

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 30th July, 1957.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
Address-in-reply, presentation .....	500
Questions : Railways, (a) suspension of road bus service to Bunbury .....	500
(b) repainting of York station .....	500
(c) rehabilitation of system and allocation of estimated expenditure .....	501
(d) Kalgoorlie Trans dock and goods sheds, employees .....	501
Land tax, valuations and percentage increases .....	501
Treasury, liability at the 30th June, 1957 .....	501
Harbours, (a) use of Fremantle berths, etc. ....	502
(b) overseas terminus, Fremantle ....	502
State Transport Board, installation of bulk wheat bin, Jerramungup .....	503
Motor-vehicles, (a) wharfage and handling charges, effect on trade .....	503
(b) wharfage charges, method of reckoning .....	503
Health, Anti-Cancer Council .....	503
Education, (a) speech survey by Miss D. C. Adams .....	504
(b) Bunbury domestic science centre, students and appliances .....	504
Fishing industry, use of nets in Swan Estuary .....	504
State Shipping Service, gross tonnage and maximum loaded draught .....	504
Orchard registration, (a) necessity for annual fee .....	504
(b) registration on a periodical basis .....	505
Parking facilities, resumption of Hamilton Square .....	505
State-wide referendum, approximate cost .....	505
Chase Syndicate, pasturing of sheep, Esperance .....	505
Bills : Agent General Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report .....	505
Public Service, Message, 2r. ....	514
Agriculture Protection Board Act Amendment, 2r. Com., report .....	515
Fremantle Prison Site Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report .....	517
Justice Act Amendment, 2r., Com. ....	517
Local Courts Act Amendment, 2r., Com. ....	520
Bees Act Amendment, 2r., Com. ....	523
Dairy Cattle Improvement Act Repeal, 2r., Com., report .....	526
Supply (No.1), £21,000,000, returned .....	527

to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament. His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms:—

Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

## QUESTIONS.

### RAILWAYS.

(a) *Suspension of Road Bus Service to Bunbury.*

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it a fact that the railway road bus service to Bunbury has been suspended?

(2) Is it a further fact that this service operated at a profit of £1,000 per annum?

(3) Is it also a fact that the alteration of the Bunbury service will mean—

(a) a reduction of 690 diesel miles per week at 80 pence per mile;

(b) a reduction of 1,044 bus miles per week at 30 pence per mile;

(c) an increase of 230 steam miles per week at £2 2s. per mile;

resulting in a further net overall cost of £6,400 per annum in providing the Bunbury service?

(4) Who was responsible for the decision to suspend this service?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

(1) The number of road services have been reduced.

(2) The profit for the whole Perth-Bunbury road service was £885 for the year ended the 30th June, 1956, and £1,200 for the year ended the 30th June, 1957.

(3) Reorganised services are estimated to reduce costs by approximately £3,250 per annum.

(4) Reorganisation of W.A.G.R. services is designed to effect general economies as required by Parliament, and decisions are made by the Railways Commission.

(b) *Repainting of York Station.*

Mr. MANN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) What was the actual cost of repainting the York railway station which was carried out recently?

(2) How many men were employed and for how long?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

(1) £860. The station buildings include the station master's house.

(2) Two painters, two painter's assistants and one apprentice were employed for 1,695 man hours on this work.

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

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

### Presentation.

The SPEAKER: I desire to announce that, accompanied by the member for Canning and the member for Gascoyne, I waited upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-reply

*(c) Rehabilitation of System, and Allocation of Estimated Expenditure.*

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) On the 30th November, 1956, Hansard, page 2817, he indicated that the Railways Commission estimated that £75,000,000 spread over ten years would be needed to rehabilitate the railway system as it then existed. Will he inform the House what sum the commission estimated would need to be spent on—

- (a) track rehabilitation;
- (b) replacement of over-age rolling-stock;
- (c) replacement of over-age locomotives;
- (d) new marshalling yards, goods yards, etc.;
- (e) chord line;
- (f) installation of centralised traffic control and signalling equipment;
- (g) any other substantial rehabilitation expenditure to bring the whole of our then existing railway system to a state of efficiency?

(2) How much of this expenditure is still necessary after closing 842 miles of line?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

The commission estimates the various costs as under:—

- (1) (a) £45,850,000.
- (b) £11,850,000.
- (c) £4,500,000.
- (d) £2,250,000.
- (e) £600,000.
- (f) £1,600,000.
- (g) £8,350,000.

(2) £63,500,000.

*(d) Kalgoorlie Trans Dock and Goods Sheds, Employees.*

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many men are employed working on the Trans dock at Kalgoorlie (including men who work at Parkeston)?

(2) How many men are employed at the goods sheds at Kalgoorlie?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

(1) 87, including one junior clerk part-time and 79 temporary workers.

(2) 38, including seven temporary workers.

**LAND TAX.**

*Valuations and Percentage Increases.*

Mr. BOVELL asked the Treasurer:

(1) In what towns and districts have taxation valuations for land tax purposes been increased during the last two years?

(2) What is the percentage increase of such valuations in each town and district affected?

The TREASURER replied:

The details are as follows:—

**Revaluations.**

**For year ended the 30th June, 1955.**

Metro-politan Districts.	In-crease.	Country Town.	In-crease.	Country Districts.	In-crease.
	Per Cent.		Per Cent.		Per Cent.
Armadale	280	Brunswick		Busselton	188
Bassendean	166	Junction	677	Carnamah	30
Bayswater	183	Bedfordale	234	Dowerlo	23
Belmont	277	Ptn. Busselton	92	Mingenew	68
Fremantle	150	Carnamah	926	Narrogin	6
Nedlands	227	Cranbrook	315	Quairading	12
Peppermint Grove	103	Eaton	9	Serpentine	
Ptn. Perth Mun.	218	Geraldton	64	Jarrahdale	244
Ptn. Perth Rd. Bd.	262	Karragullen	194	Three Springs	65
		Mingenew	358		
		Mullewa	72		
		Wungong	1,182		
		Yarloop	300		

**For year ended the 30th June, 1956.**

Claremont	86	Beverley	33	Capel	305
Cottesloe	94	Boscabel	Nil	Dandaragan	77
Gosnells	377	Broomo	99	Mandurah	235
Melville	60	Ptn. Busselton	72	Murray West	40
Mld. Jct.	122	Carnarvon	71	Arthur	37
Mosman Park	283	Derby	2,179		
Nth. Fremantle	418	Dowerlo	170		
Ptn. Perth Mun.	32	Dunsborough	534		
Ptn. Perth Rd. Bd.	219	Ejanding	12		
Victoria Park	143	Jarrahdale	29		
		Jingalup	Nil		
		Katanning	164		
		Kellerberrin	260		
		Keysbrook	97		
		Kojonup	241		
		Mandurah	44		
		Manmanaling	11		
		Minnivale	87		
		Mundijong	26		
		Muradup	61		
		Onslow	120		
		Pt. Hedland	549		
		Quindalup	2,130		
		Roebourne	681		
		Serpentine	30		
		Vasse	184		
		Wonnerup	244		
		Wyndham	1,174		
		Amery, decrease of	13		

**TREASURY.**

*Liability at the 30th June, 1957.*

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Treasurer:

What was the full liability at the 30th June, 1957, for—

- (a) creditors for supplies and services and other contracts;
- (b) guarantees;
- (c) deferred commitments;
- (d) promised contributions to various charitable, educational and similar bodies and organisations for financial assistance yet to be paid;
- (e) trust funds used by the Treasury;
- (f) contingent liabilities?

The TREASURER replied:

(a) As departmental accounting is on a cash basis, this information is not available.

(b) See answer to (f).

(c) £123,527.

(d) £346,479.

(e) Private trust funds—Nil; Government trust funds—£4,244,393, which were used in the main to finance the accumulated deficit of £3,743,199 on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(f)

	£
Treasury guarantees to Rural & Industries Bank	4,529,996
Other contingent liabilities	12,841,187

Made up of—

Metropolitan Markets Trust debentures	92,486
State Housing Commission debentures	782,441
State Electricity Commission—inscribed stock and debentures	11,966,260
	<u>£12,841,187</u>

### HARBOURS.

(a) *Use of Fremantle Berths, etc.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What was the daily average number of ships using berths at Fremantle for the year ended the 30th June, 1957?

(2) How many berths are there now in the Fremantle harbour?

(3) On what dates were all the berths occupied?

(4) Were any ships kept waiting for berths during the year ended the 30th June, 1957, and if so, how many, and for how long?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Inner harbour, port of Fremantle, 12.4; outer harbour, port of Fremantle, 2.23.

(2) Inner harbour — nominally 17 berths; outer harbour—6 berths.

(3) 1956: September 14

" 19— 2 days

October 11

" 12

" 13

" 15

" 16

" 17

" 21

" 22— 8 days

November 5

" 6

" 7

" 8

" 9

" 15

" 17

" 26

" 27

" 29—10 days

1957: February 27— 1 day

March 13— 1 day

April 15

" 16

" 17— 3 days

May 27

" 28— 2 days

June 7

" 11— 2 days

Total 29 days

(4) (a) Yes.

(b) 15, as under—

Date; Vessel; Period of Delay;  
Reason for Delay.

4/7/56—"Enggano"; 29 hours;  
awaiting bulk oil berth.

24/8/56—"Cinulia"; 50 hours;  
awaiting bulk oil berth.

18/9/56—"King James"; 12  
hours; awaiting berth.

12/10/56—"Fernhurst"; 25  
hours; awaiting berth.

12/10/56—"Taranaki"; 27  
hours; awaiting berth.

12/10/56—"Tekoa"; 62 hours;  
awaiting berth.

17/10/56—"Arendsker"; 24  
hours; awaiting berth.

19/10/56—"Vignes"; 9 hours;  
awaiting berth.

26/10/56—"Macoma"; 24 hours;  
awaiting bulk oil berth.

11/11/56—"Cape Howe"; 30  
hours; awaiting berth.

12/11/56—"Tremayne"; 64  
hours; awaiting bulk wheat  
berth.

15/11/56—"Karamea"; 10  
hours; awaiting berth.

19/2/57—"Clan Kenneth"; 25  
hours; awaiting bulk wheat  
berth.

21/2/57—"Castle Harbour"; 50  
hours; awaiting bulk wheat  
berth.

23/2/57—"Baron Murray"; 55  
hours; awaiting bulk wheat  
berth.

Total, 496 hours.

(b) *Overseas Terminus, Fremantle.*

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) When will a start be made on the planning and construction of the overseas terminus at the port of Fremantle?

(2) What amount of money will be expended on this project this financial year?

(3) What is the estimated total cost?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Planning is already in hand, and construction will be commenced as soon as possible.

(2) Provision of up to £250,000 is made in this financial year's loan fund allocation.

(3) The completed scheme is estimated to cost £1,000,000.

### STATE TRANSPORT BOARD.

#### *Installation of Bulk Wheat Bin, Jerramungup.*

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has the Transport Board made any recommendation regarding the installation of a bulk wheat bin at or near Jerramungup?

(2) If so, what was the recommendation and to whom was it made?

(3) Did the recommendation propose that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. should pay for the installation?

(4) If so, what authority has that company at present under the Act to do so as the bin would not be on railway lands?

(5) Is the Government prepared to pay for the bin?

(6) When is such a necessary facility likely to be provided?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) A recommendation that bulkhandling facilities be provided at or near Jerramungup was made to the Minister for Transport.

(3) No.

(4), (5) and (6) When a bin at Jerramungup is considered necessary, the Government will negotiate with C.B.H., which company is the bulkhandling authority in Western Australia for its erection under similar terms as for the erection of away-from-siding bins already in operation.

### MOTOR-VEHICLES.

#### *(a) Wharfage and Handling Charges, Effect on Trade.*

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Works:

(1) As the information given by him to my question on Wednesday, the 24th July, regarding the wharfage and handling charges applying at Fremantle and ports in other States for the export of motor-vehicles shows that the respective charges are—

Fremantle—£6 19s. per car;

Melbourne—Nil;

Brisbane—9s. 6d. (approx.) per car;

Adelaide—£1 11s. 8d. (approx.) per car;

Sydney—Figures not given in answer, but are approx. 11s. per car.

will he inform the House of the reason why the Western Australian export industry is so badly handicapped?

(2) Does not the wide disparity in these charges act detrimentally to Western Australia as far as our new and potential export trade with Malaya (it being understood that over 150 cars have already been exported in under one year) and other countries north and west of our shores, is concerned?

(3) In order to enable our State to compete on equal terms to assist our expansion of industry and to help ensure full employment, will he take immediate steps to make the charges here comparable with those in other States?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The charges quoted for Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Sydney are not entirely correct as they do not appear to include handling charges, which approximate £1 per vehicle.

(2) and (3) The question of wharfage charges on the export of motor-vehicles assembled or built in Australia and shipped on their own wheels having been under consideration, the Fremantle Harbour Trust commissioners at their meeting on the 26th July, 1957, decided that the charges would be assessed on a weight basis.

#### *(b) Wharfage Charges, Method of Reckoning.*

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Are inwards wharfage charges on motor-vehicles reckoned on dead weight, and outwards wharfage charges on motor-vehicles reckoned on the far more expensive weight by measurement?

(2) If the answer is "Yes," will he explain why this is so?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) Inward wharfage charges on motor-vehicles on wheels assembled or built in Australia and transported interstate by ship are assessed on weight basis.

(b) Inward wharfage charges on motor-vehicles other than those specified in (a), are assessed on measurement.

(c) Outward wharfage charges on motor-vehicles assembled or built in Australia and shipped on their own wheels from now on will be charged on a weight basis.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

### HEALTH.

#### *Anti-Cancer Council.*

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Health:

(1) When was the Anti-Cancer Council formed?

(2) How often does the council meet and how many times has it met?

(3) Is a report of its activities available, and if so, will such reports be prepared and made available to members of this House?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) In April, 1956.

(2) It meets when there is business to discuss. It has met six times.

(3) Yes.

### EDUCATION.

(a) *Speech Survey by Miss D. C. Adams.*

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Has he seen the report of Miss D. C. Adams, a speech therapist, who recently visited the Goldfields and conducted a survey of the speech of children in that area?

(2) Have such surveys been conducted in other areas recently?

(3) If so, were the findings similar to those on the Goldfields?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. Miss Adams is an officer of the Princess Margaret Hospital and no copy of her findings has been forwarded to me.

(2) No.

(3) Answered by No. (2).

(b) *Bunbury Domestic Science Centre, Students and Appliances.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) How many students, per week, attend the domestic science centre in Bunbury?

(2) How many of the following items are on issue to such centre—

- (a) refrigerators;
- (b) electric irons;
- (c) flat irons;
- (d) electric wringers;
- (e) washing machines;
- (f) mangles;
- (g) wood stoves;
- (h) electric stoves;
- (i) gas stoves;
- (j) treadle sewing machines;
- (k) electric sewing machines?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 286.

(2) (a) Refrigerators	....	—
(b) Electric irons	....	2
(c) Flat irons	....	60
(d) Electric wringers	....	—
(e) Electric washing machines	....	—
(f) Mangles	....	1
(g) Wood stoves	....	3
(h) Electric stoves	....	—
(i) Gas stoves	....	—
(j) Treadle sewing machines	....	2
(k) Electric sewing machines	....	2

### FISHING INDUSTRY.

*Use of Nets in Swan Estuary.*

Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Why is it that licensed fishermen and others are allowed to use hauling sunken seine nets and drops nets in the Swan estuary from Mill Point to Preston Point bank for the catching of crabs, flounder and flathead during the months of June, July and August?

(2) Why is it that hauling sunken seine nets and drop nets are not used during the above months in the Mandurah or Bunbury or in any other estuary?

(3) Is he prepared, in the interests of the ratepayers from Midland Junction to Fremantle, to prohibit the use of hauling sunken seine nets and drop nets in the Swan estuary from Mill Point to Fremantle from the 1st May to the 1st December in each year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) These nets are orthodox types which do no harm to the fishery.

(2) The fishermen at the centres mentioned have never evinced any desire to use them.

(3) No. To do this would be in nobody's interests.

### STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

*Gross Tonnage and Maximum Loaded Draught.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

What is the gross tonnage and maximum loaded draught of each vessel operated by the State Shipping Service?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied:

	Gross Tonnage.	Maximum Draught.
	Tons.	
M.v. "Koolinda" ....	4,227	18ft. 2½in.
M.v. "Kabbarli" ....	2,707	18ft.
M.v. "Koojarra" ....	2,958	18ft.
M.v. "Kybra" ....	858	12ft. 7in.
S.s. "Dulverton" ....	2,411	18ft. 9in
S.s. "Dorrigo" ....	2,321	19ft.
S.s. "Delamere" ....	2,354	19ft.

### ORCHARD REGISTRATION.

*(a) Necessity for Annual Fee.*

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Whilst conceding that the provisions of the existing Act call for annual orchard registrations, what are the practical or technical reasons—other than accounting difficulties—which make annual registration necessary?

The MINISTER replied:

There would be no serious practical difficulties—other than accounting ones—in the operation of a scheme whereby orchard registration fees were paid for a specified period other than one year.

An amendment to the existing Act would be necessary for any alteration to the present method of payment.

(b) *Registration on a Periodical Basis.*

Mr. COURT (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the Minister's answer, will the Government give consideration to introducing amending legislation to provide for the registration of all orchards on a periodical basis instead of on the annual basis at present provided by the statute?

The MINISTER replied:

From memory, this question followed a previous one which asked for a seven-year registration period.

Mr. COURT: The seven years was only a suggestion; it could be five.

The MINISTER: Personally, I would not be in favour of such a long period because many things could happen within the time. There could be a change in ownership or alteration in the size of an orchard which would not necessarily be registered, and the department would, therefore, know nothing of it for quite a long time. I think, however, there might be some merit in a lesser period, and the Government will give some consideration to the views expressed by the hon. member.

#### PARKING FACILITIES.

*Resumption of Hamilton Square.*

Mr. HEAL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) Is it intended to resume Hamilton Square or portion of it for the future expansion of Perth or for parking facilities?

(2) If so, will added recreational grounds be made available in the same area?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied:

(1) Hamilton Square is affected by future road proposals but the extent cannot be determined until more detailed plans are finalised.

(2) There are no proposals at this stage for additional recreation grounds in this area.

#### STATE-WIDE REFERENDUM.

*Approximate Cost.*

Mr. COURT (without notice) asked the Minister for Justice:

What would be the approximate cost to the State Government of holding a State-wide referendum on a given subject?

The MINISTER replied:

As far as the Electoral Office is concerned, roughly, between £17,000 and £18,000, exclusive of the cost of printing rolls, ballot papers, etc.

#### CHASE SYNDICATE.

*Pasturing of Sheep, Esperance.*

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

I remind the Minister that when Mr. Chase was here, there was a suggestion that some 20,000 sheep would, by November, be on pasture in the area held by the Chase Syndicate. Can he give any indication to the House as to whether that might be so; or will any stock at all be carried there at that date?

The MINISTER replied:

I was not aware that such a promise was given for such a short space of time, but if it was, I would say it is very unlikely to be fulfilled. The work is progressing according to plan; in fact, it is ahead of schedule. I believe that an area of something like 20,000 acres has now been seeded, but to imagine that between now and November it will be possible to carry 20,000 sheep there is, I think, stretching it a little too far. I have never heard of this myself, and I doubt very much if it is possible in the time.

#### BILL—AGENT GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [4.48]: The Bill simply provides for an increase in the salary of the Agent General, and with this proposition we all agree. If we had any criticism, it might be that it is not sufficient. As the Premier indicated during his introduction of the Bill, costs are rising rather rapidly in Great Britain and it would appear that even though there is to be an increase of £850 sterling in the salary of the Agent General, it will not be long before we will again be required to amend the Act to provide reasonable recompense to our representative in England.

Apart from this fact, I feel that as the State grows and expands, with the great potential that we know exists here, more and more responsibility will rest on the shoulders of the State representative in the United Kingdom. It is unfortunate that a greater increase has not been provided for in the Bill because of the increases in the cost of living in Great Britain. We have read where the Government of that country is battling with the problem of inflation and, as has been the case in Australia, I have no doubt that within the next year or two there will be a further upward movement in their costs.

When replying to an interjection of mine, the Premier indicated that the Government would most likely increase the expenses allowance. It is some time since Mr. Dimmitt passed away—on the 29th January, 1957, to be exact—and it would

appear that the Government has had ample time in which to decide whether or not it would increase the expenses allowance. I expected the Premier to give me something more definite than a reply that "most likely" an increase would be made. According to what we hear from those who have been in Great Britain, the call upon the Agent General is a very real one and his expenses account must assume large proportions.

If we expect the representative of the Government in Great Britain to do his job properly, he should not be worrying about personal expenses. He must find a limitation on his expenses account most frustrating, especially if he has to watch every penny. From what we hear in this House, I would say that the first contact and the first approaches made to industry and people who really matter in Great Britain, are through the social side. Also, we expect our representative in England to maintain a certain dignity because of his high office. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, as you have been in England recently, will agree with the suggestion that there is a real call on the Agent General financially. I think it was the member for Moore who put forward the suggestion that a house or living accommodation should be provided for the Agent General.

The Premier: I think it was the member for Bunbury.

Hon. D. BRAND: It might have been; the member for Moore also interjected at about that time. However, no matter from whom the suggestion emanated, it was a very good one, and whilst we realise the difficulty of providing a house in close proximity to the offices occupied by the Agent General and his staff, it is the responsibility of the Government of any State, or indeed of the Commonwealth, to provide some housing for its representatives, particularly if, as in our case, the representative has to come up for re-appointment at the end of his three-yearly term.

I am not sure whether the Premier put forward a reason or an excuse for not adopting this suggestion, but he said that the wives of the Agents General would require certain alterations to the house. All our wives do that from time to time, but do not make a great deal of progress, and I think that our representatives in the past would have been quite happy if a house provided by the State had been available for them, and in such cases I think it would have been of a reasonable standard.

If it is not possible to provide a house, the Premier might give consideration to a housing allowance to meet the heavy call made on an Agent General in paying rent for a flat or other accommodation. I should imagine that if the Agent General were a family man, he might require more than the accommodation which was available

to the late Hon. J. A. Dimmitt and the late Hon. W. H. Kitson. In that regard, I am thinking of the appointment of a younger man. If we were to appoint a younger man with a family, he would find it most difficult to obtain accommodation of the standard which we would expect for our Agent General, at a reasonable figure.

The Premier: What is the age of the member for Dale?

Hon. D. BRAND: I do not know; and if I knew, I would not be at liberty to disclose it. In any case, he is obviously embarrassed, and I do not want to upset any chance he might have of being appointed, any more than I would like to upset the chances of the Minister for Transport. I am not sure which one the Premier had in mind when he spoke of a man about the age of 45.

Mr. Lawrence: What I am wondering is whether he would be a family man.

Hon. D. BRAND: That is also private. I was looking at the parent Act which is a very old one and has been amended only when the salary has been increased. The Act is dated 1896 and from then until 1955 it has been amended on only three occasions—in each case as I say, it has been a matter of increasing the salary. I find that in Victoria the Act has been brought up to date—at least to 1945—and in that Act certain duties of the Agent General are laid down. I think in these more advanced times that when the opportunity arises, and we wish to review our Act, which is outdated and outmoded, we should do something about bringing it into line with the Victorian Act.

The duties of the Agent General of Victoria, which might be of interest to members, are laid down in the Act as follows:—

- (a) The promotion of the sale of primary products of Victoria;
- (b) the promotion of the sale of the products of secondary industries of Victoria and the stimulation of interest in the extension of existing, and the establishment of new secondary industries in Victoria;
- (c) the fostering of trade between the United Kingdom and Victoria;
- (d) the dissemination of knowledge of, and the encouragement of special interest in, Victoria;
- (e) the promotion of emigration to Victoria;
- (f) the dissemination of information for the purpose of attracting tourists to Victoria;
- (g) co-operation with Agents General of other States of the Commonwealth and with the High Commissioner of the Commonwealth; and

- (h) the carrying into effect of any direction of the Governor-in-Council in relation to the above matters or affecting the representation of Victoria in the United Kingdom.

At least once in every three months the Agent General shall furnish to the Governor in Council a report on the exercise of his functions and on any matters which may affect the representation of Victoria in Great Britain.

I read that because I think it is worthwhile information. As far as I can recall, our Agent General is not required under the Act to furnish any periodical report of his activities, although no doubt he does so.

We, on this side of the House, are disappointed with the reaction of the Premier to the suggestion that the tenure of office should be extended beyond three years. True enough, as the Premier indicated, if the Agent General were a good one, no doubt the Government of the day would extend his term for another three years. That has been the case for many years when Governments of different political affiliations have extended the period of office of various Agents General. I notice that in Victoria the tenure of office of the Agent General is five years; it is the same for South Australia and for Tasmania the term is three years. I have not been able to ascertain the situation in New South Wales and Queensland.

At the present time we are looking around for a man who would truly represent us in Great Britain. It is apparent that the Government is having some difficulty in making this appointment, because it is now some six months since the late Mr. Dimmitt passed away. As a matter of fact, just after my election as Leader of our party, I was approached by the Press and asked to comment on the suggestion by the Premier that an amendment be made to the Act to possibly increase not only the salary but also to review the question of the tenure of office.

I supported the idea and said that an appointment for five years would, in my opinion, be reasonable. Any worth-while businessman, or anybody else, established in Western Australia would find difficulty in settling down in the Old Country, and doing the things that would be expected of him in this capacity. Indeed, it would take him quite five years to become acquainted with the various aspects of representation, and also to become known in Great Britain. At the present time, however, after having settled down, it is necessary for him to run the gauntlet after three years of being reappointed. No matter how well he might be doing on the job, or how efficient he was in the eyes of the Government, it would still be necessary for him to be reappointed, and this would be enough to unsettle the man.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They have all been reappointed.

Hon. D. BRAND: That is so, but if that is to be the position, why not make the period of appointment five years and say to the man appointed, "You have security for five years." I would like to see a similar provision to that in the Victorian Act included in our Act to the effect that if the man is not living up to what was expected of him, and if the Government happened to be dissatisfied, it would have the right to suspend him. Accordingly, on behalf of the Opposition, and in particular on behalf of the members of my own party, I would like to see the tenure of office extended to one of five years.

The Premier: You suggest that the Victorian Act has a provision for suspension in certain circumstances.

Hon. D. BRAND: Yes, I will read the relevant portion to the Premier. It is as follows:—

(3) The Governor-in-Council may at any time on the ground that the Agent General—

- (a) has been guilty of misbehaviour;
- (b) is incapable of properly carrying out his duties; or
- (c) neglects or refuses to carry out any direction of the Governor-in-Council given pursuant to this Act—

suspend or remove such person from his office.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: One man from the Eastern States was suspended as soon as he got there.

Hon. D. BRAND: That is my whole point, and if the Premier has any misgivings about the man not coming up to scratch, it would be possible for the Government, if we included a provision similar to that in the Victorian Act, to suspend him. But I think that we should appoint him in the first instance for five years. As I have pointed out, there is a provision in the Victorian Act which gives the Government the power of suspension if the Agent General is not doing his job. I understand that New South Wales has spent something like £51,672 on the Agent General's office which comprises a staff of 51. It would seem that New South Wales appreciates the importance of that office to the extent that that Government is willing to spend substantial sums of money for representation.

I know that in comparison with New South Wales our revenue is small but I feel, because of the need of industry, both secondary and primary, in this State and because of our vast undeveloped areas and small population, there is an urgent need for us to spend more on worth-while representation in the United Kingdom. It has



been said, and I think it was repeated during the visit of Lord Carrington, Britain's High Commissioner, that whilst we are quite happy to have American interests and investment brought into this State, it would be preferable if we could possibly get the United Kingdom also to take a greater interest.

Recently I read that Mr. Shinwell, M.P. in the British Press, urged the United Kingdom to take such action in order to influence people to spend more money in Australia and keep up with the Americans, as he put it. He pointed out that Britain had a vested interest in this country and it was high time the United Kingdom took a greater and more direct interest in establishing industry and investments in Australia. If that is to be so—and it is a very worthy purpose—I think it is very necessary to have an able and competent man appointed to the position of Agent General to help us obtain our share of whatever is going. It must be admitted that it is through goodwill and the establishment of such goodwill, that we are able to interest people, even hardened businessmen, to come to this country.

We have much to show in this State, and it is only through competent representation, and the appointment of a man well versed in the history and geography of the State and its potential—one who is able to put our case to them in the best possible terms—that we will be able to secure more investment from Great Britain.

The Minister for Health: Have our Agents General ever tried to advocate the development of primary industries in this State?

Hon. D. BRAND: My term as Minister was only one of three years; the Minister for Health has been a Minister in a number of Governments and is in a far better position to answer that question. I would imagine, however, that each Agent General in his turn has put forward the case for Western Australia's primary producing potential to the best of his ability. It is possible that the fault lies with the various Governments of the day if sufficient emphasis was not placed on this aspect of our industry. It is also fair to say that the business interests and investors of Great Britain have not given priority to primary production in Western Australia or in Australia; rather have they thought more in terms of secondary industries.

We know that vast sums of money have been spent in other parts of the British Commonwealth. One example that comes to mind is the growing of peanuts in Africa. There have been other such ventures where millions of pounds have been spent. It is my opinion that if we had an Agent General who was ambitious and alive and keen to obtain whatever was

going, then we could gradually direct that flow of capital to Western Australia simply by explaining to people just what we have here.

I support the Bill. I regret that the amount is not substantially more. If the salary were in the region of £5,000, with allowances, then it would enable us to get the best possible man for the job. I hope the Government will make an early decision. As I have said, we have been without representation for six months and we cannot expect the officers in the Agent General's office to continue to carry the heavy burden themselves. It is high time Western Australia polished up her show window in Great Britain and attempted to vie with other States in an endeavour to secure her share of that which is vital to the expansion and development of this country, namely, British capital.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY (Murray) [5.10]: I support the Bill, because I am one of those fortunate members who has had an opportunity, on a number of occasions over the years, to visit the Agent General's office in London. I realise what a great benefit that office is, particularly to Western Australians who happen to be visiting London, and also to people in Great Britain who wish to obtain first-hand information with regard to business propositions in this State. I think the Leader of the Opposition is right when he says that every possible effort should be made—and I am sure it will be made—to obtain the right type of person for this important post.

It is necessary for the man appointed to have a good knowledge of primary industries, and a good practical knowledge with regard to the expansion of secondary industries in this State. I am sure the Agent General can do a considerable amount to interest people in the affairs of Western Australia in an endeavour to encourage investors and capital into this State. Not only does he come into contact with people in Great Britain itself, but he also meets people from Europe where, I think, there is also scope for the encouragement of the necessary finance to help them establish their industries in this State.

In days gone by, the Agent General was called upon to do more work than has been the case latterly. Certainly, when my own Government came into office, the Agent General was kept busy, because, as members know, there was an acute shortage of basic materials throughout the Commonwealth. The result was that we had to ask our Agent General to keep on the lookout in order to secure those much-needed goods; and it was also necessary for him to try to get the necessary shipping space, which was in great demand, in order to bring those goods to this State. Fortunately, however, the position has improved since then. There is no pressing demand

at the moment to bring these goods from overseas such as there was a few years ago.

Then again, in past years the Agent General played an important part in obtaining finance for State public works because, we in this State, relied on overseas borrowings to implement our public works programme. As one who visited London recently, Mr. Speaker, you would know that there are six Agents General in London, and that there is also Australia House.

Formerly the Agent General was also responsible, to a much larger extent than he is today, for the encouragement of emigrants to this State. To a considerable extent that duty has been taken over by the Commonwealth Government and Australia House has become the main centre. But I consider that intending migrants will be able to get a more intimate knowledge of the affairs of this State by going to the Western Australian Agent General's office in London, than at Australia House. It is generally agreed that the atmosphere in the Agent General's office is much more friendly than the atmosphere which appertains to Australia House. That might be brought about by the fact that the Agent General possesses greater knowledge of this State as compared with the knowledge apparent at Australia House. It could also be caused by the fact that more of the visitors from this State call at the Agent General's office, with the result that it has a much closer contact with Western Australia.

I consider that the term of office of the Agent General should be longer. I have said that on several occasions in this House. In discussions with the Premier I have also made that suggestion. I would have thought that the Government would have agreed to extend the term of office. In the past this position has been given to ex-Ministers of the Crown. Some considerable time before I went into Parliament it seemed to be the practice for successive Premiers to be appointed Agents General. I do not know if this is putting any idea into the Premier's head. I can recall at least three Premiers who resigned and became Agents General. They were Sir Walter James, Sir Cornthwaite Rason and Sir Newton Moore.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That was a long time ago.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: In latter years ex-Ministers of the Crown have been appointed to that position. The late Mr. Dimmitt was the only appointee who had not held ministerial office. I suggest to the Premier, that even at this late stage, he could give consideration to increasing the term of office beyond three years. It must be remembered that whoever is appointed has to uproot his home and leave the State for only three years. If a member of Parliament or a Minister of the

Crown were appointed, he would have to resign his seat in Parliament. That has applied in the past.

It is very seldom that any appointee who has been a member of Parliament has returned to politics after serving his term. Naturally, when he gets away from the State he loses intimate touch with its affairs, and it becomes very hard for him to re-enter politics. There is also the other aspect; he might not desire to go back into politics, particularly if he were up in years.

The Minister for Health: Don't you think this State should follow the English tradition of appointing ex-Ministers of the Crown?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not wedded to the idea that this appointment should be given to a member of Parliament. The position should be offered to someone who has an intimate knowledge of the primary production of this State and also of the prospects for expansion of secondary industries. Ministers of the Crown, in the course of their duties, do gain such experience. Furthermore, they have an intimate knowledge of the political affairs of the State, but in this regard I do not mean party politics.

The Minister for Health: I am only looking at this position following the English tradition.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I suppose tradition has something to recommend itself. In this case the Government should look for someone possessing a thorough and practical knowledge of the State; who is an enthusiast in regard to the State's development. When discussing the position of Agent General for this State, I was told when I was in England during the term of my Government, that we would have to look round for new premises. In that regard we had been very fortunate in obtaining offices in The Strand in London. The lease of those premises has proved beneficial to the State financially. The Government was able to let a considerable portion of the building, and that arrangement has paid off very well indeed. Getting such a prominent stand in London has certainly turned out to the State's benefit. I do not know what the position is in regard to the future of those premises and how long the present lease will continue. I should say that the Government will not be able to obtain offices under such favourable terms as obtain in the present lease. In my view, it would be difficult to obtain a better site.

During this debate, I might say something about the staff of the Agent General's office. In that respect the State has been very well served indeed. The overwhelming majority of Western Australians who have visited London have returned high in their praise of the services they received at the Agent General's office.

That office not only becomes their business centre in London but also their social centre. I have heard it suggested on a number of occasions that two members of that staff who have long been associated with that office should be given the opportunity to visit this State in order that they might obtain a more practical knowledge of its affairs. Such a suggestion has considerable merit. Perhaps the Premier might give consideration to it.

I support the second reading of the Bill. I think the increase in the salary of the Agent General is long overdue, as is an increase in his allowance. I consider that the term of his office should be extended beyond three years. As I said, whoever is appointed to this position, has to make sacrifices—and great sacrifices—in having to leave Western Australia to take up a position of considerable importance for only three years. It has been said by the member for Fremantle that those who previously occupied the position of Agent General have remained in that position longer than three years, and the term has always been extended. During my Government's term of office, the appointment of Mr. Kitson was extended for a further three years after his first term expired. The present Government also extended the term of the late Mr. Dimmitt for a similar period.

The point is that there is no certainty about this extension and about what matters might crop up from time to time. There might be a change of Government and influence might be brought to bear in the appointment of this position. There is no certainty that the term of office of the Agent General would be extended beyond the present period of three years. That does not work to the good of the occupant or the position. I, therefore, urge the Premier to give further consideration to extending the term of office of the Agent General.

**MR. ACKLAND** (Moore) [5.26]: I do not want to delay the passage of this Bill unduly because I feel it will receive the support of this Chamber. Both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Murray touched on one or two subjects which I intended to mention, but I do not want to indulge in any repetition. I agree with the Premier's statement that he does not believe in the Western Australian Government obtaining a permanent residence in London for the appointee.

**Hon. Sir Ross McLarty:** There used to be one.

**Mr. ACKLAND:** I am now talking about the present time. It is very much better for each Agent General on going to London to be able to select a residence to suit his own family requirements. If the Government obtained premises in London on a permanent basis, they would need a

great deal of structural alterations with the appointment of each new Agent General to suit his individual family needs.

With those who spoke previously on this measure, I agree that it would be a good idea if the term of office were extended beyond the present three years. The average Western Australian who goes to live in London, permanently or for a reasonable period, would find it rather difficult to fit into the life of the London community. The people of that city are totally different to Western Australians and it would take some considerable period for a Western Australian to adapt himself to the altered conditions. This position is so important that the appointee needs to be a man who will be readily accepted by the community in which he lives. He occupies a very important position. He must not only be a man of integrity—no doubt he would be, in any case—but he must also be a man who will be accepted by those with whom he comes into personal contact.

I had the good fortune of associating with two Agents General in London at various times. On the first occasion I met a very sick Agent General who was labouring under extreme difficulties owing to bad health. On a later occasion I met the late Mr. Dimmitt who I discovered had "cogged" right into the community of London. I was fortunate in going with him to attend ceremonies on two occasions. It was most interesting to observe how he had gained the confidence of the people with whom he had come in close contact arising out of his position.

The selection of an Agent General needs to be made with a reasonable assurance that the man appointed can secure the confidence of those hard-headed, shrewd business people he will be dealing with very intimately. I am glad the Government has decided to increase the salary and the expenses of the Agent General, because I know that although Savoy House is ideally situated, Western Australia was not getting the benefit of its excellent position.

When I was in England two years ago I noticed that the two very fine shop windows—one facing The Strand and the other on the side street—had been leased or let to two firms in England to enable them to display their products. If I remember rightly, one was the firm of Lister, which makes shearing machines and engines and goods of that description. The other was the Ford Motor Co.

If we rent a building in such an excellent position as that in which Savoy House is located, it seems to me that sufficient finance should be made available to provide a constant stream of suitable propaganda concerning the advantages of Western Australia, and that material should be exhibited in those windows. I support the Bill and would

like to see the Government give consideration to extending the tenure of the Agent General's office. I trust that the Premier will see that full advantage is taken of the excellent position we have in London, and that it is utilised for the benefit of this State.

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning) [5.33]: Because the subject has been well covered by previous speakers, I do not want to delay the House. But although it is perhaps getting away from the Bill a little, I would like to ask the Premier whether any of the suggestions made last year concerning improvements at Savoy House have been carried out.

I feel sure that the idea of some folk, as mentioned by the Premier, that it is not necessary for us to have a representative in London, is not agreed to by any member of this House. I am certain that our having a representative in London is of great advantage, not only to the Government but also to the people of Western Australia as a whole. I have evidence of the assistance given by the two previous Agents General to many people who have gone to England; not only those who have gone as visitors, but also those who have gone to take up residence there. The advice given to them has been of considerable advantage, because I have received word from them indicating how happy they have been to have had contact with the officials at Savoy House.

It seems to me that more could be done with regard to migration. A number of people have written to some of our local papers—I would refer particularly to "The Farmer's Weekly"—asking for sponsors. Some of them have been interested in engaging in different types of agriculture; others have sought employment. They have written asking for information as to various types of agriculture and employment in this State, and inquiring whether they could secure sponsors. Perhaps it would be possible for information to be given to these prospective migrants that would assist them and indicate to them the opportunities available here.

I, for one, would be very pleased indeed to see every opportunity given to improve the conditions of whoever is appointed to this position with a view to ensuring that he is able to provide the information required by people in England concerning Western Australia. I support the Bill and assure the Premier that it will receive every assistance from our party.

**MR. WILD** (Dale) [5.36]: I do not want to say what has been said by previous speakers, because it would only be repetition. However, I would like to make the observation that I consider the office of Agent General in London to be a very important one; it really is the shop-front of this country in Great Britain. The

Premier and you, Sir, and several other members of this Chamber have, in recent years, had an opportunity to visit London and observe some of the work done.

When I was there, knowing the salary offered to the occupant of the office, I could not help thinking that he had always been grossly underpaid. If we are to have an Agent General in London, let us be big about it and pay him adequately, in order that he will not have to draw upon his own income. Except for a man with an independent income, I think that even on £3,000 a year the Agent General would find it extremely difficult to fill that high office, particularly when one thinks of the entertaining that has to be done. Every Western Australian who goes to London calls to see the Agent General, and, in some way or other, most of us have been entertained by him. There are hundreds of Western Australians passing through that office every month.

The Agent General is our representative there, and he has the privilege and honour of being entertained himself by persons in all walks of life throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain; and he has to reciprocate. Consequently, on the salary which has been provided, he must have had to dip into his own pocket very considerably to maintain his position.

The question of a house for the Agent General has been raised. I think it would not be propitious for a house for this purpose to be owned in England by the Western Australian Government. On the other hand, the man appointed to the office could be a younger man with two or three children or he could be one with no family. There would be no sense in having a large house in one of the suburbs of London which would be occupied, perhaps, just by a married couple.

Nevertheless, when one considers the rents that have to be paid, one cannot help thinking that some suitable arrangement should be made. Although the Premier has stated that the expenses allowance is to be raised, possibly there should be a separate provision for rent. I do not know what the two previous occupants of the office—Mr. Kitson and Mr. Dimmitt—paid. I went to their particular flat on two or three occasions while I was in London, and I cannot imagine anybody being able to secure a flat such as that which Mr. Dimmitt had in Kensington for less than ten guineas per week. I think it is necessary for the Agent General to be within reasonable access of his office.

As the Premier knows, the Agent General is called upon to do a lot of night work. When he attends functions, he possibly does not leave them until midnight; and if he had to go to an outer suburb—where the rent would be relatively cheaper—he would not get to bed, after having done his work, until the early hours

of the morning. The result is that it is necessary for the Agent General to be within easy access of Savoy House. Therefore, he has to pay a commensurably higher rent than would be the case were he able to travel the longer distance into one of the outer suburbs.

In regard to the question of the tenure of office of three years, I think that maybe this matter is a little out of focus in the eyes of some people. It appears that in the past the occupant of the office has been one who has decided to vacate politics. That being so, he must have in the back of his mind the fact that he might have only three years in the position, and if he returns to Western Australia, he will be out of politics; because he would not have much chance of re-entering them, and he would be faced with the question: What do I do now?

In most cases the men appointed to this office are in their late forties or fifties, and their chances of rehabilitating themselves in some form of industry or some vocation are extremely limited. In those circumstances, it would be well for the Premier to give consideration—if not now, then in the future—to providing appointees with a tenure of office of five years.

Like other speakers on this side of the House, I cannot sufficiently stress the importance of this office. The man holding it has a marvellous opportunity to do good for Western Australia. We badly need industries in this State; and if we had a man who was persona grata with the industrialists and people who count, he could be all the time on the look-out for opportunities to induce those who want to invest capital to do it here. He does not want to be dragging his feet.

In common with others, I would like to see the development of the "Bring Out a Briton" campaign; and if the occupant of the office was charged with the responsibility of doing all he possibly could to furnish up-to-date evidence of what can be done in this State by one who is prepared to come out and show grit and initiative, a great service would be done to this State.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you like to bring out someone like Keith Miller is bringing?

Mr. WILD: I do not know what the Premier would say about my age if I suggested that!

The Premier: There is something in tonight's paper about an old fellow of 85.

Mr. WILD: I wish to join with other members on this side in saying that I support the measure. I would like to see something more given to men occupying this position because, not only are they worth it, but they need the money to do the job properly. Furthermore, I think some consideration should be given to giving them a longer tenure of office. I support the Bill.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [5.45]: I have already mentioned the question of the Agent General's office in London this session, when speaking to the debate on the Address-in-reply, but I wish now to emphasise that I think an increase in the salary is necessary and I urge the Premier also to consider extending the term of office from three to five years. I believe this is necessary because, owing to the nature of the office, the results achieved depend largely on the initiative of the appointee, and if he is to carry out a programme which will impress the people of Great Britain, I am convinced that he requires a longer term than three years in which to do it.

No one holding that position could plan very much within three years. Our Agent General in London has a tremendous responsibility in many directions, including immigration and also in inducing tourists to visit this State. That does not receive much attention from the staff at Australia House because most of them seem to have come from the Eastern States. Our Agent General can do a great deal also in securing British capital for investment in this State which requires advertising in England in view of our huge undeveloped areas and rich potential.

The older States such as New South Wales are able possibly to run for a while on their reputations, but Western Australia needs strong advertising, and the man appointed as our Agent General must be one who can make our products appear attractive to the people of England. A new appointee must have before him a very big programme to assemble and prepare, and I do not think he has any chance of doing it properly if he is appointed for a term of only three years. I urge the Premier again to consider extending the term of office of the Agent General.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.47]: I cannot remain silent any longer hearing about nothing but the three-year term. Most members opposite who have spoken have said that the term of office of our Agent General should be more than three years, but I think three years is quite long enough and it has proved satisfactory for the last 40 or 50 years. Any man in that office who finds himself recalled at the end of three years, can say to himself that he must have been a dud, as otherwise he would have received a further term of office. Any man who proves himself capable in the job can look forward with practical certainty to a further term of office.

Should the term be extended to five years we might strike a dud appointee and then we would be in trouble, just as the authorities in New South Wales were a few years ago. They appointed a man to the position of Agent General and he no sooner arrived in England than he was

recalled and they had to pay him three years' salary. I am more concerned about seeing that we collect a suitable man for the position of Agent General, and the position is one which I am convinced should be held by an Australian-born citizen. While I have nothing against people who are not Australian-born and number many of them among my friends, I think that to send anyone but an Australian-born person home to represent Western Australia in London would be the worst advertisement we could get.

Just imagine the people reading in the London morning Press that Mr. John Smith, born in Kent perhaps 40 years ago and who went to Australia 15 years ago, has now come home to represent Western Australia as Agent General in London! They would immediately say to themselves, "This must be a pretty poor country if they have not a man of their own to send home to represent them and have to send one of our boys back here to do the job." I hope and trust that the Government will consider the three-year term of appointment as satisfactory, and I hope further that the appointee will be Australian-born.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—in reply) [5.50]: I thank members for the contributions they have made to the debate on the second reading of this measure. The main point put forward was that which has just been dealt with by the member for Fremantle; namely, the term of the appointment of our Agent General. Members of Cabinet gave long and careful consideration to that question and were finally convinced that the present term of three years is suitable in the circumstances. The three-year appointment with the probability of a further three years constitutes an additional incentive for any person appointed to the office to give of his very best during the initial term, as he knows that if he gives of his very best during that term, he is practically certain of reappointment for a further three years.

That has been the result during past years and, as some members have already pointed out, if the term were to be extended from three to five years, with no probable prospect of reappointment for a further term of five years, there would not be the same incentive for the incumbent of the office work as hard during his period of appointment as there is at present. I think that, on balance, the three-year term with the almost certainty of reappointment in the event of the person appointed proving himself worthy, is preferable to any move that might be made to extend the term of appointment from three to five years.

I was interested to hear the member for Murray comparing the duties of the Agent General in London today with those that our Agents General had to carry out some

years ago. There was certainly a great deal of merit in what he said, and I think he proved—in making his comparison—that the duties to be carried out today are not as extensive and probably not as onerous as were those of the past. Nevertheless, the duties of this office today are tremendously important and the Agent General for this State in London is in a position to achieve very beneficial results for Western Australia.

Any Agent General has, I think, to face up to many difficulties in connection with the migration of British people to this or any other State of the Commonwealth. I am sure the member for Murray will agree, from personal inquiries made in Britain when we were there three or four years ago, that there was a great disinclination on the part of the authorities there to do anything but discourage the migration from Britain of the types of men we were most anxious to obtain for this State and which those in authority in the other States of Australia were also anxious to obtain.

**The Minister for Transport:** Is that how we came to get the member for Dale?

**The PREMIER:** The argument put forward by the authorities in Britain was that Britain depended greatly for her activity and maintenance as an important nation on her export trade which, in turn, depended very largely on the manufacturing industries of Britain. Britain was therefore of necessity anxious to hang on to as many of her skilled men as possible because they were valuable units in the total economy of the country. I therefore suggest that any person who goes to London as Agent General for this State will not find it easy to obtain skilled men to migrate to Western Australia, because they are the men who are in great demand there and the authorities are not anxious for them to leave Britain because the loss to her in that way could be substantial.

**Hon. Sir Ross McLarty:** The authorities in Britain are also keen to hold on to their young people.

**The PREMIER:** That is so, as the hon. member points out. An Agent General in London could achieve great results for Western Australia, but I do not think he could achieve them rapidly. The people there who are in a position to do big things for any part of Australia are not people who make decisions quickly. I think that is the main reason why the American Chase Syndicate was able to take up its vast area of agricultural land in the Esperance district.

Some two years before the representatives of the Chase Syndicate investigated this Esperance land, representatives of a British company investigated it and inspected it and worked out in detail the arguments for taking up the land and

those against it. Finally that British company decided against proceeding with the idea, the main reasons being, I believe, that there were some possible doubts about the prospects of ultimate success, and the ingrowing anxiety to be as cautious as possible in regard to the investment of their funds. Whether we agree with the policy they adopted and the course they followed, or not, we have to admit, beyond argument, I think, that British people make up their minds slowly.

Hon. A. F. Watts: Do you think they have been a bit frightened since the failure of the ground nuts project in Gambia?

The PREMIER: They want to be sure when they finally make up their minds that they are on an absolute winner. I therefore repeat that I believe any person who goes to represent this State as Agent General in London could not hope to achieve great results in the first few months, although there are great results to be achieved. As time goes on, I believe we will see the investment of much greater amounts of British capital in this State in both our primary and secondary industries.

The questions of salary and expense allowances and possible rental allowances and all the rest of it are naturally subjects that allow a great deal of discussion, but I would point out to members that the proposal contained in this Bill, plus the proposal considerably to increase the entertainments allowance, add up to quite a substantial overall increase in the total amount which the new Agent General will receive, as against what has been received by Agents General for this State during the past few years.

Mr. Bovell: Is the Agent General subject to British income tax?

The PREMIER: The present total is £3,400 per annum and the probable total in the near future will be £5,000 per annum, making an increase of £1,600 sterling for the new appointee as against what was being received by Agents General for several years past. I think that is a very good step forward and quite an important contribution.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE.**

#### *Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [6.4] in moving the second reading said: This is the third time that such a Bill has seen the light of day in the Legislative Assembly. The first occasion was in 1955 and the second in 1956. On the first occasion, the Bill, if I remember correctly, was narrowly defeated after a rather chequered career during which discussion was limited and hurried. Last year, a Bill succeeded in passing through this House by a unanimous vote. It was not approved in the Legislative Council mainly because it arrived there rather late in the session. Members of that Chamber decided that they had not had time fairly to consider the provisions in the Bill and consequently they rejected it.

On this occasion the measure is being introduced early in the session to give members of this House, if they need it, ample time to consider and debate the provisions contained in it and, more importantly, to allow of the fullest discussion required in the other Chamber. The contents of the Bill have been fully explained in this House on the two previous occasions and that fact makes it unnecessary for me today to go into any considerable detail in connection with the Bill.

The measure proposes to supersede the present one-man public service commissioner control of the Public Service by setting up a public service board of three members. Two of those members would be appointed by the Governor-in-Council and the third member, who would represent the Civil Service Association, would be elected by the taking of a secret ballot in which all members of the Civil Service would be entitled to participate.

It will be seen, therefore, that this Bill seeks to operate the principle of employee-representation on the board of management—if we care to call the proposed public service board a board of management. The main justification for the proposed change is to be found, I think, in the prospect that a board of three members, as against a single public service commissioner, would enable the operations of the Public Service to be much more closely scrutinised, with the probability—if not the certainty—that a great deal more efficiency would be introduced into the operations of the Public Service.

I am sure that all members of this House who are Ministers today or who have been Ministers in the past or, even members in the House who have never been Ministers, realise that the Public Service is, to some extent, unwieldy in its set-up and in its operation. There are many departments of government, as we all know. They have grown considerably in recent years because of the growth of population and probably more because of the growth in the number and variety of the activities which Governments are either called upon to do or choose to perform in these times.

Clearly, it is not possible for individual Ministers to give to the growth of the Public Service the attention which would be required; to know for certain whether this continual growth in Government departments is thoroughly justified and, just as clearly, it would be impossible for one public service commissioner to do the job thoroughly and effectively. Therefore, it is considered by members of the Government that a public service board of three members would be able to do much more along those lines than would a single public service commissioner.

I think I speak for all Ministers when I say that easily the main reason which prompted Cabinet to give approval to the introduction of this Bill was the probability that much greater efficiency would be achieved in Government departments than it is possible to secure today. I think there is probably more room—if not some considerable room—in the Public Service for amalgamation of departments; for more co-operation between some departments, if not between all departments—and for the achievement of better results from the number of persons employed than has been achieved in the past.

It is not always the fault of the employee if better results are not achieved. It is often due to lack of co-operation or to a lack of scientific association of one department with another. I think even in private industry a great deal depends, in regard to efficiency and output, upon management and the time and effort which can be put into the task of organising, to the best possible advantage, the efforts of everybody employed in the organisation. What applies to private enterprise would, I think, apply, by and large—certainly not totally—to the departments of government.

So the Government introduces this Bill because it believes that there is a reasonably good prospect of achieving a better organisation of Government departments and through that organisation, or reorganisation, of achieving much greater efficiency. There is, of course, a good deal of loose criticism of Government departments and of the work they do and of the work which they fail to do. However, one has to be on the inside as well as on the outside to appreciate both sides of that story. My own impression of the officers with whom I have direct association—the number is naturally limited—is that they do an excellent job in all circumstances. But my departments are small in the numbers they employ, and we all know that a small organisation appears, at any rate, to produce better results; to give better service.

That might be true, in fact, in all directions because with a small organisation the person in charge has the opportunity to keep each employee under his direct supervision and there is not the room for inefficiency or for lack of co-operation which might develop in a larger set-up or organisation.

There are practically no alterations in this Bill compared with the one which was introduced into this House and approved by this House last year. The only two slight alterations that I can think of are one dealing with the question of leave and the other dealing with the question of a quorum. The member for Stirling last year raised the point of two deputies constituting a quorum, pointing out the dangers which could arise under that set-up. This Bill has been altered to make it necessary for at least one member to be present to constitute a quorum. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. D. Brand, debate adjourned.

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

### **BILL—AGRICULTURE PROTECTION BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

**MR. BOVELL (Vasse)** [7.31]: The numerical strength of the Agriculture Protection Board is now nine, and this Bill, as introduced by the Minister for Agriculture, is to increase the strength to ten members. It might be of interest to the House to know of the personnel of the existing board. It is as follows:—

The Chief Inspector pursuant to the provisions of the Vermin Act, who shall be chairman.

The officer in charge of the administration of noxious weeds control pursuant to the provisions of the Noxious Weeds Act, who shall be deputy chairman and who shall act as chairman in the place of the chairman during his absence.

The Government Entomologist, who shall act as chairman during the absence of both the chairman and the deputy chairman.

The Chief Warden of Fauna.

An officer of the State Treasury.

Each by virtue of his office is a member of the protection board, and—this is the portion of the Act which will be amended—the remaining four members, who shall be appointed by the Governor to hold office during the Governor's pleasure, shall be nominated by the Minister, and one shall represent the pastoral industry; one shall represent the agricultural industry; and two shall represent local authorities, and the Minister shall nominate such members from such names as are submitted to him by the executives of the organisations concerned.

The Minister has said that at the moment there is no representative of the areas from Serpentine southward to Northcliffe and



across to Augusta, and these areas of the State are completely without representation on the board. The amendment will provide that—

one shall represent agronomic industries carried on in areas of intensive culture, including the fruit-growing industry and the dairying industry.

I am in accord with the provisions of the Bill now under discussion, but would point out that while these areas in question have no direct representation on the protection board at the present time, it could be that the representatives of local government, at a future time, could come from the areas which have special mention in the Bill. I think it is only a coincidence really that all the members of the board now are north of the area referred to in the Bill, and perhaps it might be advisable for the Minister to give consideration to zoning, so that every area will have a direct representative.

Furthermore, in Acts of this nature, it is usual to name certain organisations. The Pastoralists' Association might desire to submit a panel of names to the Minister from which the Minister would choose their representative and, in regard to the agricultural districts, it might be advisable if the Minister had a panel of names submitted to him by the Farmers' Union in order to select the representative of the agricultural districts.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is what we do now.

Mr. BOVELL: It does not say specifically in the Act that the Minister shall do that. It just says that there shall be two representatives of local authorities. Presumably a panel of names would be submitted by the Road Board Association for various parts of the State, but the Act is not specific in this matter. I do not intend to move any amendments on these lines, but I would suggest that the Minister give consideration to these questions and perhaps, at a later date, further amend the Act so that specific organisations are represented and their representative chosen from a panel of names which had been submitted to the Minister. I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CORNELL (Mt. Marshall) [7.37]: I desire to say a few words in support of this Bill along the lines of the member for Vasse. The Bill in its present form seeks to redress an imbalance on the Agriculture Protection Board by including a representative from areas mainly in the South-West, which has no specific representation at present. However, as the member for Vasse has stated, by virtue of the fact that members are nominated by various pastoral and agricultural organisations, it could be that the imbalance which the Minister now endeavours to correct, may face in the other direction, and we may find that the South West has all the nominee representatives, as

well as a specific representative and the east and north-eastern wheatbelt not so covered.

Therefore, I urge the Minister to look, in due course, at the proposal propounded by the member for Vasse in an endeavour to zone the State so that each area is represented on the Agriculture Protection Board.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Harvey) [7.38]: I desire to support the Bill. I also endorse what has been said by the member for Vasse and the member for Mt. Marshall when they point out the possibility of the present imbalance going the other way on account of the present method of appointment of personnel to the board.

We, in the South-West, particularly the irrigation areas, have long felt the need of some representative on the Agriculture Protection Board because of the particular difficulties and problems which arise in that area—problems which are so different from those in many other areas.

Therefore, in supporting this Bill I would point out to the Minister that there is a very sound argument for the personnel on the board to be appointed from specific areas—areas with which they are familiar. This would bring a good balance of opinion to the board, as well as an overall coverage of the many problems associated with the various areas of the State.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. E. K. Hoar—Warren—in reply) [7.40]: In reply, I would like to say, regarding the points raised by the three members who have discussed the Bill, that what they advocate is actual every day practice now. Although the Act does not specifically lay down that certain zones should be represented, that is what actually occurs and, by having the suggested amendment included in the Act, it will definitely give a coverage over the whole of the agricultural areas.

If we forget the respective board representation and bear in mind that we must have a nominee from the pastoral areas, we must, if this Bill is successful, have two nominees from the agricultural areas, one of whom shall come from the South-West and the second from some other part of the agricultural areas, and by that method the whole State will be represented.

Mr. Cornell: You cannot do that if a nominee is not submitted from that area.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do the same as Ministers who have preceded me. We call for a list of names from the organisation concerned and, in future, if this Bill becomes law, there will be one representative from the South-West representing agriculture and one from some other agricultural area, as well as one from the pastoral areas. I promise

to give the matter raised some further thought and if it is found that it would perhaps tie up more definitely if we had a zoning system incorporated in the Act, we can proceed along those lines at a later date.

Mr. Bovell: I would like a panel of names incorporated in the Act; such as a panel of names from the Pastoralists' Association or the Farmers' Union.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Like many other Acts, this gives the Minister the right to appoint, and we go to the people who are interested.

Mr. Bovell: I think it might be advisable.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think it would be dangerous in an Act of Parliament to indicate to the Minister how to do it.

Mr. Bovell: Such a provision is in a number of other Acts.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have never seen one myself. The purpose behind this discussion is a system of zoning representation, and I will give that matter further consideration.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—FREMANTLE PRISON SITE ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [7.45]: When I first saw that notice was given to introduce this Bill, I thought the measure might have something to do with the allotting of a new site for the Fremantle gaol, but when the Minister introduced it, of course, I found its purpose was merely to tidy up certain factors concerning the area of the original gaol site.

It appears that over one hundred years ago a special ordinance was passed vesting in the Crown, certain land in Fremantle for the purpose of a convict site. Subsequently, in 1902, an Act—a very short Act—was placed on the statute book and it contained a First and a Second Schedule. The import of it was to repeal the special ordinance to which I have referred, and then to apportion the 39 acres approximately, for the purposes of a prison.

Members will be interested to note that the boundaries of this area extend along Hampton-rd. to Alma-st. and then west to South Terrace and thence to Holdsworth-st., thus enclosing a large area of, roughly, 39 acres. In the course of time,

since 1902, this area has undergone a great number of changes; so much so that we find a great part of it is taken up by the Fremantle oval, the South Terrace school, the Fremantle hospital, the Fremantle markets, and that portion of it that was once occupied by the Base Flats. So we see that the area that was given in 1902 as a gaol site has no, or very little, relationship to the gaol site today.

Apparently since the Base Flats have been demolished, and following upon requests to the Government for the apportionment of certain parts of that site to various people, it has been found difficult, if not impossible, to give the sites with any clear title to the land involved. Consequently, the need was created for this, what I term facilitating Bill, which will facilitate the working of the Lands Department in apportioning the land which is still part of the original gaol area.

It appears that the land in question was vested in the Crown but did not come within the purview of the Land Act so that transfers of land, or changes of title to the land, were not possible while the Government was unable to give a clear title to the land involved. The Bill clears the way to overcome these troubles, and I see nothing in the measure that is not good.

I derived a fair amount of enjoyment from delving into the past and looking into some of the historical items involved. I find that the First Schedule to the 1902 Act states when dealing with the various angles to the boundaries I outlined earlier, that an iron boundary mark shall be fixed at every angle or corner of the land herein described. I just wonder how long ago it was that these iron boundary marks were taken out. I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [7.54]: The reason for the introduction of this Bill is the fact that at present there is no provision for setting aside a judgment obtained in any court presided over by justices when the judgment is given in default. The Bill, in one of its amendments, of which there are three, seeks to correct that position. One question we should ask ourselves here is: Is this desirable?

The Minister for Justice: The Supreme Court has that power now.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I agree with that. In the case submitted by the Minister, it would be justifiable because of inadvertence or some other cause; and it is quite possible to conceive of other cases where it could also be justified. But there is another aspect to it, namely, that any person could seek to delay the action of the court simply by not presenting himself—whether he be the complainant or the defendant—at the court. The result would be that he would have the right to appeal within 28 days. So he would dodge the result of the judgment for that period and the case would have to be tried again. It seems to me that the length of time—28 days—is quite unreasonable in the circumstances and could be shortened considerably.

Mr. Lawrence: What circumstances?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: After all, it means that one of these people—either the complainant or the defendant—after receiving due notice of the action, has not appeared. It is difficult to imagine that there could be many excuses for that. Then there is no financial penalty. When the person who has not appeared seeks to have the case heard again, he simply pays the fees prescribed on a complaint.

So he has the advantage of a 28 days' delay and no financial penalty. It seems to me that this right could be used just to delay the action of the court. I feel that the Bill is quite justified with one or two amendments—namely the reducing of the number of days, and also an amendment dealing with Clause 4 of the Bill. These matters I propose to deal with in the Committee stage. I feel that what I shall suggest will enable the Bill to carry out what is desired by the Minister without its having the faults I have mentioned.

The second amendment, dealt with in Clause 4, is quite a simple one. It means that any fine inflicted can be paid to the person who has been assaulted, to reimburse him for any damages he has sustained. The amendment makes clear that this can be done without difficulty. There is no trouble over this amendment.

The third amendment relates to an appeal which can now be made to one justice. It has been found that one justice when approached privately, perhaps, by a lawyer, may be influenced to some extent to allow only the minimum security prescribed by the Act, namely, £25, when the particular case may warrant a much higher amount. The amendment in the Bill will take this matter out of the hands of one justice and place it in those of a court of petty sessions. There is no objection to this part of the Bill. I support the second reading, but I shall suggest one or two amendments when the Bill is in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Moir in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—New subheading and Section 136A added:

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I move an amendment—

That the word "twenty-eight" in line 24, page 2, be struck out with a view to inserting the word "fourteen."

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I wish members would place any amendments they have on the notice paper so that the matters can be investigated. I think it would be an advantage to allow a person 28 days. The legal people have drafted this Bill. It was suggested by the Crown Law Department, and a good deal of consideration has been given to it. I do not think the amendment should be accepted. However, if the Leader of the Country Party, who is a legal man, thinks that 14 days is sufficient time, perhaps we could agree to it.

Hon. A. F. Watts: I think it is 14 days too long, really; but I am prepared to meet you halfway.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: As the Leader of the Country Party, who is the only legal member, thinks that 14 days is sufficient and that it will not be detrimental to the clause, I have no objection to it.

Amendment (to strike out word) put and passed.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I move an amendment—

That the word "fourteen" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Mr. Chairman, from the remarks of the Leader of the Country Party—that he would meet the Minister halfway—I took it to mean that 21 days would be allowed, because that is halfway between 14 and 28. Would I be in order if I moved for the insertion of the word "twenty-one"?

The CHAIRMAN: We already have an amendment before the Chair. If the hon. member wants to move any further amendment, he will have to wait until the one now before the Chair is decided.

Amendment (to insert word) put and negatived.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I move an amendment—

That the word "twenty-one" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment (to insert word) put and passed.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I move an amendment—

That the word "may" in line 16, page 3, be struck out and the word "shall" inserted in lieu.

This amendment has been moved to cover the person who, through circumstances beyond his control, has not attended the court and it could be applied to anyone who sought to delay the court. If this amendment is agreed to, I propose to move that after the word "decision" in line 18, page 3, the following words be inserted:—

Unless the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the court that the default in appearance was occasioned by inadvertence or by circumstances outside the control of the applicant.

This will cover what the Minister had in mind and if both amendments are agreed to, the court of petty sessions shall refuse the application unless such circumstances as I have outlined have been proved.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member state what he proposes to amend?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: My amendment at the moment is to strike out the word "may" in line 16 and insert in lieu the word "shall." I am giving members the reason for doing this and also telling them what I propose to do if the amendment is agreed to. If both amendments are agreed to, the court will not be used as a means of delaying justice.

Mr. Lawrence: It will make it obligatory.

Mr. JOHNSON: It is my intention to oppose the amendment on two grounds. Firstly, the proposal introduces an aspect of the onus of proof which, I think, is less than completely desirable. If we agree to such an amendment, we will also show less than the usual degree of belief in the value of those in charge of our courts of petty sessions. If they are capable of being in charge of courts, they should not need to be instructed as to suitable grounds for appeal and the necessary bona fides of an appeal and whether or not the course of justice was being delayed. I think the Bill is quite satisfactory, and if it should be proved in practice to be otherwise, it can be amended later on.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I agree with the member for Leederville; I cannot see any reason for the amendment. If the amendment is agreed to, it will take away from the courts the privilege which they now enjoy and we might as well take away any discretionary powers now vested in our magistrates. I strongly oppose the amendment.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I do not think either the Minister or the member for Leederville has seen the objective of the member for Narrogin. That objective is not to restrict the court but to restrict the number of cases that can be brought before it when the circumstances do not justify their

being brought before the court. What he says is that the court shall refuse an application unless the applicant can show that his failure to appear in the first instance was due to inadvertence or circumstances beyond his control. If those words are included, only the man who can establish that fact will worry the court with an application. If the whole amendment is not agreed to, anybody who failed to appear, even if he failed to appear deliberately, could within 21 days, ask the court to give him a fresh hearing and thereby, in my view anyway, succeed in wasting the time of the court and the money of the country. The member for Narrogin seeks to deter such people.

I do not know what is going to happen to the courts of petty session in some instances if the appeal goes through in its present form because of the great number of cases dealt with in petty sessions, particularly under the Traffic Act and similar legislation where defendants do not appear because they realise there is not much hope of getting out of the charge by arguing the point and thus adding to their expenses. The Bill will give the opportunity to hold up proceedings against them. It is not less than 21 days and such further time as the court may take before it can deal with such applications. It will deter those people from going there at all. The proposed amendment says that a magistrate should not make an order for rehearing unless one can prove that there were circumstances outside one's control which prevented one from appearing. The hon. member's amendment does not throw discredit on the court; in fact, the contrary is the case.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If a person deliberately fails to appear, I cannot see why the Minister should feel such concern for him. Under the Bill a person can delay the course of justice for 21 days without any penalty whatever, after which the case must again come before the court. Under my amendment, if a person has a just case it can be heard again despite the fact that he failed to appear on a previous occasion.

The Minister for Justice: Who will decide whether it is a just case?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The court. Why should a person deliberately failing to appear seek the protection of the court?

The Minister for Justice: Who will decide whether it is deliberate?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The court. The court will decide whether it should refuse an application. It will not be refused by the clerk of courts. My amendment will prevent people from deliberately flouting the law.

Mr. JOHNSON: Having listened to the Leader of the Country Party and the member for Narrogin, I fear they are trying to stultify the effect of the amending

Bill. As I see it, the Bill seeks to give persons who are dealt with in the court by a magistrate the right of appeal to a higher court.

Hon. A. F. Watts: It is to the same court, otherwise I would not be arguing.

Mr. JOHNSON: We all know that a great number of traffic summonses are dealt with in the court, and if the stories we hear are to be believed, very often people are dissatisfied with the fine which they thought was going to be, say, 10s. and eventually turned out to be £20.

Mr. Roberts: The fines are getting so high that it is to one's advantage to attend the court.

Mr. JOHNSON: When the person again appears before the court, he must still pay his fees and run the risk of not having the case found in his favour. It is possible he may then get his fine increased. The proposed amendment, I think, endeavours to exclude from the Bill those for whom it is specifically designed.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The provisions contained in the Bill have been tried in Victoria and found to be successful. I oppose the amendment because I do not think it will help the court at all. The whole matter should be left to the discretion of the court. If a solicitor happens to overlook a case and nobody turns up, the defendant should have some redress.

Hon. A. F. Watts: You will get it under the amendment proposed by the member for Narrogin.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I would like to stick to the Bill and, in future, I would ask members to place their amendments on the notice paper, particularly when they are of a technical nature, and they can then be examined by the department.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The situation as mentioned by the Minister is covered by my amendment, but that set out by the member for Leederville is not. I fail to see why we should protect people who wait and see the nature of the fine, and then decide whether or not they should appear.

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

Ayes	.....	15
Noes	.....	21
Majority against	.....	6

Ayes.

Mr. Ackland	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Owen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Court	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. Manning
Mr. W. Manning	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Evans	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Nuisen
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Norton
Mr. Johnson	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Thorn	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Grayden	Mr. May
Mr. Perkins	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Mann	Mr. Potter
Mr. Oldfield	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Sewell

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

### BILL—LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

#### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling) [8.33]. I propose to agree to the second reading of this measure, but in doing that, I would point out to the Minister and members of this House that I do not agree to the whole Bill. There is no point in my covering the first five clauses because there is nothing objectionable in them, and the reasons for them have already been quite effectively disclosed by the Minister.

When it comes to the next clause, and the consequential amendments to the Local Courts Act which follow in the clause after that, I feel that the House and the Committee should give them very considerable consideration before they are passed, as the clause to which I take objection provides as follows:—

(6) The Minister or the magistrate may by delegation in writing signed by the Minister, or as the case may be, the magistrate, delegate to the clerk authority to exercise generally, or in any particular case, or in any case of a class, the jurisdiction conferred upon the magistrate by the preceding subsections of this section; and the clerk who is the delegate

(a) may, subject to the provisions of Subsection (7) of this section, exercise that jurisdiction as if references in those subsections to the magistrate were references to the clerk; and

(b) may exercise any power conferred by this Act or the rules of court on the magistrate, as incidental or ancillary to the exercise of the jurisdiction referred to in

paragraph (a) of this subsection, including any power of fining, or compelling the attendance of, any person who neglects or refuses to appear to be examined; or who, having appeared, refuses without lawful justification to answer to the best of his knowledge any question put to him in examination, or to produce anything he is required to produce for the purposes of examination.

(7) The effectiveness of an order made, or decision given, or direction issued, in exercise of jurisdiction mentioned in paragraph (a) of Subsection (6) of this section by a clerk acting under power of delegation is, and shall be expressed to be, suspended until the order, decision, or direction, is reviewed by the magistrate, who shall review it as soon as is practicable after it has been made, given, or issued, but this subsection does not apply in respect of the exercise by the clerk of any power mentioned in paragraph (b) of Subsection (6) of this section.

(8) The magistrate on reviewing under Subsection (7) of this section, an order, or a decision or a direction,

(a) may confirm it, and direct it to take effect from a day to be appointed by the magistrate;

(b) may vary it and direct it to take effect as so varied from a day to be so appointed; or

(c) may set it aside;

and the decision of the magistrate has, and shall be given, effect according to its tenor.

There are a good many facets to this diamond of my objection to this particular clause. On the one hand, if it is desirable to delegate the powers to clerks of court in regard to the hearing of judgment summonses, then, in my view, the procedure proposed to be followed is very cumbersome. Let me say at the outset that I do not think in the circumstances I propose to relate shortly, that it is fair and proper to delegate this right or authority to clerks of court; but if that is done as the clause starts off by proposing, then surely it is not necessary in every case to bring the magistrate back into it for the purpose of reviewing the decision of the clerk before that decision in any way takes effect.

The Minister for Justice: That is for protection.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: The Minister says it is a protection. If he will listen to me, he will discover that I consider the protection should start by the magistrate doing this job.

The Minister for Justice: This Bill will facilitate the work of the magistrate.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: In my humble opinion, it will not facilitate the work of the magistrate, and if it does in rare cases, it will not facilitate the cause of justice. I am satisfied of that, because as I have said, first of all, it is proposed to delegate the authority to clerks of court. I admit there are some clerks of court, if they have the time, who are qualified to deal with these matters. I refer more particularly to the clerks of court in some of the larger centres where local hearings are held from time to time.

Mr. Bovell: At present they are greatly overworked.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I am coming to that aspect of it. I agree with the hon. member. I agree if the clerks of court have the time, there are some of them who are qualified to deal with these matters. But there are certainly some others who, because of short experience, or in some cases lack of sufficient experience, are not qualified to deal with them.

There are, I believe, in some of the smaller local courts—it is just as necessary that these things are done in the smaller districts as in the larger ones—police officers acting as clerks of court in addition to the other duties which fall on them as officers of the Police Department, and who possess little or no experience of the activities of a local court, which has to be distinguished from a court of petty sessions, because it does not deal with offences as a local court does. The local court deals with claims for money, damages and so forth, which is a very different branch of the law.

There is no doubt in my mind that some clerks of court would not be efficient in performing this job. Of course, the Minister will say that this is subject to delegation and subject to the right of the magistrate to review. I know it is, if the Bill is passed, but I must persist in telling the Minister that we have carried on for a great number of years without such a provision.

Slowly but surely the work of the local courts is increasing. In order to relieve the magistrates to some extent, though not to the extent that at first sight appears possible because of this review paraphernalia, the Minister proposes that clerks of court should do some of the work for the magistrates. The remedy for this increase in cases and particularly in the hearing of summonses to which this clause refers, is to appoint more magistrates—the trained men whose duty is to be on the bench of this State to deal with such matters.

There is at the present time one resident magistrate in Albany whose circuit extends from somewhere north of Pingelly, and in some cases east and west, yet the municipality of Narrogin has grown to such a tremendous extent in the last few years

that it justifies, in the opinion of most people, the appointment of a resident magistrate to deal with cases in that centre and some of those in its more immediate vicinity. Yet to deal with Narrogin and the other substantial settlements further south, the magistrate has to come from Albany to deal with them. Because the work is getting too much for him, it is proposed to delegate some of his authority to the clerks of court.

Let us think of the position of the clerks of court at those centres. For those gentlemen, hard worked and, in my opinion, overworked, as I had a considerable amount to do with them in past years, though not in the last few years, the position has grown worse, not better. Such an officer is clerk of the local court, clerk of the children's court, clerk of the Licensing Court when it sits, receiver of revenue in connection with stamp duty on documents, collector of various Government moneys, collector of accounts, representative of the Department of Agriculture for orchard licences, electoral registrar for the Legislative Assembly, and in bigger places for the Legislative Council, returning officer, agent for the State Government Insurance Office, agent for the Social Services Department, registrar of births, deaths and marriages; in addition at times he has to perform marriage ceremonies and a few other things thrown in.

He is like the gentleman in Gilbert and Sullivan's Mikado who was "Lord High Everything Else," yet the Minister comes to this House and proposes to impose on these people the duties that are set out in the Bill. So far as I am concerned, we should not do that. It will not contribute to the cause of justice. It is not fair to these good people.

The remedy, as I said before, is to re-organise the magisterial circuit by the appointment of two or three more magistrates so that these problems can be better solved. Because of the increase in population of the State, the amount of this work will increase. So far as I am concerned, while I support the second reading of the Bill, I shall do my best to have the clause to which I have taken objection, and the next following, which I regard as consequential to it, thrown out of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Moir in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Section 130 amended:

Hon. A. F. WATTS: This is the first of the two clauses to which I said I proposed strongly to object. I think that my remarks on the second reading will be so fresh in the minds of members that I need

not repeat them. They stand in my mind as strongly as ever they did, and I am opposed to the clause.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The clerks of courts are doing a wonderful job, but most of them have staffs to assist them. This provision is not mandatory in any way. It is subject to the Minister or the magistrate asking the clerks at times to do this work instead of the court. Even then, the decision is still subject to the magistrate, so justice will be meted out impartially.

This provision is designed to help the magistrates. I will admit that we are very short of magistrates just now; and those that we have are required to travel long distances at times to deal with cases involving only perhaps 10s. or £1 or £2. The clerks of court are, generally speaking, quite competent to hear such cases. Their judgments could still be set aside by a magistrate if either the defendant or the complainant were not satisfied. This would not impose more work on the clerks.

Members: Oh!

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I admire our clerks for the work they are doing. This provision is to facilitate the work of the magistrates. It is very difficult to secure more magistrates. At one time quite a number were qualified by examination; but today there may be no more than one, and he is young. It is difficult to secure lawyers and solicitors for this work. They have a close preserve; and they are not going to take the paltry fee we pay our magistrates, especially when they have to start from the bottom. The Under Secretary for Law thought that this would facilitate the work of the magistrates; and, after a thorough investigation, the magistrates agreed. To a very great extent the hon. member's objection would be correct if we had plenty of magistrates; but we have not.

Mr. BOVELL: I support the Leader of the Country Party in his efforts to have this clause deleted. He has outlined the numerous duties of clerks of court in the country. I know that the one at Busselton is overworked in every direction.

The Minister for Justice: The clerk of court at Busselton would not be asked to do this work except in isolated instances. He is only 32 miles from Bunbury.

Mr. BOVELL: This clause will impose further duties on clerks of court and they would have to undertake those duties should the necessity arise; and no Minister or anybody else can say how often the necessity would be likely to arise.

Reference was made by the Leader of the Country Party to the fact that these clerks of court perform marriages. I did not know that until I was in the clerk's office at Busselton a few weeks ago and

he said, "If you like to stay and witness a wedding ceremony, it will be at 3.30." The parties were waiting outside.

I was there only yesterday morning and there were several women complaining about the condition of State Housing Commission homes; and he had to listen to their tales. He is on his own, and has no assistance. I marvel at his tolerance in carrying out the duties he has to perform. With my knowledge of the duties of clerks of court in country areas, I would be very averse to their having any further work forced on them.

Progress reported.

## **BILL—BEES ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

**MR. OWEN** (Darling Range) [8.54]: This Bill proposes three amendments to the Act. In themselves they are small and, perhaps, of a minor nature. Actually, however, they are of considerable importance to the bee industry.

**Mr. Nalder:** They have a sting in them!

**Mr. OWEN:** One certainly has a sting in it, which will have to be extracted. The Minister explained that the honey industry is worth quite a lot to the State, the production being valued at somewhere in the vicinity of £250,000 per annum. This provides for local consumption and export, and therefore brings us overseas credit. The bee industry is of considerable importance to the fruit-growing industry in that bees ensure the setting of many kinds of fruit, and I for one, am very interested to see the bee industry kept in a healthy state.

It was also said by the Minister that there are 638 beekeepers in the industry. I presume that he meant there are 638 registered apiarists; and that would make the average production per apiarist, worth something like £400. When one knows that some of the larger apiarists have a production running into many thousands of pounds, it stands to reason that there must be quite a number of beekeepers who have only a few hives which are of no commercial importance at all. But they are part of the industry and have to be looked after. By looking after these small apiarists and thereby eliminating disease from their apiaries, disease can be prevented from spreading throughout the industry. I mention that because it is important to realise that, in respect of the disease mentioned by the Minister, its occurrence in one hive can be a great danger to the whole industry.

The Minister for Agriculture: There are 464 beekeepers who have fewer than 25 hives each.

**Mr. OWEN:** Yes; and possibly some have only one or two.

The Minister for Agriculture: A half-dozen or so.

**Mr. OWEN:** Like many other forms of primary production, beekeeping has its difficulties. There are seasons of very poor honey flow, when the beekeepers are hard put to make a living. Again, bees—like other forms of livestock—are very subject to disease. The Minister mentioned one disease which is of great concern to all beekeepers—namely, American foul brood. This is caused by a germ or bacillus larvae.

**Mr. Nalder:** Was it originally imported?

**Mr. OWEN:** Yes. It is not native to this country. No doubt it was imported in infected honey, because that is the chief way in which it is transferred from one hive to another and from one district to another. It can also be carried in articles such as beehive frames or hives, or in equipment used for the extraction of honey. So it is of great importance that this disease should be kept at a minimum; and the first amendment in the Bill aims to do just that.

I mentioned previously that this bacteria is transferred from one place to another with honey—not necessarily, of course, by honey in packages or tins. It can also be transferred from one hive to another by the bees themselves. Besides taking nectar from flowers to produce their honey, bees also, where possible take up any stray honey they can find around the place; and during extracting time, when bee keepers are taking the caps off sealed honey, many robber bees come and lap up honey and take it to their own hives.

**Mr. Nalder:** Is it a fungus?

**Mr. OWEN:** It is a bacteria. Also when hives become unhealthy, and the swarm is depleted, and particularly during times of poor honey flow, bees from other hives often come in and rob the poor hives—the ones that cannot protect themselves—and take honey from them to their own hives to store or to feed their brood. So the avenues for the spread of this disease are very wide indeed.

At present the Act provides for a proclamation to be made to declare any part of the State or district an infected area and to prohibit the movement of beehives to other parts of the State. The appropriate provision in the Act reads—

The Governor may by proclamation—

(a) declare any portion of the State in which any disease affecting bees exists and defined in such proclamation to be an infected area;



(b) prohibit, either absolutely or subject to regulation, the sending or bringing of bees, honey, wax, hives, beekeepers' appliances, or any other articles used in connection therewith into any infected area, or the sending or removal from an infected area into any other part of the State of bees, honey, wax, hives, beekeepers' appliances, or any other articles used in connection therewith, in the opinion of the Governor likely to spread any disease.

That in itself gives a large measure of protection, but before any proclamation can be made, there is a lapse of time during which a beekeeper—particularly if he is an unscrupulous type of person—can transfer hives, parts of hives, etc., from an infected area to an uninfected area. The amendment is aimed at prohibiting such action during the lapse of time before the proclamation can be issued.

I do not think any one who understands the circumstances can object to the amendment to provide for what is referred to in the Bill as the interim prohibition order. That interim order would give the inspector or officer power to make the necessary prohibitions. When introducing the Bill the Minister said that the period would be 42 days. He said, "I therefore think that six weeks should be ample time to give the inspector an opportunity of getting the authority of the proclamation to prevent the removal of hives and other equipment." I agree that it is ample time and I think it is much too ample.

To illustrate the difficulties that would face beekeepers if the period of 42 days were allowed, I would point out that if the outbreak of disease was slight or if the inspector was not correct in his diagnosis of the disease, he might serve the interim prohibition order on the apiarist who would, if it lasted 42 days, be faced with a serious problem, particularly at the end of a honey flow when the feed for bees was scarce. It seems desirable to restrict the period to two or three weeks. Admittedly, if it is intended to issue the proclamation declaring it an infected area, the proclamation takes over, but if the outbreak is not of a serious nature surely the beekeeper should not be tied up for 42 days by an interim order!

If the disease was present perhaps only in a minor degree, the beekeepers could not shift their hives away, but I stress the desirability of some elasticity to allow the inspector to approve of the movement of clean hives, not necessarily to another part of the State but to another quarantined area so that they could be observed, to make sure that they were not infected. Were that not done, in the event of the honey flow being poor, the bees in an infected hive might rapidly become depleted

in number, and bees from another hive, searching for honey to feed their own broods, might rob the infected hive and so spread the disease. In that way a minor outbreak of disease could become general throughout the apiary.

When members of the honey section of the Farmers Union asked for some control in the interim period, they had discussions with officers of the Agricultural Department and it was agreed that a period of 21 days should be sufficient. The beekeepers would have preferred 14 days but agreed to a compromise at a period of 21 days. Despite that, for some reason between then and the introduction of the Bill to this House, the period has been extended to 42 days, and I would like the Minister to explain the reason for that. In the absence of a satisfactory explanation I propose, when the Bill is in Committee, to move to have that provision amended.

I would point out to the Minister that it is desirable that there should be the most cordial relationship between the beekeepers and the department as the department has a limited staff and must rely on the beekeepers to report diseases and co-operate with the department to the greatest possible extent for the good of the industry. I would remind the Minister of the good relations which exist between the fruitgrowers and the department, as exemplified in the campaign to eradicate codling moth in the Bridgetown area.

Members of the Fruitgrowers' Association—particularly in the area affected by codling moth—are happy to work in with the departmental officers, and I think there has been 100 per cent. co-operation between them. Unless there is some urgent need for the period of 42 days to be retained, I ask the Minister to reduce it to 21 days, as was originally agreed on between the officers of the department and the honey section of the Farmers' Union.

The next amendment contained in the measure seeks to link the Bees Act up with the Bee Industry Compensation Act. These two statutes must go hand-in-hand, because where there is need to destroy beehives or bees, there is also need for the apiarist to be compensated in some way. The third amendment seeks to substitute the word "infected" for "affected," and the object of another is to give the inspector power to allow fumigation of hives, and so on, instead of having them totally destroyed. When hives are badly infected with the American foul brood, the frames and the honey are usually destroyed by burning and very often the box part of the hive is destroyed also, although I believe it can be successfully treated by charring the surface to kill the spores.

I understand there is now a fumigant on the market that will kill the spores, and that is all to the good as the boxes are

expensive, and if it is possible to rid them of the infection without destroying them, I believe we should agree to that being done. I support the second reading but would again ask the Minister to explain the reason for extending the time of the prohibition order from 21 to 42 days, and I reserve the right, when the Bill is in Committee, to move to have the shorter period substituted.

**MR. BOVELL (Vasse)** [9.13]: I support the provisions of this measure from a general point of view. The growing of honey is increasing in importance in the State's economy and everything possible should be done to encourage further development of the industry. Together with the member for Darling Range, I hope that close and cordial relations will continue to exist between the beekeepers and the Department of Agriculture. Honey is the purest food in the world and it has a very wide variety of uses. I believe the Minister owes something of his present good health to the use of honey.

The Minister for Lands: I do! That is a fact!

The Premier: Hear, hear!

**Mr. BOVELL:** I can say that honey has assisted to improve my health considerably. Honey never goes bad. No matter how long it is kept, it will still remain edible; quite fit for human consumption. This is proof in itself of the good quality of this food.

The Minister for Justice: It does not even go bad in a bad person.

**Mr. BOVELL:** I cannot vouch for that. However, it does not go bad in me. I want to support the member for Darling Range in his reference to having the period of 42 days reduced to at least half that figure, namely, 21 days. At the moment, the secretary of the honey section of the Farmers' Union is rather surprised that the Bill under discussion provides for 42 days because he and the members of his executive understood that the period was to be 21 days.

In my opinion 42 days is a dangerously long period, which may result in other hives in the near vicinity becoming infected. The member for Darling Range has covered the provisions of the Bill very effectively and I therefore do not wish to weary the House with any repetition. I support the provisions of the Bill in the main, but I trust the Minister will agree to reducing the term that I have referred to to 21 days at the most. It would be preferable if the period were to be 14 days, but if the Minister is convinced that it would not be advantageous to beekeepers if such a short period were provided, I would recommend that he postpone the Committee stage of the Bill and report progress.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE** (Hon. E. K. Hoar—Warren—in reply) [9.18]: I do not wish to say a great deal in reply except to thank members who have spoken for their contributions to the debate. I think there is some merit in the proposal advanced by the member for Darling Range, namely, that the period of 42 days be reduced, but I do not think it should be reduced to the extent which the member for Vasse suggests. Experience has shown that, in the past, too long a period elapses between the time when an inspector—who may be hundreds of miles away from Perth—discovers that there is disease in a hive, with the consequent danger of a whole area being infected and the time that he gets his report in, either orally or in writing, and, finally, in getting a proclamation signed by the Governor.

Friendly co-operation should exist between the Department of Agriculture and the producers—especially on the part of the beekeeper who is immobilised—to enable an infected area to be made free of any disease as soon as possible. Therefore, no matter what time is provided, so long as the beekeeper is enabled to continue with his occupation day by day, that is the main consideration. In any case, a beekeeper has no right to use an infected hive and if his hives were clean, it would not matter if the period provided were to be longer.

**Mr. Bovell:** When is the other Bill coming down?

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** That Bill is No. 30 on the notice paper, but unfortunately it is not yet printed. The hon. member will notice, however, that it is receiving every attention. If the member for Darling Range cares to move an amendment, when the Bill goes into Committee, that the period of 42 days be reduced to 28 days, I will offer no objection. I would not agree to a lesser period because I know the difficulty the officers of the department experience between the time when disease is discovered in a hive and the time any action can be taken.

**Mr. Nalder:** Have there been many instances of an outbreak of this disease?

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** Yes, that has been responsible for the amount paid out in compensation. Last year some £253 was paid out in compensation and this year it has reached the sum of £281. An outbreak of this disease is a very serious thing. A period of two or three weeks is not long enough to provide in the Bill and yet six weeks may be too long. However, the objective of the officer inspecting would be to free any hives that were notified or at least have them treated or destroyed at the earliest possible moment, according to circumstances. It would not be in the interests of the officer concerned, any more than it would be in the producer's interests to

delay that procedure for any time, and the only reason that the period of 42 days was provided in the Bill was to have plenty of time to cover any contingency. I think, however, that 28 days may be sufficient.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Moir in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 6 amended:

Mr. OWEN: I thank the Minister for his co-operation in agreeing to a reduction of this period. I was anxious to have it reduced to 21 days, but, in view of the Minister's co-operation, I move an amendment—

That the word "forty-two" in line 1, page 3, be struck out and the word "twenty-eight" inserted in lieu.

Mr. BOVELL: I wish to thank the Minister also for agreeing to the reduction of this period. It is not quite what we want, but, in the interests of the beekeepers, it will be better than having 42 days inserted in the Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. OWEN: I move an amendment—

That the word "forty-two" in line 11, page 3, be struck out and the word "twenty-eight" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## **BILL—DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT ACT REPEAL.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 25th July.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Harvey) [9.28]: The Act which this Bill seeks to repeal was first placed on the statute book in 1922 when dairying, as an industry, was vastly different from what it is today. I think the first approach to have this legislation enacted was made by the Royal Agricultural Society. At that time the State's average butterfat production per cow was only 110lb. and many dairy farmers were receiving an annual return per cow of not more than £10.

In an effort to improve this position, it was suggested that all bulls other than the registered pure-bred animal, should be inspected and, if of a satisfactory standard, registered by the Department of Agriculture. So legislation to bring this about was introduced and agreed to. The main purpose of this measure was to prevent the use of mongrel bulls and the main objective was to raise the butterfat

production per cow. Today the average butterfat production per cow is over 230lb. Therefore, this legislation has achieved something, even if it has not been a direct contributing factor.

Of course, there are many other contributing factors that have brought about this increased production, one of which has been the dairy cattle herd recording scheme. To the farmer who participates in it, this scheme indicates which are his good producing cows and those which are not. By a system of culling, he is able to dispose of the poor producers and so raise the standard of his herd and, in turn, raise the State's average production per cow.

Mr. Nalder: Is the herd testing voluntary?

Mr. I. W. MANNING: To participate in this scheme, a dairy farmer has to apply to the department to have his herd tested and if there is a vacancy and he can be accommodated, the herd recorder visits his property and tests each cow on it. Another important contribution which has lifted the quality of dairy cattle and raised the standard of production in this State is the work done by stud stock breeders. These people, and there have been many in this State, are breeding stud dairy cattle and, I suppose, the best-known names among those people would be W. Padbury, A. W. Padbury, R. H. Rose, Dunkley Bros., and many others. These men, by visiting the Eastern States and purchasing high-priced good quality cattle, are able to bring them back to this State and hand on their progeny to the dairy farmers. By that means they have made a great contribution towards raising the standard of dairy cattle in this State.

We have seen the production or the average production per cow of butterfat rise from 110 lb. in 1922 to over 230 lb. today, which, in the line of dairying, is quite an achievement. Of course, the dairying industry today is a vastly different one from what it was in earlier days when the emphasis was on butterfat production.

The dairying industry is now divided into two categories. One is the production of butterfat and the other the production of wholemilk. The problems associated with these two industries are very different indeed. The research, which has been carried out by the Agricultural Department and the contributions which have been made by the stud stock breeders have all been towards raising of the butterfat standard but, today, the emphasis, so far as the wholemilk producer is concerned, is on the solids-not-fat content.

Therefore, we find that while we have looked after one section of the industry, there are many difficulties associated with the other section. While I support this

Bill I pass on to the Minister the suggestion that while this industry has reached a stage where this legislation is no longer necessary, there are still many problems facing dairying as an industry and, in particular, the wholemilk industry.

The Minister for Agriculture: I agree with you.

Mr. I. W. MANNING. I believe this legislation no longer serves any useful purpose and can well be repealed. As the Minister pointed out during his second reading speech, the registration of grade bulls is no longer necessary. I support the Bill.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse) [9.37]: If we cast our minds back to 1922 when the dairying industry was in its infancy, we will remember that the late Sir James Mitchell was then embarking on the group settlement scheme to encourage and develop butter production in Western Australia. I understand that we were importing so much butter from the Eastern States that it was considered desirable to develop our own resources and firmly establish butterfat production in this State. As we know, Sir James Mitchell, as Premier of the day, selected certain areas in the South-West for the project. There were many hazards in regard to the scheme, but, despite the early problems, I think today everybody will admit that group settlement has proved one thing: We have now established an industry which produces most of the butter requirements of Western Australians.

The necessity for this Act, which has been in operation since 1922, seems to have disappeared. I have no doubt that the Minister for Works will recall the days of the early settlers when he was a school master in a group settlement in the South-West and was, of course, an aspirant for political honours in the area which I now have the honour to represent. He will probably know first-hand of the problems encountered by the pioneers of the butterfat producing industry back in those days.

Many of the people concerned had, it is true, no knowledge of dairying whatsoever. Many of them came from Great Britain; some had been engaged in the mining industry on the Goldfields; there were others who had an elementary knowledge of the industry. However, today, most people engaged in the industry understand quite a lot of the fundamentals necessary for successful dairy farming and, for that reason, I agree with the member for Harvey and the Minister that there seems to be no purpose in continuing the provisions of the Act.

However, vigilance must be exercised by the Department of Agriculture to see that the progress of our dairying industry is not prostituted in any way and a clear and careful eye must be kept on operations and

workings, both in the wholemilk and butterfat sections. In recent years, a cattle industry has developed in the South-West—beef cattle. I do not think the Bill applies to beef cattle, the raising of which has come into prominence in the South-West in recent years and is quite important in farming operations throughout the whole of the South-West Land Division.

I do not want to occupy any more time of the House but would like to conclude by saying that provided the department keeps a watchful eye on the progress of the industry and sees that no detrimental effects are caused to it by the repeal of this Act, I feel everything will be in order and, for that reason, I support the second reading. However, I wish to emphasise again the necessity of the department's being careful and doing its utmost to see that the standard of our dairy cattle is maintained and improved.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

**BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £21,000,000.**

Returned from the Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 9.41 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, 31st July, 1957.

### CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Albany regional hospital, departments and amenities .....	528
Bunbury regional hospital, comparison with Albany proposal .....	528
Police, Victoria Park traffic branch .....	528
Transport, cartage of produce in Northampton-Ajana-Yuna areas .....	528
Bills : Interpretation Act Amendment, 3r. ....	528
Western Australian Marine Act Amendment, 2r. ....	529
Local Government, 2r., Com. ....	529
Agent General Act Amendment, 1r. ....	544
Agriculture Protection Board Act Amendment, 1r. ....	544
Fremantle Prison Site Act Amendment, 1r. ....	544
Dairy Cattle Improvement Act Repeal, 1r. ....	544

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