Shire Council. Our clients did not participate in those discussions on the advice given them by certain quarters, that they should leave these negotiations to the scientists concerned as their interest, being of great public concern, would have to take first place over private interests.

One would agree with this. Then it seems the Carnamah Shire Council sent out the following letter:—

As you are no doubt aware, the popularity of Lake Indoon for picnicking, swimming and boating, is increasing rapidly, and my Council has noted that the eastern boundary of the pastoral lease, 392/408, bisects the lake, with the result that half of the Lake is within the pastoral lease and the other half is situated on vacant land.

In the absence of a controlling authority, my Council feels that as representatives of the general public within the Shire, an approach should be made to you to ascertain if you would have any objections to the use of that portion of the lake falling within the pastoral lease, for aquatic sports.

Your advice in due course would be appreciated.

Of course, that letter indicated that the Carnamah Shire Council had made up its mind about what it proposed to do. It was going to turn Lake Erindoon into a picnic, swimming, and boating area, the extent of which could not be anticipated.

Of course, the lake is in the district represented by the Premier, and this letter, exactly as I have it here, was sent to the Premier for his information. In trying to work out what happened I have come to the conclusion that the stage had practically been reached where the scientists and those whose job it is to protect fauna had reached agreement that this area ought

to be created a reserve. I would assume that the papers were practically ready for signing. The Carnamah Shire Council then approached the member for the district, who happens to be the Premier of the State, and *ipso facto* that was the end of it.

That is my summing up of the situation. What I would like to know is whether or not boating and picnicking in any area ought to have prior consideration over fauna reserves. One just cannot pick out an area because it happens to be in the district represented by the Premier.

Mr. Gayfer: Can't they work together?

Mr. TONKIN: If it is to be applied in this way, it has to have general application. If boating, picnicking, and swimming should have prior consideration over fauna reserves, then it should be the same in the district of Albany, the district of Warren, the district of Vasse, and any other district. We just cannot say that because it happens to be in the district represented by the Premier, who is all-powerful in Government matters, an exception shall be made and preference shall be given to swimming, boating, and the like.

Mr. Hall: Is a permit still required to get into the area?

Mr. Lewis: Would it not depend on the availability of the natural reserves, lakes, etc.? There might be half a dozen.

Mr. TONKIN: Does not that question apply to all districts?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: A special case was put up in connection with this district. In fact, it was a very special case; because the grey kangaroo is supposed to be protected and this is regarded as an area where it can be protected and studied. This is the opinion of a man who has spent 10 years in the study of this and other similar animals.

Although I have mentioned one matter previously, the Premier was not present when I said it, and I think it is important that it should be brought under his notice. According to Professor Main, one of the shortcomings of his work in connection with the study of the grey kangaroo, etc., is the inability to find a study area where large numbers of such animals can be found regularly.

The Minister for Education wants to know about the availability of such areas. I would think that the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna or the Minister for Lands would be in a better position than I am at the moment to answer that question. Apparently, if there are any other areas as well suited as this one, they are not immediately available. Otherwise these scientists would not be making representations with regard to this particular area. The letter goes on to say—

—where large numbers of such animals could be regularly found, marked and studied over a period of years without

the interference by shooters who would disturb the animals and make the scientists' findings doubtful.

It seems that the scientists are particularly keen about this area, because of the study they carry out in the interests of their work. That is why they made strong representations; and it looks, too, as if they convinced somebody there was a case. I do not know whether it is correct, but I have to accept the information as being the true situation. I am informed by a very worthy gentleman that the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee and the Fisheries and Fauna Department were in favour of the area being gazetted a fauna reserve.

The fact that it has not been so gazetted suggests that somebody with powerful influence has decreed otherwise. That brings me again to the question I asked initially: How sincere is the Government in this legislation? Example is always better than precept, and here was an excellent opportunity for the Government to demonstrate its sincerity and set an example. Although this has been brought to the notice of several Ministers in addition to the Premier, boating and picnicking are to prevail. Is it any wonder that I have my doubts about the sincerity of the Government in this matter?

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [4.15 p.m.]: My belated comment shall be neither too dramatic nor justifiably critical, such as was the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, who has just resumed his seat. I say "justifiably critical," because it would appear that another area which has been a sanctuary for bird life since time immemorial is likely to disappear as a consequence of permission being given to certain people to conduct water sports in that area in preference to its being reserved for the encouragement and protection of bird life and other fauna as has been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition.

However I am pleased to see the interest that has been shown in this important Bill by members on both sides of the House. Among other things, the Bill seeks to do the following:—

- (1) to retitle the principal Act as the Fauna Conservation Act;
- (2) to delete section 5 which gives precedence to other Acts over the Fauna Act;
- (3) to retitle the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee "The Fauna Board of Western Australia" and to enlarge its membership;
- (4) to direct the board to undertake a system of classification of sanctuaries and the preparation of working plans;
- (5) to introduce two additional licences—firstly, a game or duck shooter's license, the proceeds of

which will be credited to the fauna conservation trust fund; and, secondly, a license that will give direct contact with the processors of fauna such as the kangaroo meat processors;

(6) to increase penalties;

(7) to give more specific regulatory powers in relation to the control of sanctuaries.

The last objective has particular relevance to the point just raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister, when introducing the Bill in another place, is reported on page 1016 of *Hansard* No. 9 to have said—

Man has long sensed a moral responsibility as the dominant animal on earth to protect those incapable of protecting themselves.

This seems to indicate a greater consideration for animals than for *homo sapiens*, but nevertheless it is a laudable objective.

I consider we have to protect our wildlife not only from man, but also from itself, as I will demonstrate. It is necessary to assist the balance of nature. It cannot be left to itself. Relative to my comment, I have noticed articles in the Press indicating a need to assist nature to balance itself. I have noticed Press opinion expressed that kookaburras are predators of small birds, and I would suspect, even of magpies. In this respect I must relate my own experience.

During a visit to the country on one occasion a small bird flew across the windscreen of my car. It was obviously a fledgling, and a kookaburra took it in flight up onto the limb of a tree and proceeded to beat it to death. That one instance I witnessed must, in many circumstances, be repeated over and over again and, if this is so, kookaburras are constantly destroying our small bird life.

I also witnessed a similar incident near my own home. This may not be of interest to other members of the House, but it is of interest to me and it is relevant to the Bill. It relates to kookaburras and magpies. There are several nests of magpies near my home and a colony of young magpies has been raised. There are also kookaburras in close proximity to the nests and at nesting time I have seen warfare between the magpies and the kookaburras as a result of the kookaburras preying on the magpies' nests in an effort, apparently, to eat the eggs or take the fledglings. This seems to indicate the necessity for man to intervene if the magpies are to be preserved and further to assist the balance of nature.

I have personal memories of living at Canning Bridge as a boy. The bush was right at our back door and there was a multiplicity of types of birds in the natural vegetation existing there at that

time, but such birds are not seen now. It appears that as soon as an area becomes closely settled, the natural vegetation is destroyed and small birds, because of the loss of their natural habitat, no longer appear. Some members opposite apparently find what I am saying to be rather amusing, but I regard the disappearance of small birds as being rather sad. I suggest that human beings, especially those in the metropolitan area, do everything they possibly can to discourage small birds.

It is therefore the responsibility of members of Parliament, and the responsibility of the authority to be constituted under the provisions of this Bill, to assist in the conservation and protection of the type of wildlife I have mentioned. I have attempted to illustrate the need for this, but obviously certain members of the House are not listening. The Bill itself will not reverse the process I have mentioned, but it will be instrumental in having sanctuaries established and for that reason alone it is desirable. In a sanctuary, care will still be needed to ensure that one species of wildlife does not increase at the expense of another along the lines I have mentioned.

If research and investigation establishes the validity of my contention that kookaburras destroy fledglings then, as has been suggested to me, an open season could, with advantage, be declared on kookaburras. From the observations I have made it would appear that kookaburras are increasing in number. I am certain they are now more prolific than they used to be and that the increase in their numbers has been at the expense of other small birds. A member opposite has pointed out to me that kookaburras were imported from the Eastern States and he has also said they have a happy laugh. I admit that; because they have, perhaps, something to laugh about in view of the fact that they are protected and are thus enabled to help themselves to small birds.

It would be interesting to learn of the experience of authorities in the Eastern States concerning the inroads that may have been made into the numbers of small birds and small species of fauna in those States by kookaburras. As far as I know kookaburras are protected, but I could be corrected on that statement. If they are protected, perhaps some relaxation of the protection could be made even if only for a short period. For some strange reason man has to shoot at something, including the insulators on top of telegraph poles, water tanks, and even road signs. Shooters could perhaps be encouraged to shoot at kookaburras when they are found preying upon small birds or other small fauna species.

Mr. Dunn: Are kookaburras edible?

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not know, but I would not like to try them. I have seen kookaburras dispose of field mice, but

these species are no loss. However, many small animals are disappearing in the same way as many of our small birds. This causes me great concern as it obviously causes concern to the Minister for Works. He may be surprised to see me taking an interest in this type of legislation instead of in a measure that is more controversial.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not at all.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do take this matter seriously, as I hope other members do; and I sincerely trust my comments are brought to the attention of the proposed new wildlife authority so that some consideration may be given to my suggestions. There are members who say that their comments get no further than being recorded in *Hansard*, but I hope my comments get further than that.

I have also noticed a recent Press report on illicit trade in our Australian birds, which are taken overseas by air transport. In the report it was stated that amounts of \$200 and \$400 were being offered for Australian parrots, cockatoos, and the humble galah.

Mr. Sewell: If that is so there is a fortune for somebody up my way.

Mr. FLETCHER: In reply to the interjection just made, I do not know whether the word "galah" had reference to our feathered species or to the human species. The Press report also stated that Western Australian cockatoos were commanding big prices overseas.

Mr. Bickerton: So are hawks!

Mr. Sewell: The Northam variety is not.

Mr. FLETCHER: Prior to that demonstration of levity, I was saying that cockatoos are also commanding a big price overseas. Those offering such prices can have the cockatoo belonging to my neighbour for nothing. In fact, I would pay anyone to take it away, because it screeches all day and every day and even after dark.

Mr. Brady: It sounds like a Liberal member.

Mr. FLETCHER: I fear the bird will meet with an accident in the very near future. I might mention, in passing, that the immediate neighbours are religiously inclined, and they would need to be because it would try the patience of a saint. Although I live a few hundred yards away I can still hear it and it certainly tries my patience. Furthermore, it is no satisfaction to me, and perhaps it is no satisfaction to many others in the vicinity, that the life expectancy of a cockatoo is much greater than that of a man, so it appears I will have to put up with the screeching of this cockatoo for the remainder of my life, unless of course, I shift from the locality.

Nevertheless, our bird and animal life certainly need protection. I hope the illicit trade that is being conducted with

our bird life is countered by the imposition of severe penalties in an effort to deter this practice. I repeat that I hope my comments, particularly those dealing with the predatory habits of kookaburras, are seriously considered. I support the Bill as one which seeks to give protection to all form of wildlife which are unable to protect themselves.

The SPEAKER: Before I call on the member for Avon, I would like to draw the attention of the member for Fremantle to Standing Order 127. He is not the only member who has offended in this regard.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [4.30 p.m.]: There are one or two points I wish to make in connection with this Bill during the second reading stage. There seems to be seven main objects in this Bill, and they were quoted by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. In the main I will allude to the second of the seven proposals; that is, the provision in the Bill which seeks to delete section 5 of the Act. This section gives other Acts of Parliament precedence over the Fauna Protection Act.

I am not particularly enamoured with the proposal to delete section 5 which gives precedence to the Fisheries Act, the Vermin Act, the Whaling Act, and the Zoological Gardens Act. We in this State, which owes a lot to agricultural development, recognise the need for the administration, and the benefit, of the Agriculture Protection Board, which was set up by an Act of Parliament in 1950 following the move for a Select Committee in 1944. This Select Committee was converted into a Royal Commission in 1945, so important was considered the need for a full inquiry. The findings of the Royal Commission revealed, among other things, the following, which appears in the *Votes and Proceedings* of 1945, volume 2, page 497:—

Hitherto, in our opinion, one of the greatest deterrents to any really concerted and wholehearted attack upon the vermin in many districts has been the almost complete absence of activity on Crown lands, abandoned holdings and reserves. There are those who argue that rabbits and other vermin do not inhabit Crown lands or forest country except within short distances of cultivation. Your Commissioners can only be guided by evidence, and this is, in our opinion, conclusive, that in many parts vermin are found throughout these lands and rabbits are to be found many miles from cultivation in many places where conditions are congenial to them. Therefore, to state that the vermin problems can be faced without active measures for their eradication on Crown Lands and reserves would merely be to postulate for their perpetuation as a menace to the State's development.

In dealing with Crown land proper the Royal Commission had this to say, and I quote from page 6 of the report—

The emu, the fox, the wild dog and the kangaroo (where these last are troublesome) have their principal habitat on land of this type. To say that the Crown (in right of the State of Western Australia) has been sadly lacking in a proper appreciation of its responsibilities to those who have pioneered and developed respectively the outer and more settled areas, is to put the case mildly. It is, we agree, the duty of the Crown to set an example to its people.

The findings of the Royal Commission pointed out that an incentive should be given to local authorities and other organisations to carry out the preservation and protection of the farm lands, and to overcome the ravages of vermin which is allowed to roam on Crown land areas.

If many of these protected areas are brought into being as areas in which shooting is to be confined or prohibited, then I envisage we will be back to the days when overwhelming devastation was caused by rabbits and other vermin, because of the existence of the areas off which the people in the country have for years tried to clear vermin. If the new authority is to pursue the lines laid down by the Royal Commission to control the vermin on the huge areas of land set aside for conservation and for other purposes, that would be all right; but if the dominance of so-called experts in conservation practices is to override the views of the one or two members of the authority who have practical knowledge, and who convey to the authority the requests of other boards which have considered various problems associated with vermin destruction, then I feel the deletion of section 5 will be a bad thing for the State.

It would be much better to include on the board a representative of the Country Shire Councils Association, a body which gave evidence before the Royal Commission I have referred to. It would mean much to the State and it would give confidence to the people of the State if a member of the Country Shire Councils' Association, a member of the Farmers' Union, and a member of the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association were included. There would then be three representatives of country interests on the board to balance out the membership, and to enable thought to be given to both sides of questions.

Mr. Runciman: One member of the board is a representative of the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association.

Mr. GAYFER: He is one against nine others on the board. We find there is one member on the board who has wide and practical knowledge of matters associated with the destruction of vermin, but he might not have any practical ex-

perience. Farmers generally have been protectors of animal life from time immemorial, and nobody can deny that. The farmers have obtained their livelihood from wildlife by domesticating them. That is, in general, our heritage of which we are proud. Without the help, the consideration, and the efforts of these people, no law brought down purely for the purposes of conservation would ever succeed. I now refer to a document which has been sent to all members of Parliament by the Avicultural Society which recognises this need. The pamphlet states—

Is it not therefore important that ALL members of the Board should have a sympathetic understanding of the people—particularly the people on the land such as the pastoralists and the farmers without whose co-operation they haven't got a hope in hell of succeeding.

The Minister in charge of the Bill in this House has placed an amendment on the notice paper to include a representative of country interests on the board.

I agree fully with conservation and protection of wildlife; but protection of the basic industry of this State is also a matter in which the people are vitally interested. The board was set up to protect and to look after the fauna of this State. We have been paying huge taxes for many years for the purpose of controlling and eradicating vermin and noxious weeds. If the huge areas of land proposed to be set aside as reserves are virtually not to be policed, but allowed to revert to their natural state, then Western Australia will be taking a very backward step. I repeat that I am not particularly enamoured of the provision in the Bill which seeks to delete section 5 of the Act.

Another provision in the Bill refers to the licensing of duck shooters. The member for Murray said that he thought there were around 8,000 duck shooters in the State, but the Avicultural Society claims there are 11,000. I cannot say whether there are 8,000 or 11,000, so I take a figure between the two and say there are 10,000 duck shooters.

Mr. Craig: A figure between 8,000 and 11,000 is not 10,000.

Mr. GAYFER: It is easier to multiply the figure of 10,000 by \$2 to arrive at \$20,000; whereas if we take the figure of 9,500 and multiply it by \$2 we will not have a round figure total. Therefore I say there are 10,000 shooters in the State. The \$20,000 expected to be derived from the licensing of duck shooters will have to provide everything that appertains to wild ducks and other wildlife. I am not against the licensing system, because in general the duck shooters have expressed approval of it. Therefore the decision rested in their hands. However, I am against the proposal of the Minister to open the duck shooting season on the 20th

January. At that time of the year in our particular part of the State—the position there might be a little different from that in the south-west—the areas of water are numerous, but this year the number of such areas is very small indeed.

The duck population found on these areas is fairly dense, and this year dense to the point where the ducks are as thick in numbers as I have ever seen; yet, it is proposed to wait until the 20th January before allowing the duck shooters to shoot them. With the drying up of the water there will be a greater loss of duck life with the opening of the season at that date than with the opening when more large tracts of water still exist. In another place this aspect was given a great airing.

I had the privilege of presenting a petition to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna from the various duck shooters in the Beverley district.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine himself to the Bill. He cannot debate an administrative action taken on matters not covered by the Bill.

Mr. GAYFER: I bow to your wisdom, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hawke: He made a ruling.

Mr. GAYFER: I did not know it was a ruling. I did not notice the book of Standing Orders in the hands of the Speaker. I was saying that it was proposed to impose a charge on the duck shooters. I thought that in referring to this matter I would be permitted to speak on the rights which have been granted to them, and for which they are to be charged.

The SPEAKER: That is the position, but the honourable member cannot go so far as to discuss an administrative action taken; to tell the House what the deputation said to him; or to say what he said to the deputation.

Mr. GAYFER: I do not want to mention what the deputation said to me. I handled a petition from the duck shooters of the Beverley district, and in it they considered that the opening of the season on the 20th January was unsuitable. I agree with them. The Minister in reply to other deputations from the south-west district which waited on him said that he would make up his mind towards the end of November as to when he would fix a date for the opening of the shooting season.

In all sincerity I would ask the Minister to take into consideration the point which has been brought to his notice by the shooters in the country, because for many years they have had the opportunity to study the habits and the life cycle of the duck. If the season is opened on the 20th January then we will find that many wardens appointed under the Act from

the ranks of farmers are away on holidays. There are 500 to 600 wardens throughout the State, and many of those who are farmers will be on holidays in January. January is the only month when the sheep and wheat farmer can take his holidays. If the season is to open on the 20th January, then many shooters from the city will go into the country to shoot wild duck at a time when wardens are not about. The wardens have been appointed to ensure that duck shooting is carried out in accordance with the provisions of the law.

Mr. Davies: Are they honorary?

Mr. GAYFER: Yes; and there are 500 or 600 of them throughout the State and they are very well respected in their jobs. I also noticed that when the statement was made that the shooting season would open on the 20th January, the wardens were amongst the last to find out that this was to be a possibility. They read it in the Press just the same as everyone else. I think the public relations in regard to this whole business were rather sadly bungled; so much so that I asked the country newspapers to print a statement as to why the shooting season should open on the 20th January. They sent out a statement headed, "What is All the Fuss About?" To head a Press release, "What is All the Fuss About?" in regard to a departmental matter like this would not give very much confidence to those who were querying the position.

The SPEAKER: I do not think this is in the Bill.

Mr. GAYFER: I heard your remark, Mr. Speaker. I am of the opinion that if the duck shooting license is to continue and the \$2,000 odd from the 8,000 or 10,000 duck shooters is to be a positive thing, then greater liaison will have to be made between the authorities and the duck shooters themselves. Even at this late stage of the proceedings I think it would be possible for the authorities to consult more closely with wardens and other recognised bodies of people in the country areas as to setting the correct date for the opening of the duck shooting season.

On these two points I will let my criticism of the Bill rest. I am very sincere in both of them. In the first instance we do not have enough practical knowledge, as far as protection is concerned, of the authority proposed to be constituted; and in the second instance, as far as the duck shooting fees are concerned, unless they are going to give sufficient uplift to the sport in future years without creating a hardship to the shooters, then I am afraid I cannot agree with them at all.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [4.48 p.m.]: Almost every item about which I wished to speak has already been mentioned by previous speakers, so my remarks will be very short, although there are one or two aspects that were mentioned ear-

lier which I would like to deal with in a modified form. I applaud—as other speakers have done—the new approach to this question; that is, by approaching it from the conservation point of view rather than the protection point of view. The Minister emphasised this when introducing the measure, and earlier speakers have applauded it. However, the Minister gave no indication as to who was the author of the Bill.

From time to time the Government has introduced measures and said that the bodies associated with a certain type of work or with an interest in the particular matter within the community had been consulted. There are a number of bodies within the community associated with animals and birds—and bees, if one likes—but apparently the department has taken upon itself to write this Bill. As far as I can ascertain, none of the bodies that could have been consulted have been. I think the Government has written the measure itself without bothering to consult outside agencies. It is not bound to do this in any way, but that has been the practice in the past. There will be a heavy Government bias in the new authority that is to be set up under this measure.

I think we are continuing some of the opinions and thoughts that have been applied over the years by persons who constituted the old committee. There is very little scope for much new opinion to be brought to the authority. I think the authority is being widened by the inclusion of several members, and an additional one if amendments on the notice paper are agreed to. I think a great deal of attention must be paid to selecting the right members of the public.

As we all know, certain persons are to be *ex officio* members of authority, and there are limitations as to who the others will represent. There are to be three members of the public and possibly four appointed to this authority, and one person will need to have a wide practical knowledge of the native fauna of the State. I suggest this is the time when the Government might consider selecting these representatives from societies and bodies that have a particular interest in this kind of work. Of course, I mention the Avicultural Society with which the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has had some correspondence, particularly during the earlier months of this year.

I think all members received copies of correspondence that passed between the society and the Minister; and it would appear that the society and the Minister are not on the best of terms. I mentioned the Avicultural Society to a member of the Government and he said that this society was more or less a trading association. I do not think it is fair to say that; and I am sure it does not reflect the Government's attitude. This idea—if it is very wide-

spread—should not go unchallenged. All members in the House receive a copy of the society's magazine each month. Indeed, the latest copy arrived today in which there are two pages dealing with the exchange of birds, but there are 12 pages of general information on bird life. I think this society can be taken as very sincere and worth while in our community. It has a very great concern for the bird life of the State; and some of its writings have already been quoted in the House this afternoon.

Another point I wish to mention was spoken on briefly by the member for Fremantle. I refer to overseas trading in birds. I am wondering whether the extended provisions to be given to the authority under this Bill will enable the authority to do something to effectively counter the substantial overseas trading in Australian birds.

Members have probably noticed an article which appeared in the *Daily News* on the 31st October. The item emanated from Sydney and stated that Europeans will pay up to \$3,000 for parrots; and a principal of the Customs Prevention and Protection Branch spoke of the difficulties the department experienced in preventing the smuggling of Australian birds out of the country.

When one realises the high prices being received for Australian birds, it is a matter of concern for us to make sure that the statutory bodies we set up have the requisite power and finance to effectively police this kind of smuggling. This one article publishing the statement of a senior officer of the Customs Branch is sufficient to justify the charge that there is extensive overseas trading. If members would like further information, I would refer them to the latest edition to arrive here of a Dutch publication called, *Onze Vogels*. The copy I have is a September edition and it arrived from Europe by airmail. In this edition—and those immediately prior to it—there is an advertisement amongst those of the birds for sale. I was fortunate enough to have this advertisement translated by a member of the Parliament House staff, and the translation is as follows:—

Regularly on hand rare Australian parrots also barnards, Port Lincoln, multi colour, stro, twenty-eight, clowncurry, hooded, yellow belly, gold shoulder, blue bonnete, etc. Let us know what you want and we will deliver it to you.

Then follows the business address of this man who claims to be able to supply all of these Australian birds.

It is illegal for me to hold in captivity or own any of these birds, which are apparently advertised on a world-wide basis. So it would appear from this advertisement and the article I quoted from the *Daily News* that there is a lucrative

trade in Australian native birds. From inquiries I have made, it seems this trade is carried on very extensively, particularly in the north-west of this State now that many additional ships are calling at the ports.

If the Government is genuine in its desire to conserve the fauna of Western Australia, it must look closely at this situation. It has been suggested to me that we should not bother about a few birds being smuggled out of the country; but when one realises that no Australian can keep these birds in captivity and the vast sums of money involved in this kind of trade, it is time substantial action was taken. This is a matter at which the new authority should have a close look.

I have spoken to bird lovers in this State and they assure me that overseas trading in our native birds is a widespread practice and they feel very badly about it. I merely ask that when the authority is set up it should give particular attention to this facet of conservation of bird life in Australia; and that the three members of the public to be selected as members be people actively engaged in animal or bird life hobbies so the authority can have the advantage of the knowledge they have of their particular interests. These people would do more good than would someone who has retired and who needs a few cents to add to his pension.

I do not think that is the Government's intention, but I do hope that the persons chosen will have an interest in some aspect of wildlife within this State.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [4.58 p.m.]: I did not propose to say anything on this Bill because I think it represents an excellent move forward, but seeing the Leader of the Opposition gave me a special mention, perhaps I should assure him—he has said from time to time that he does not accept our assurances—that there was nothing out of the ordinary in respect of this matter.

The case of Lake Erindoon was raised with me by the Shire of Carnamah. This is an area of fresh water which is being used by the public for bathing and water sports. In view of certain approaches that were made by private people—at least leaseholders and landholders—about the area, the shire felt that some action should be taken to ensure that the public associated with the area should be able to use it. I understand there is a certain small acreage in which some of the people associated with flora and fauna are interested; and the name of Professor Main was mentioned to me at that time.

This stresses the point that the grey kangaroo, which is becoming very rare, was to be found in the region and it was desired that the area be preserved in order that they might carry on with their studies. The only action which I took,

after conferring with the Minister for Lands, was to see that the lake itself was protected as certain action was imminent regarding the renewal of leases and the like. We did not wish to get into a serious controversy, and we wanted to be fair to the owners and lessees so that they would know where they stood. I for one, as the local member, believe this area should be set aside for use by the public—particularly as the whole of the area is being developed.

I, too, thought there should be some protection for the kangaroos which were being shot out by crayfishermen seeking bait. The area was close to where the fishermen operated and they went in and shot the first thing that moved and used it for crayfish bait. We recognise that unless some protection is given to the area the animals will be quickly shot out. It was thought that, for the time being, by vesting the area in the local authority, some protection would be given. I think it could be said that the public which makes use of the pool would also give support and protection to the area and see that the flora and fauna were protected.

In the meantime the Minister for Lands is looking at a proposition to set up a reserve which would extend right into the lake. It might take the majority of the area referred to by the professor and by Dr. Serventy. I am not sure that the whole of the area would go into the reserve, but at least the area roundabout would receive the consideration of the Minister when he is considering what areas should be set aside as reserves.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that I am all-powerful. He knows that not to be very true. I simply do as I am told by the majority and I acted, in this case, as the local member. I took no very special action; I was simply anxious that the area should be set aside for the public.

Mr. Tonkin: Was this not a case of a wink being as good as a nod to a blind horse?

Mr. BRAND: It was not because of direct action.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [5.3 p.m.]: I would like to make a few brief comments on this measure because there are one or two aspects I would like to draw to the Minister's attention. The addition of the Conservator of Forests to the authority which will now control fauna, and also the appointment of the Chief Vermin Control Officer, are of particular interest to me. I say this because a great deal of the natural habitat of fauna is being destroyed by the Forests Department in the process of clearing the natural country for the purpose of planting pines.

The fact that the Conservator of Forests is to be a member of the authority will mean that consideration will be given to this point of view when decisions are made by the Forests Department with regard to which areas of country it will clear, and for what purpose that country will be cleared. Usually, clearing is done by the Forests Department for the purpose of pine planting and I think this transforming of the natural bush country has an adverse effect on the fauna in the area. I wished to make that point.

Another matter is the laying of 1080 poison. I think that care is exercised by many farmers with this poison but, perhaps, additional care should be taken so that the terrain is poisoned with a view to catching rabbits. The poison 1080 also kills foxes, and does a mighty job in this respect. However, many small marsupials, and other rare bush animals, are being destroyed in this way.

I take this opportunity of asking that caution be exercised in selecting the type of country where 1080 is to be laid when other alternatives are available for the poisoning of rabbits. One method I would personally recommend is the treatment of the warrens, which is a good method of controlling rabbits in country which is the habitat of the more desirable fauna.

Those are the two points I wished to briefly make. To mention them again, one is that some desirable patches of bushland in out-of-the-way places could well be left in their natural state with a view to preserving the fauna, particularly kangaroos, and the smaller wild animals. The second point is that care should be exercised in the laying of 1080 poison, because I think we are destroying our fauna a lot quicker by this method than any other.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [5.8 p.m.]: In view of the comments made in regard to Lake Erindoon—I think that is its correct title, but it is more commonly known as Lake Indoon—by the Leader of the Opposition, I want to say that the position with regard to this lake is one which is a common day-to-day decision for consideration by the Minister for Lands. There was no control over the verges of this lake, which is an ideal place for public use and recreation. It had been considered by the local shire council—the Carnamah Shire Council—that some supervision should be initiated over this area, because it was thought that the lake was ideal for recreation.

I have considered the matter and it is proposed that if all the aspects of the case finally turn out this way, a little over 300 acres on the verges of the lake will be preserved for public recreation and vested in the Shire of Carnamah. Consideration is being given to creating a

larger area adjacent to the lake area as a fauna and flora reserve, but this is still in the process of consideration.

I repeat: this is a daily responsibility of the Minister for Lands, and I do not see, from information which has been made available to me—and I have given study to this particular exercise—that there is any difference between this area and that around Two People Bay. It can be used for the protection of fauna and it can also be used by the people. The people are not being denied the right to go to Two People Bay. There is a road through the reserve, and on a recent visit to Albany I went through to see that public access was still maintained. The road goes through the reserve which has been created for the noisy scrub bird, and people can go to Two People Bay, but they cannot live there. That is the only restriction. The same situation can apply in the Lake Erindoon district. The lake can be used by the public under the jurisdiction and control of the shire. The area adjacent—and a decision has not yet been made—can be a flora and fauna reserve, and the grey kangaroo will have ample room to exist.

Mr. Tonkin: How many kangaroos and birds will stay there?

Mr. BOVELL: How many noisy scrub birds will stay at Two People Bay? I will leave that for the House to decide. As I have said, reserves are a decision to be made by the Minister for Lands, and I will make a final decision—as is my responsibility—when all the facts are considered. I have informed the House of those facts and of the proposals which are now under consideration.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [5.11 p.m.]: There have been a lot of speakers on this Bill and, in those circumstances, I shall be extremely brief. I want to applaud the Government for introducing the Bill. I think it is a splendid one. The new authority which will be set up will be a great improvement on the old Fauna Protection Advisory Committee.

We are clearing 1,000,000 acres of land each year in Western Australia and this area is increasing—and we will have to give more thought to the preservation of wild life. We have to remember that we are custodians with respect to fauna in Western Australia. It is our responsibility to ensure that our fauna remains in existence, not only because of the pleasure this fauna will give to generation after generation of people, but because of its value to science.

One speaker mentioned the effect of 1080 poison, and I agree with his comments in this regard. I know what happens at Morawa where I have a property. Poison 1080 is frequently used in that area, and, of course, it is laid in an open trail. The oats lie in this trail for weeks on end. Frequently the poison is laid in areas where

there are no rabbits at all. In those circumstances, without any doubt, the only creatures that eat the poison are birds. On several occasions when I have been at Morawa, crows have flown into the house on the property and subsequently died. That indicates that even crows can be poisoned with 1080. They could have come from miles away where the poison had been laid, but it must be 1080 poison.

One can imagine the effect the poison is having on cockatoos, galahs, and parrots. Many people take violent exception to galahs, but it appears to me that they do little damage—certainly in the area I am speaking of. It would appear that galahs do not alight in the wheat crops, mainly because of the damage caused to their wings. They alight at the edge of crops and eat a certain amount of wheat. This, however, is of little consequence. We have large flocks on the property which I am speaking of and we have gone out of our way to leave large areas of bush for them. The sections of bush are surrounded by wheat crops and, as I mentioned earlier, very little damage occurs. I think a lot of the criticism concerning destruction by galahs in the wheat belt is unwarranted.

In the wheatbelt people poison galahs by the thousands. Quite apart from the fact that the galahs might be poisoned by 1080 poison, many people go out of their way to poison them by other means. They are destroyed by the thousands with the full approval of the Department of Agriculture.

In view of the fact that mention has been made that the common galah is worth up to £200 overseas, it seems strange that we should be poisoning them by the thousands when they could be exported. Generally speaking, I am very much in favour of prohibiting the export of birds, but I think we should make some exceptions and this is a case in point.

Birds classified as vermin could prove to be a profitable export. In this category we could also include certain types of parrots, such as the 28, which cause a tremendous amount of damage in various parts of the south-west. These birds are sold at high prices overseas and it seems to me it would be preferable to allow a limited export of them rather than to poison them in the way people are doing in certain wheatbelt areas.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [5.17 p.m.]: It is really not surprising that so much interest should have been evidenced in this piece of legislation, and it is pleasing that so many individual contributions have been made to the debate. The subject matter, generally, is one which has a wide and diverse appeal to the community by and large, and that appeal is reflected in the interest the debate has caused in this

Chamber. As a matter of fact, I was impressed by the extent of the research and the background knowledge that was evidenced by some members' speeches. It follows, I suppose, that I was not so impressed by others.

Mr. Hall: I wonder why.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am not pointing the finger at anyone.

Mr. Kelly: Just looking.

Mr. Bickerton: How do you know we are going to be impressed by your speech?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That remains to be seen. The interest about which I have spoken is very much in evidence in other countries of the world—countries which perhaps have a much older civilisation than we in Australia have. The general consensus of opinion in those older countries, nowadays, is that more should have been done previously towards the conservation of natural fauna and flora.

Some countries have done a great deal—in this regard I refer to the Yellowstone National Park in the United States of America. However in America, even though the authorities have set aside large tracts of land for the protection of fauna and flora, they still wish that much more land had been devoted to its conservation. South Africa is another country which has a national park of great size and importance—I refer to the Kruger National Park. Indeed, one member, if I remember aright, spoke about the Kruger National Park and about the fact that one could travel through this park in a motorcar but the rules were such that motorists and passengers were not permitted to alight from their cars, and cars had to stop to allow lions and elephants to cross the road. I suppose there is reasonable doubt whether that regulation is to conserve the animals or the human beings.

Mr. Bickerton: It is to prevent damage to the motorcars.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Possibly. In our State, of course, the Press recently featured a photograph which showed motorists stopping to allow tortoises to cross the road. I do not know whether these Press photographs and reports go overseas, but one could imagine that if these tortoises were thought to be as big as the lions and elephants in the Kruger National Park, there would be a natural inclination on the part of motorists to stop for their own safety. We all know that some foreigners will believe anything about Australia.

At this juncture I think the point should be made—and this was one of my reasons for mentioning other countries—that Australia, and particularly Western Australia, as a young country has excellent opportunities to endeavour to conserve its fauna and flora. I really do not think Govern-

ments have been remiss in their duty in this respect, and in answer to a question asked by the member for Gascoyne the other day I said the State had devoted 4,128,000 acres towards the conservation of fauna alone. This does not mean that they are the only acres that are devoted to the conservation of fauna. There are many other reserves involved.

For example, there are State forests, although the purists do not think this is complete conservation country, and possibly that is so. However, a great tract of land is occupied by State forests and it is useful for conserving fauna. State forests cover some 4,500,000 acres of land, and we have other reserves, including flora reserves, under the control of the Lands Department. Possibly those reserves would extend over 2,000,000 acres and that is why I say Governments have played a very important role, and I think the people themselves, by and large, have played an important role—not all of them, of course, but some of them. I also agree with the remarks of one member that farmers—not all of them, either, but a number of them—have played an important role in conserving native fauna and flora.

Mr. Davies: Has the authority indulged in any propaganda to encourage conservation?

Mr. Gayfer: There will be all the rabbits in the world on these areas.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We do not want to conserve the rabbit population. The Government has from time to time announced to the Press measures which have been taken for the conservation of our various species of fauna, and these announcements have received world-wide publicity through the Press. Very frequently these announcements concern some of our more strange and unique types of fauna.

One member asked in what areas were kangaroos declared vermin. I cannot say just where they are so declared, but in most of the northern areas of the State they are. However, this is a matter for the Agriculture Protection Board to determine from time to time. As a matter of fact, there has been close liaison maintained between the Agriculture Protection Board and the people at present in charge of fauna protection.

Mr. Gayfer: Do you think one voice on this wild life authority will be sufficient to convey the thinking of the Agriculture Protection Board?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: More than one voice will be raised on this matter, and in the interests of the development of the country. I think the honourable member fears too much when he makes that remark. My amendment will place on the authority a person who has country interests. No segment of the community is stipulated, but it is intended to appoint

someone who will fill the bill described by the honourable member.

Mr. Bickerton: Would you consider the member for Avon for that particular role?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think he would make a very good representative.

Mr. Bickerton: I am sure he would.

Mr. Gayfer: I don't want to buy into that one.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: During the time the Leader of the Opposition spoke he mentioned the Bill only once, and that was to say, in the first sentence, that he supported the measure. He spoke about Lake Erindoon near Eneabba. We have heard several comments about this and I am referring to his remarks only because he made the point that he doubted the sincerity of the Government in regard to this legislation.

I think that is unfair. No other member in the Chamber doubted the sincerity of the Government in trying to protect fauna. I agree there are individual cases where a Government does not move in the way a segment of society wants it to move. But the Leader of the Opposition knows that many representations are made to a Government about a wide range of problems, and the Government, or the Minister involved, must look at all facets of the problem. Having looked at them he must then make a decision; and the Leader of the Opposition knows, as well as anyone else, that a Government cannot please all segments.

Mr. Tonkin: What was the decision of the Minister involved?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Well—

Mr. Tonkin: Don't guess.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The one about which the honourable member complained—

Mr. Tonkin: What was the decision of the Minister involved?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Not to have this declared a fauna reserve.

Mr. Tonkin: Was it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Goodness gracious me!

Mr. Tonkin: Was it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not know what the Leader of the Opposition is getting at.

Mr. Tonkin: If you don't know, ask the Premier.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think the Leader of the Opposition is getting at some abstruse matter. I am talking about the generalities, as a matter of fact, and I wish to take him to task for criticising the Government on this matter and in regard to the sincerity of its approach to the conservation of fauna.

I have already stated that by and large I believe Governments have discharged their duties and responsibilities in a

reasonable way, having regard for all the facts. I do not think any reasonable member in this House would deny that. I think it is just too silly, and for a moment I thought the Leader of the Opposition was going to move a motion criticising the Government.

Mr. Bickerton: This is enough to give us one.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In this case a decision was made and the people won. They wanted the area for a sports ground and, on this occasion, the fauna lost, although not completely.

Mr. Brand: It has not lost.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The area is only a sports ground and what fauna can be protected there will be protected. We have had complaints from Albany because we have taken too much notice of the fauna to the exclusion of human beings.

Mr. Hall: About 850 people signed a petition.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not agree with the remarks of the member for Albany, because people do have access to the beach. However, there are extremes of thought on most problems, and I think the Leader of the Opposition tended towards the extreme on this occasion.

I think I should say, too, that tomorrow there is to be a field day at the Tuttanning reserve, near Pingelly. This reserve was created about six years ago and at the time I was Minister for Fisheries. It would be interesting for members to go there to see what the Government has done, with the active co-operation of the neighbouring farmers, to conserve fauna and flora.

Mr. Gayfer: The field day is on Friday.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is tomorrow. I thank the honourable member for being so helpful.

Very intensive care is being given to fauna on this reserve; a building has been placed there and laboratory facilities provided, together with some sleeping accommodation. By and large the reserve will be a classic spot where fauna can be preserved. In due course it will become a show place.

I think a notice has been placed on the notice board giving the details of this field day, and if it is at all possible for members to attend, I am sure they will find it most interesting, and be able to see for themselves just what is being done.

I would now like to say that the Avicultural Society has a very definite place in our community life. From time to time it does cross swords with the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, but by and large their views are not so far distant from each other as may be imagined, and of course they do have a tremendous amount of common ground.

The Avicultural Society is one that devotes itself to the care of birds generally, more particularly to the breeding and cag-

ing of birds. Its interests, therefore, are not completely similar to those of the Department of Fisheries and Fauna, except in the general sense. However, I have listened to the remarks made by the member for Victoria Park and I will convey his views to the Minister concerned.

The member for Gascoyne referred to licenses and said that perhaps eight licenses might have to be taken out by any one person. This is not so. I have inquired from the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna, and I am informed that shooters are required to take out a hunter's license. It is expected that this will continue.

The securing of statistics from processing establishments will give the department a little more control and make its general work a little easier. It naturally follows that it will require, to some extent, the co-operation of the processors when it comes to obtaining the statistics. It would be absurd to require a processor to take out a license for every tent, freezer, or whatever else he might use. It would create unnecessary work both for the processor and for the department, and this is not envisaged at all.

It is expected that the master processor will list the various units under his control, and the details will be laid down in the regulations. I am pleased the Bill has received widespread approval. There are one or two amendments on the notice paper which can be moved in the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 6 amended—

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 3—Delete the word "means" and substitute the word "meanings".

As it stands, the word "means" is an error; it does not make sense when one reads the definition "to process." The word should be "meanings". This arose out of a request to me by the member for Gascoyne.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 10 amended—

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have an amendment on the notice paper.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): Order! It would appear that the member for South Perth has an earlier amendment. I have, however, already put clauses 5 and 6. They have been agreed to.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I was on my feet. I could not hear too well. As soon as the Minister moved his amendment to clause 4 and you put the question I waited for you to call clause 6, and immediately you did I stood up.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clauses 5 and 6 were put and passed, and I cannot now go back, but if the Minister wishes to recommit the Bill he may do so.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If it is within my power I will certainly recommit the Bill to help the member for South Perth.

Mr. NORTON: Before the Minister moves his amendment to clause 7, I would point out this clause deals with the constitution of the authority. Like the member for Avon I feel that the balance of the authority is not what it should be. The Bill says that three shall be persons who are not officers within the meaning of the Public Service Act. I think these members should be appointed from a panel of names submitted by, for example, the Pastoralists' Association or the Farmers' Union, who have knowledge of the life and breeding habits of fauna, and who will be able to give any guidance necessary when the reserves are established. I think it would be a great advantage to the authority for it to have such persons as members.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I believe the composition of this authority will prove to be a very good one. I do not believe the three members referred to by the honourable member should be drawn from a panel of names submitted by one or more approved organisations, some of which he has referred to.

It will be noted one of the amendments I intend to move will provide for the addition of one more member to this authority to represent country interests generally. The whole intention is to give the Minister the opportunity to appoint people who will prove to be of value to the authority.

Mr. HALL: This legislation reminds me of the people at Two People Bay. This area might not be in my electorate—it might be in the electorate of the member for Stirling—but the people were forced out of it by the present authority without any legal backing.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: This authority didn't—

Mr. HALL: This legislation will provide the legal authority.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not so.

Mr. HALL: It is; and it cannot be denied, the Director of Fisheries and Fauna did not have the authority to do what I have just mentioned. The Minister cannot deny the fact that people were barred from this area.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If you are going to talk on these lines, it would be better to talk on clause 10.

Mr. HALL: I will talk on clause 14, too.

Before this measure is finished with, I will prove how little the Minister knows about this. Rights have been taken away from people, and a petition lodged in this Chamber was totally ignored; and this must be a reflection on the Government and the authority. The Director of Fisheries and Fauna is dictatorial, and I understand he retires at the end of the year. I will not hammer that any more.

The Government has introduced legislation after an eviction notice has been given to the people. When votes are being cast in 1968, I think the Government's action will be reflected and the Government will be put out of office. An amendment to the Fauna Protection Act has been introduced after similar evictions have been enforced all around the coastline of Australia; and the public will resent this.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

Page 4, line 27—Delete the word "ten" and substitute the word "eleven".

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the size of the authority. Representations have been made from country interests that one of the three persons referred to in subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (b) should be separately nominated to represent country interests. The Minister for Fisheries and Fauna has agreed to this proposition and asked me to move this amendment to determine whether or not this should be so.

Mr. DAVIES: This amendment will probably double the size of the present committee. We have said before that we are concerned at the extent to which this Government has gone in appointing all kinds of committees. The Minister pointed out that there must be specialised persons on the authority; and then there are three others. However, he said that only one of the three need have a wide practical knowledge of the native fauna of the State and that country interests should be particularly represented.

The manner in which the Government has approached the setting up of this authority indicates to me that it already knows who the members are going to be. For the life of me I cannot understand why one of the three persons already mentioned in this part of the clause could not represent country interests. All that is stipulated is that these three persons shall not be officers within the meaning of the Public Service Act, 1904, and one of them must have a wide practical knowledge of the native fauna of the State. I think it would be desirable that the three of them have a wide practical knowledge of the native fauna of the State.

Since only one member has to have a wide practical knowledge of the native fauna of the State, surely one of the other two could be appointed to represent country interests, without specifically naming them.

I notice this Bill, like so many others, provides that the Minister shall set the amount of remuneration that members shall obtain for attending meetings of the authority. However, we have not been told what the amount will be. I understand there is a scale of amounts.

I do not see any reason for the additional expense of appointing an extra member to the authority at this stage when the Bill has already been debated in the Legislative Council and is now before us.

One of the persons, as I have said several times already, could represent country interests, one city interests, and the other could have the required knowledge of native fauna. We do not even know what facet of country interests the person is to represent if he is appointed. Is he going to represent those farmers who are all in favour of killing all the wildlife? It is a very broad provision. I cannot for the life of me see why it should be extended when there is already ample provision for country representatives to be appointed if required.

Mr. GAYFER: I rise at this juncture to support the Minister and also to criticise the member for Victoria, Park for that part of his dissertation wherein he wanted to know whether the appointee was to protect the farmers who are out to destroy all the wildlife. I have made it pretty clear that we have learnt to live with this over many years. It is not our desire to destroy wildlife and fauna. We merely want to live with it and be protected from those species which behave to the detriment of the industry we pursue.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not know whether the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna knows who the three people are who will be the zoologists and the botanist. It is certainly not within my knowledge. However, this amendment was accepted by the Minister in another place after representations had been made to him. If we had rejected the request, we would have been criticised for not including another representative on the board. Therefore it is difficult to win. I consider the additional member will be of value to the authority.

Mr. HALL: The matter before the Committee is of great concern. I feel that most of the Country Party members would feel this is only a softening up. We have no guarantee that the country representative will be drawn from the country, and the atmosphere could be one of complete city domination. Can the

Minister handling this Bill assure us that this will not be a sop and that the country representative will be drawn from the country?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I assure you he will be a country representative.

Mr. HALL: Appointed from the country?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes.

Mr. HALL: That is the point I wanted to raise. I know the Minister for Industrial Development likes everything to be tied up in the industrial centre of the metropolitan area.

Mr. COURT: You are blaming me for everything in the north.

Mr. HALL: I have to blame the Minister for Industrial Development because he is the only one I can pin onto. Have I the assurance of the Minister on this point?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes.

Mr. DAVIES: I did not say that all the farmers wanted to destroy the wildlife. I was asking whether this person would represent that section of the farming community which would like to eliminate all wildlife. I recognise that most farmers have learnt to live with the fauna of the country; and the objective of the Bill is to conserve rather than to destroy. I will have a look at *Hansard* later, but I am sorry if I was not specific enough.

Although I thank the Minister for his explanation, I still cannot see that it is necessary to include an additional man. We could easily have stipulated that one of the three members was to represent country interests and then the representations to the Minister would have been met; the country people would have been satisfied; the Government would have been saved a little expenditure—not much, but a little; and the committee would not have been enlarged. I oppose any addition to the authority because I believe the same ends could be accomplished in another way.

Amendment put and passed.

The clause was further consequentially amended, on motion by Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON, as follows:—

Page 5, line 9—Delete the word "six" and substitute the word "seven".

Page 5, line 16—Delete the word "three" and substitute the word "four".

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 23—Add after the word "State" the words "and one to represent country interests".

I have already spoken about this amendment when dealing with the first one, and I therefore now commend it to members.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 13 put and passed.

Clause 14: Section 12E added—

Mr. NORTON: I just want to bring to the notice of the Minister what I believe is a misprint. Lines 12 and 13 of proposed new subsection (2) read—

Where the sanctuary comprises land of a kind firstly described in the interpretation—

That part of the interpretation refers to land held under Government reserves, but this particular provision is referring to land which is privately owned. One reserve I could point to is Hamelin Pool, near the homestead, and served by artesian water. That becomes a reserve for bird life at the request of the station. However it is the property of the station; and other similar pieces of land throughout the State are privately owned, but are under the control of this body.

If we look at the land firstly named in the interpretation, it is Government reserve. That named secondly is owned by private persons, and it appears to me that this could be a mistake in the printing.

The interpretation in the Act is as follows:—

"sanctuary" means an area of land—vested in the Crown and which the Governor, subject to such conditions and limitations as he thinks fit, reserves to His Majesty or disposes of in such a manner as for the public interest may seem fit for the conservation of fauna, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (g) of section 29 of the Land Act, 1933-1948; or

The second part of the interpretation is as follows:—

which is the subject of an agreement made between the Minister and the owner of the land for its use as a sanctuary;

I take it that proposed new subsection (2) refers to the area which is private land.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not think there is any problem in regard to this. The member for Gascoyne has just read out the definition of sanctuary, which is contained in section 6 of the Act. I cannot see that the amendment contained in the Bill cannot be covered by the definition, and I fail to see where there is any misprint.

Mr. HALL: Part of proposed new section 12E reads as follows:—

12E. (1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Act, the Authority may grant a permit in writing to any person to enter and use the whole or any part of the sanctuary

This brings me very forcibly to the petition which I have lodged in this House and which was totally ignored by the Government. The petition contained some 800 signatures of people who wanted access to one of the greatest recreational areas there could possibly be. I refer to Two People Bay. The Minister for Lands did mention this matter when he was speaking. That beach, and its attributes, should be made available to the people.

Under the provisions of this Bill people will be restricted and will have to obtain a permit even to go into the area. Under this provision the whole of Western Australia will be subject to the same restriction. This cannot be disputed. Whatever part of the State one wishes to go into—whether it be Two People Bay or any other area which the Director of Fisheries and Fauna decides we shall not enter—he will require a permit. If there is anything more dominating or more dictatorial than that, I have yet to find it.

Mr. Hawke: The penalties are severe, too.

Mr. HALL: At this point I ask members: Would any members like to be subjected to the restriction of having to ask for a permit to go to a particular beach? The whole phraseology of the Bill actually smells, and that cannot be denied. This is something which goes against our democratic principles and it should be stopped as soon as we can put a plug in the hole. The talk about the noisy scrub bird is rubbish. If one section of our coastline is to be denied to the public, then access will have to be denied all round the coastline of Western Australia.

The important thing is that we are sacrificing our rights and privileges because of a dictatorial attitude. This is what is crippling Western Australia at the moment. Let there be no mistake about that; this is the one thing that really is destroying the whole of the rights and privileges of the people of Western Australia. Through inference, the member for Northam substantiates my ideas. Let us face facts. Are we going to stand by and tolerate the taking away of the rights and privileges of our people? This is already happening in the area of Cockburn where beaches have been taken away from the people. It is occurring everywhere and yet we are prepared to bow down and scrape to it. Now is the time to exercise our rights and privileges to defend this avenue and allow the people to retain at least something of nature with all its benefits.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.