

BILL—MINING ACT AMENDMENT.*Council's Message.*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 7.30 p.m. on Wednesday, the 15th November.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 15th November, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Pastoral leases, as to watering points and development	1912
Parliamentary tours, as to inspecting Norseman pyrites and Esperance light lands	1913
Butter, as to supplies to small shopkeepers	1913
Standing Orders suspension	1913
Bills : Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), Standing Orders suspension	1912
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment, 1r.	1913
Traffic Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1913
Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1913
Public Works Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1913
Medical Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1913
State Housing Act Amendment, Assembly's request for conference	1913
Bush Fires Act Amendment, report	1913
Health Act Amendment, Com. report	1913
Agriculture Protection Board, 2r., Com.	1926

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).*Standing Orders Suspension.*

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I move (without notice)—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to be passed through all its stages at the one sitting.

The PRESIDENT: Standing Order 422 reads as follows:—

In cases which in the opinion of the President are of urgent necessity, any Standing Order of the Council may be suspended on motion duly made and seconded, without notice, provided that such motion be agreed to by an absolute majority of the whole of the number of members.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	3
Majority for	16

Ayes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. G. Hislop	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. L. A. Logan	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

QUESTIONS.**PASTORAL LEASES.**

As to Watering Points and Development.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the Commonwealth Government agreed to share in the estimated cost of more than £500,000 to provide water points on Kimberley cattle stations?

(2) What is the nature of the Government subsidy to be paid on fencing, yards and building materials for these stations?

(3) Will the Government give consideration to subdividing these million-acre leases and allowing private capital to develop the areas?

(4) Would these leases, when improved and appropriately subdivided, be suitable for soldier or closer settlement?

(5) Are these stations bound to raise beef for which purpose the expense is claimed to be warranted?

(6) Is there no vacant area which this money would develop?

(7) Has the Government any scheme for making land available for better settlement in the Kimberleys?

(8) If so, what is the nature of such scheme?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. The subsidy granted by the State Government is limited to a maximum of £20,000 per annum.

(2) No agreement to subsidise fencing, yards or building materials has been made by the State Government.

(3) The terms of pastoral leases in the Kimberleys do not expire until 1984.

(4) Answered by (3) above.

(5) The position is governed by Section 103 of the Land Act.

(6) No.

(7) The State and Commonwealth Governments are testing out the possibility of irrigation on the Ord River.

(8) Answered by (7).

PARLIAMENTARY TOURS.

As to Inspecting Norseman Pyrites and Esperance Light Lands.

Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the valuable information obtained by members of Parliament in being able to confer with each other on the scene during a recent reso trip to the Albany district, and in view of the urgent need of developing the pyrites industry at Norseman for use in the manufacture of superphosphate for this State, will the Minister consider arranging a reso trip for members to visit Norseman in connection with the pyrites industry, and Esperance to inspect the possibilities of the development of the light lands in that area?

The MINISTER replied:

No good purpose would be served by a reso tour embracing Norseman and the Esperance area. Local members of Parliament and officers of the Department of Agriculture have considerable information on these matters. This information is readily available to anyone interested.

BUTTER.

As to Supplies to Small Shopkeepers.

Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is the Government aware that a certain wholesale firm is refusing to supply butter to small shopkeepers in less than a 56lb. box?

(2) As this policy, if adopted, means definite hardship, will the Government inquire if this is correct, and if so, take steps to prevent the small man being penalised?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. This is the first intimation.

(2) As there is more than one wholesaler it would seem inconceivable that this practice would be adopted by all wholesalers. There are at least half a dozen wholesalers of butter and the manufacturers themselves are wholesalers and supply retail stores, as far as is known, in any quantity.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

On motion by the Minister for Transport, resolved:

That Standing Order No. 62 (Limit of time for commencing new business) be suspended during the remainder of the current session.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY SUPER-ANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Traffic Act Amendment.
 - 2, Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment.
 - 3, Public Works Act Amendment.
 - 4, Medical Act Amendment.
- Passed.*

BILL—STATE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Request for Conference.

Message from the Assembly requesting a conference on the amendments insisted on by the Council and notifying that at such conference the Assembly would be represented by three managers, now considered.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to, that the managers for the Council be the Minister for Transport, Hon. E. H. Gray and H. K. Watson, and that the conference be held in the President's room at 2 p.m. on Thursday, the 16th November.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Section 40 amended:

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added:—

- (c) Inserting after subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (b) a proviso as follows:—"Provided that in the Metropolitan Province the annual rate shall be assessed on the annual value, and not on the unimproved value of the land."

I consider that the amount to be paid for health services should be on a uniform basis throughout the metropolitan area. It was said that I should seek to amend another Act, but I cannot do so because this is the only measure before us. What can be done is that the Committee can amend this legislation and then the local governing bodies, if they so desire, can alter their method of rating from the unimproved capital value to the annual value. For their ordinary rates they may do that with the consent of the Governor. If this amendment be carried, and if local governing bodies wish to do so, they can ask the Governor to allow them to collect their ordinary rates on this basis.

The Road Districts Act is designed for the outer areas. Municipalities are expected to govern the towns and cities. The effect of the amendment will be that the Nedlands, Peppermint Grove and Mosman Park Road Boards—they are the only three affected—will be required, for the purposes of the Health Act, to rate on the annual instead of on the unimproved value. I think members will agree that the areas I have mentioned are all comparable in their values with Subiaco, West Perth, Claremont and Cottesloe, yet there are different rates.

Assuming that a rate of 9d. in the £ is struck, a hotel in our area would pay on the unimproved value of £1,250. A residence would pay on £2,000 and a block of six flats on £440. Shops would pay very little because their unimproved capital value is so low. One individual I know pays on his residence something like £28 in rates, whereas only £1 3s. is paid on houses that he lets to his employees at about £1 a week. If we are going to add the cost of health services, it is only right that the rating in the districts I have mentioned should be the same as that in places like Claremont and Cottesloe.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would not your amendment mean that they have to assess their health rates in one way and their other rates in another?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Exactly! The health rate would be assessed on the basis of the annual value, whereas they assess their rates at present on the unimproved capital value. That will necessitate quite a lot of book-keeping but that could quite easily be overcome by their asking the Governor to let them have their other rates on the same basis as their health rates, namely, on the annual value, as is the case with regard to the City of Perth, Victoria Park, Guildford, Midland Junction, Claremont and Cottesloe. Is there any reason why they should not collect rates on the same basis as the municipalities in the metropolitan area? All citizens of the suburbs in the Metropolitan Province should be rated in like manner both in respect of health rates and of ordinary rates. I cannot propose any amendment to

the Road Districts Act or to the Municipal Corporations Act. However those measures are not before the Committee.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Parker has forgotten the boundaries of the Metropolitan Province. The bulk of the people he represents in this House would be exempted from this amendment which, if agreed to, would put the road boards to great expense as a valuer would have to be engaged, every house would have to be visited and the occupier interviewed. I do not think the hon. member could mention a single road board that would agree to the amendment. I know there are many reformers who advocate that even the City of Perth should alter its basis of valuation.

On the annual value basis, the man who takes a pride in his house has to pay the most rates, but on the unimproved value system the careless owner has to pay the same rates as he who looks after his property, and that is the system applying in all the most progressive suburbs. In Nedlands, one of our most beautiful suburbs, they got over their difficulties by zoning portions of their area that contained a lot of flats.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I wish to correct some mis-statements by Mr. Gray. There are road boards in Western Australia that have adopted the annual value for the township and the unimproved capital value for the rural parts of their districts.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is for shops.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I understand that for the township of Moora it is on the annual value, but the rural land is rated on the unimproved value. Section 39 of the Health Act shows that there can be either system under that legislation. Some of Mosman Park is in the West Province, but the road board there could adopt the other system if they found it difficult to handle the book-keeping. This amendment if agreed to will give relief to a lot of people.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Road boards in the South-West Province adopt both systems of valuation; the annual value in the towns and the unimproved value in the rural areas.

The Minister for Transport: Is that for ordinary rating or health rating?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: The ordinary rating. In one case they changed to the unimproved value basis and at the end of the first year they found that although they adopted the taxation values for the land, with the maximum rate of 4d. under the Road Districts Act, they were £200 short of what they received the previous year under the other system. I know of one board that adopted the idea but found it returned less instead of more money than was received under the annual value,

and unless a board can persuade the Minister to increase the minimum it cannot become any better off.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is being increased under this Bill.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: There are advantages in the annual value. Road boards will not be put to any expense, as Mr. Gray suggests.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They would have to employ valuers.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: They adopt the taxation values and both local authority and landowner accept them as final. I am speaking of the unimproved values. If they wish to rate under the annual value, they must have a valuer.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Why should they be put to that expense?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Because they want the extra money. I think most of the road boards in the metropolitan area have fairly large undeveloped areas which, if developed, would mean more revenue for them.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I oppose the amendment. Various local authorities throughout the State have different rating values. The Kalgoorlie board rates on the annual rental value and, although it is fairly light, they get along well enough. A house in Kalgoorlie rated at £2 would be rated in Nedlands at £7 or £8.

Hon. H. Hearn: It is worth the difference to live there.

Hon. W. R. HALL: It is not. Owners of vacant land should be rated as high as those who have residences on their blocks. I think local authorities should have been consulted on this matter. To include an amendment like this will make it awkward for a number of the local authorities that rate differently throughout the State. I appreciate Mr. Parker's amendment but I feel it is singling out three or four road boards and I cannot be a party to that. A matter like this should have been discussed by the Road Board Association, which should have had an opportunity to refer it back to the local authorities, which number about 127, for their views. It is rather dangerous to interfere with this legislation as suggested by the amendment, which I oppose.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I find myself in agreement with Mr. Hall. It does seem to me that the substance of this amendment is a matter which should be brought forward as affecting the Road Districts Act, and then only after consultation with the local authorities concerned. The amendment is far-reaching and would result in road boards being put to endless expense and office work in the rating of large numbers of blocks. I appreciate the point made by Mr. Parker that it might cause the road boards to

calculate their rates on an annual basis, instead of on a capital value basis but I suggest we want a more direct method of doing this. This should be brought forward as a positive measure to amend the Road Districts Act.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Though I think we can agree that there is some justification in the case put up by Mr. Parker, I am in entire agreement with Mr. Hall and Mr. Watson. This is an amendment to the Health Act, but surely it is wrong and out of keeping with the Health Act to try and put in an amendment which deals with the all-important subject of rating. The right place for matters dealing with rating is in the Road Districts Act or in the Municipal Corporations Act. Mr. Tuckey stated that in his district various road boards have adopted the method which Mr. Parker is anxious to have introduced at Mosman Park. No-one can have any objection to their adopting it.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Only in part.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: There might be a good case for amendment of the Road Districts Act or the Municipal Corporations Act making it mandatory for road boards to fix their rates in a certain way, but I submit Mr. Parker's amendment is not proper for inclusion in the Health Act. I oppose the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I hope the Committee will not agree to this amendment. It has been made quite clear that Mr. Parker is attempting, no doubt with a very good motive from his point of view, to amend the wrong Act. The Health Act sets out the limits of the rating, but it leaves it to the local authority to assess by which system it should actually apply those rates. The limits set out rose from 9d. in the £ under the old rate to 1s. in the £ under the new rate, and then from 1½d. to 3d. Sewerage rates rose from 6d. to 8d. if on the annual value, but on unimproved capital value from ¾d. to 2d. But the Act defines the limit.

The procedure is set out in either the Road Districts Act or the Municipal Corporations Act, and it should be left to an amendment of those Acts rather than the Health Act to prescribe the method by which the rates would apply. I pointed out in my reply to the debate that this would cause endless complication to road boards and would prove expensive to them. I was unable to follow Mr. Parker when he mentioned that three road boards only out of the 16 named here would be affected, because if the whole of the Metropolitan Province were included, I should say Mr. Parker's amendment would apply to the whole of those 16 boards.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The Metropolitan Province is really west of Perth. The Suburban Province is east of Perth. It only affects the places I have mentioned.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Section 293A added:

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether you propose to take the amendment appearing on the notice paper or whether you would consider the deletion of the clause first.

The CHAIRMAN: I propose to take the amendment first because if it is carried the clause might then prove acceptable to others as well as the hon. member.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That a new subsection be added to proposed new Section 293A as follows:—

(5) In any proceedings against any person for refusing or failing to undergo any examination in conformity with the requirements of a notice under this section, it shall be a defence for the defendant to prove that, by reason of any religious belief held by him, he is not willing to submit to such examination.

Provided that every such person shall be liable to take all such precautions, and do all such acts and things, as the Commissioner may at any time require or direct, for the purpose of avoiding infection by tuberculosis or the likelihood of his infecting other persons.

I hope this clause will not be passed, but, judging from the debate, it looks as though it has more than a sporting chance of being agreed to. If it is, I hope it will contain my amendment. I trust members will consider the clause in a rational manner. When we previously discussed this matter I felt that T.B. was sweeping this House and the State like wild-fire.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You mean a bush-fire.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Statistics show that the total deaths recorded last year were 4,685 and of these 157 were from T.B. The Minister suggested that because Norway has compulsory x-ray examination, we should adopt the same principle. I would remind the Minister that before public servants can be appointed in Norway they must belong to the State religion. Does the Minister suggest that because Norway has this lack of religious freedom, we should follow that practice in Western Australia? Tasmania is the only State that has passed an Act similar to the measure now under discussion.

Although we have been told that the Bill has been brought down as a result of an agreement between the Commonwealth and

the States, the position is that New South Wales has no intention of passing an Act for compulsory examination. The Premier of Queensland has expressed the view that any attempt at compulsion would strengthen mass resistance. As other States have not found it necessary to adopt compulsory examination, I suggest we should consider the matter seriously before we do. In a lecture at the John Higgins School of Medicine in America—which is one of the outstanding research schools in the world—Dr. Jerome Hearts said that one T.B. patient recovered very quickly after his mother-in-law died. He also said that in a surprisingly large number of cases, it will be seen that falling ill with tuberculosis was a way of attempting to escape from an unbearable mental situation. To make the Bill comprehensive, we should provide, in addition to compulsory chest examination, compulsory psycho-analysis for mothers-in-law and sons-in-law.

The amendment in my name is not of my drafting. After the conference in 1949 between the then Federal Minister for Health, Mr. McKenna, and the State Ministers for Health, Christian Scientists asked that consideration be given to them, and as a result of their representations, Mr. McKenna drafted this provision. It is an attempt to meet a legitimate objection, based on religious grounds. The amendment will not mean a complete exemption, because the requisite safeguards are provided. A man could not refuse examination by merely advancing a plausible excuse that he did so on religious grounds; he would have to adduce proof.

Hon. W. J. Mann: How would he prove it?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Christian Scientists have a definite belief and rely upon a higher Power for healing, but a person who claimed exemption on that ground would have to prove his membership of the organisation.

Hon. H. HEARN: I support the amendment. In these days, we should preserve the ancient landmarks that provided a way by which a conscientious objector, on advancing proof, could escape any sweeping judgment such as is contained in the proposed new section. During the recent war, thousands of pacifists lived in England, although conscription was the order of the day, but they had to prove that they conscientiously objected to war. I remind members of the figures quoted by Dr. Hislop and the fact that no arrangement has been made to deal with patients discovered by compulsory examination.

If we ignore the conscientious objection of a religious body, we shall be doing a great injustice to a valuable section of the community. Those people believe that a higher Power than any individual or Government can do certain things under given conditions, and who are we to say they

are wrong? We should at least give them an opportunity to prove that they object on conscientious grounds, and if they can prove it, should not they be allowed to escape from the general net? Compulsory examination for T.B. is one thing, but there is a danger of going from strength to strength, and one of these days we shall be asked to vote for compulsory fingerprint registration.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I oppose the amendment. Many examples could be quoted of the benefits derived by the community as a whole from examinations, whether compulsory or otherwise. The outstanding example is that of the men and women who enlisted in the Services. They underwent a chest examination.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: A very poor one.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: But still, better than none, and it was advantageous to the people concerned, as well as to the general public. The examinations disclosed to many people ills of which they were unaware, but I do not think those examinations led to any increase in the number of neurotic cases or mental upsets, and I do not think additional people contracted the disease because they were told of the presence of symptoms. A man cannot get work on the mines unless he undergoes an examination.

Hon. H. Hearn: That is on account of workers' compensation.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am not interested in the reason; the fact remains that those examinations are compulsory and they have no deleterious effect on people. The benefits resulting from compulsory examination far outweigh anything that can be urged against it. The suggestion has been made that on religious grounds certain people should be relieved of compulsory examination. I do not understand what these people are opposing. They are opposed to cures, but this does not say a T.B. case will be cured by x-ray examination, and it does not suggest that treatment must follow. These same people undergo eyesight tests and wear glasses, and if they are deprived of their natural teeth they acquire dentures.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member is speaking on the whole clause. The amendment is that certain persons may be excluded from compulsory examination on religious grounds.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Their objections on religious grounds should not be taken into consideration in view of the benefits that are derived directly from examinations, whether compulsory or not.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I oppose the amendment. I think there are occasions when we must have regard for civil authority, irrespective of what our religious views are. The first paragraph nullifies the effect of the second one. How is a person to know he has T.B. if he does not submit

to some type of examination? He may be suffering from T.B. and affect other people.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: If we provide for compulsory examination, have we the proper accommodation for the people who will be found to be affected?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member had better discuss that matter when we deal with the clause. The amendment deals exclusively with the religious aspect.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I was leading up to the point of saying whether I was in favour of compulsory examination.

The Minister for Transport: I fully answered that question yesterday.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: If we have accommodation I could vote for the clause. If we have compulsory examinations we must have somewhere for the people to go. I have not been in favour of compulsion in anything.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: What about compulsory voting?

Hon. G. BENNETTS: Other than that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I know the danger here. We have to see that everyone is protected.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I oppose the amendment, but I do so with some regret because when the question of religious beliefs arises it is only right and proper that serious consideration should be given to it. As Mr. Parker pointed out, we are all subjected to compulsion in some way or another in the society in which we live. If people were not compelled to do certain things from time to time, society could not function. For instance, it is compulsory for children to go to school at a certain age.

Hon. H. K. Watson: If it were made compulsory for a youngster to go to a State school, would you have any opposition to that?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am not going to be side-tracked by a remark which has a lot more behind it, I am sure, than the hon. member would imply by asking it in such an off-hand way.

Hon. H. K. Watson: It has a bearing on the point at issue.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The amendment says, "It shall be a defence for the defendant to prove that by reason of any religious belief held by him—". That is tantamount to defeating the compulsory clause altogether.

Hon. H. Hearn: Why not continue reading the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The salient words in the amendment are that it will be a defence for the defendant to prove that by reason of any religious belief held by him. That is, by the individual person. Any individual could say, "I have a religious belief which precludes me from being x-rayed," and I do not think a court could do anything about it. That would open the way for a lot of people to avoid the compulsory provisions altogether.

My argument is based largely on the fact that the health of the community is so important that we must all be prepared to make some sacrifices. The Bill does not propose to make it compulsory for a certain line of treatment to be followed. I would possibly support any objections to such a provision. If members of certain religious sects believe they should treat themselves in a certain way, then their views are deserving of every consideration. The compulsory clause in the Bill simply provides that people shall present themselves to be x-rayed.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Most of the aspects I was going to deal with have been covered. The crucial point in the amendment is that people holding certain religious beliefs shall be exempted from the provisions of the clause. No-one has more sympathy with the sincerely religious individual than I have, or a greater respect for the beliefs which he holds, but I point out that disease, particularly tuberculosis, is no respecter of persons, and it is our duty to protect the community against infected people; and to protect people, in some cases, against themselves. The danger is not the known case but the unknown case. A measure such as this will help to identify such a case and aid the individual concerned on the road to recovery while, at the same time, protecting other people from infection.

I will give an instance of how it works. There were 400 nurses at the Royal Perth Hospital and during the last three years they have been submitted to compulsory x-ray examinations. Previous to that, the incidence of the disease was about one per cent.—four in 400. But, in the last three years, there has been only one mild case; so the actual figure has been cut by 12. If this amendment is passed, it could have a serious effect. Person A. may be a known bad case and person B. a contact, possibly nursing that case. Person B. might say that he holds religious beliefs and that he will not submit himself to examination or undergo an x-ray. Yet, that contact who is known to be a contact, might be a source of danger. It has been stated that compulsion is opposed to our ideals of liberty. I think Mr. Heenan gave an effective answer to that. Therefore, I ask members not to agree to this amendment.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: To my mind this amendment is most unfortunate because there is no body of persons for whom

I have a higher regard than members of the Christian Science Church. I cannot see that the Bill in any way affects their religious beliefs. I understand that these people hold that all disease can be cured by mind over matter and therefore they do not suffer from T.B. So I feel sure those people would have no objection to being examined because they are perfectly confident that they do not suffer from the disease.

The minority must always give way to the majority on compulsion. If members study the Health Act they will find that it is a mass of compulsion, but it is for the purpose of preventing disease among people generally. This amendment is a shocking thing. It states that a person need not undergo an examination if he holds religious beliefs, provided he takes all such precautions and does all such acts and things as the Commissioner may at any time require or direct for the purpose of avoiding infection by tuberculosis, or the likelihood of infecting other persons. If the Commissioner does not like a particular person, under that clause he can send him anywhere. This Bill, if it is passed, will not in any way affect the religious beliefs of anyone and should it do so I feel sure that any true Christian, or true Jew for that matter would be prepared to forgo something in the interests of the public generally who do not happen to hold the same religious views.

Hon. W. R. HALL: This amendment provides sectional legislation for a religious body, but I believe that prevention is better than cure. The only way to find out whether people have this dread disease is to subject them to compulsory examination. I respect the religious views of the Christian Science Church and any other churches that have differing views, but I still think that prevention is better than cure. However, the question arises that if there are many people affected with the disease, where are they to be accommodated? It is the duty of the Government, if it introduces compulsory T.B. examinations, to provide accommodation for the people who are discovered to be infected. There are plenty of people on the Goldfields who have active T.B. They are not segregated but they are taking some sort of precautions. Surely, Wooroloo will not be the only institution set aside for T.B. patients because it will not hold the number required if everybody is compulsorily examined.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will be able to connect up his remarks with the amendment which is to grant immunity to certain religious bodies or persons. I think the hon. member is dealing with the whole clause and I ask him to keep to the amendment before the Committee.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I will endeavour to do that but I feel that if one is to give reasons, or to discuss this amendment, one has to go over the whole point.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have ample opportunity when the clause is being discussed after the amendment is either rejected or passed.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I will be pleased to do that, if necessary, at a later stage.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It would be wrong of me to strongly oppose the clause and not say something about the amendment. Whether it is worded correctly or not is immaterial and the real question is whether we should give certain sections of the people, who honestly believe in their religion, immunity from mandatory clauses such as this. When the central authority in Australia decided that it would put a Bill of this sort to the States, and some of the States suggested that examination be made compulsory, the Commonwealth Minister in charge of the suggestion, at that time, apparently saw fit to give to religious organisations the right to say whether they would submit to these compulsory clauses or not. I believe that the wording of this amendment is the same as in the original draft drawn up by the then Commonwealth Minister, who, incidentally, was in the same profession as Mr. Parker.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: He may have come from Norway.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not know about that, but he was in a position of trust in the Commonwealth and it is most unlikely that he would put up something that had so many holes in it. I do not think it makes any difference whether we give these people immunity because, as I pointed out, the power already exists. Under Section 293, the Commissioner, or any of his officers, if they suspect a person is suffering from tuberculosis, can call that person up for x-ray examination without taking the man before a magistrate or anybody else.

Hon. L. Craig: This amendment exempts such people.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No, it does not. The amendment would add a new clause altogether. I still maintain that under the parent Act, if the Commissioner believes that someone is suffering from tuberculosis he can call that person up for an examination. It is going to be a sorry state of affairs if we are not to respect the beliefs of people which are genuinely held. I do not agree with their views, and one would not expect me to subscribe to a belief which has as its principle the treatment of disease in a way which I think is not sound. But that does not alter the fact that I must respect their religious belief. Who is to say whether they are right or wrong in that belief?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would you allow that argument to hold with a case of leprosy?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig: You do not mean that, surely! Would you allow a leper to move among the community?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There still seems to be in the minds of members and the public generally the same terrible feeling regarding tuberculosis as there has been with respect to leprosy.

Hon. L. Craig: What about if we had a bubonic plague?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That has nothing to do with tuberculosis. There must be some reasoned thinking as to the types and method of infection. Members seem to delude themselves to a large extent. Only a few moments ago Mr. Parker made the statement that if the compulsion were against these religious beliefs, the holders of them should be called up for x-ray and could then be told that they could do what they liked and mix with the public. The idea behind the compulsory x-ray examination is to find out who and where these people are, and do members think it is to be left there? Not for one moment! This is the start of something as to which we do not know where we are going to finish.

To say that this is where we are going to finish is very wrong because that does not fall into line with ultimately what I feel will be the scheme of things. It will cost an immense amount of money to find these people and there must come a request for treatment sooner or later. From my point of view, I do not mind whether the Committee agrees to this amendment or not. However, I am still going to give members sufficient information on tuberculosis so that when they do vote upon it, they will have some knowledge based on long experience of the disease.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I wish to clear up one point. If I understood Mr. Parker correctly, he inferred that I had brought this amendment down out of my own head without reference to anybody.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I did not say that.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: There were some remarks implying it.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No, I did not mean that.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I have moved the amendment only because of the sincere and urgent representation that has been made to me by Christian Scientists.

Hon. L. CRAIG: An extremely great principle is involved in this amendment.

Hon. H. Hearn: Liberty!

Hon. L. CRAIG: "What crimes have been committed in thy name!"

Hon. H. Hearn: Yes, another one today, too!

Hon. L. CRAIG: The speech of Dr. Hislop really got away from the principle involved in this amendment. It deals with the rights of a section of the community, whatever it may be, to evade its responsibilities to the general public. I personally think that no one section should be able to evade the responsibilities imposed upon it by the laws of the country. If we had Mohammedans, who are opposed to the slaughtering of cattle, would he allow them to refuse to have their herds slaughtered because they were suffering from tuberculosis? We went right through the country cleaning out tubercular cattle. Would we allow the Mohammedans to refuse to have T.B. cattle slaughtered because of their religious beliefs?

Hon. W. J. Mann: They are not Christian Scientists.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I believe they are Christian Scientists. There is another sect in Canada known as the Dukhabors who believe they should throw off all their clothes, and they have been arrested from time to time for doing that. They firmly believe it is the right thing to do. Because of their religious beliefs, should we allow them to throw off all their clothes under certain circumstances? They also believe that they should burn down the dwelling of a neighbour, and they have done that. I consider that some of these beliefs are wicked and entirely contrary to the teachings of Christ.

Anyone who thinks that he, as an infected person, should be allowed to infect other sections of the community is not a good thinking citizen. It is a selfish outlook. The people of this country are entitled to make laws for the well-being, peace, order and good government of the people, and no one section of the community should be able to evade their responsibilities in that regard, whatever their religious beliefs may be. If every religious belief in the world was to be respected we would need some very peculiar laws in this country. A great principle is involved here; that is, the principle of a small section imposing its will upon the will of the people, through action by this Parliament. It would be an exceedingly bad thing if the amendment were agreed to.

Amendment put and negated.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I ask the Committee to delete the clause altogether. I do this realising quite well the degree of opposition my speech has already met with. But I want to make my position clear and to give members some idea as to why I adopt this attitude. I have never, in this House, attempted to use my position or knowledge to elevate my own ego amongst members, but tonight I am going to use my position and status and my experience to emphasise to members the solid backing I have for my opinion.

There is no-one in this State, I claim, who did more for the control of tuberculosis than I did until the full-time officers were appointed under the present organisation. As far back as 1922 I lived for considerable periods in various sanatoria and in hospitals devoted to the care of the tuberculous and on my return to Australia I submitted to Victoria a plan for the organisation of the control of tuberculosis in that State. And here, even although at times I spoke as a lone voice, which I appear still to be doing, I decried the methods that were then being used, and demanded that more and more be done to control tuberculosis.

There were times when I drew the fire from those men who opposed my views, but fortunately they were eventually listened to, and an organisation with which I am associated, together with others, has come into being, and has effected a vast improvement in the control and treatment of tuberculosis. Therefore, I am not talking about compulsion from the point of view that I am totally opposed to all control of tuberculosis, but I am extremely opposed to compulsion in the treatment of this disease and, in fact, of almost every other disease.

One of the things a physician must do is to realise that he must keep an open viewpoint on the whole of medical treatment. Equally so, it devolves upon him when working in a small department of medicine, to refrain from becoming fanatical in the belief that he can control or cure the disease on the treatment of which he is engaged. One must look at this matter, after one's years of training, from the point of view that one must regard the over-all picture as being important and not be misled by statements which can impress those who are less acquainted with the subject, and possibly endanger the general outlook towards the treatment of that disease. The statement is being made freely that, given power to do so, tuberculosis will be controlled within 50 years. That is an extremely dangerous statement.

It is more than likely that tuberculosis will be controlled within 50 years, but it will not be by the present methods. The methods being used now, and for which we are asking compulsion in all forms, will be discarded long before then. We are asking that this whole process of controlling tuberculosis within the State should be one of power over individuals; that, given power, we can control this thing when we really are not yet certain either of the pathology of it or the mode of transmission, and certainly not of the treatment of it. When we start to ask for power at a stage like that, I think we exceed our duty and certainly our rights.

All sorts of ideas have been expressed by members regarding the relationship between compulsion for certain other things and that in connection with tuberculosis. Those views were hopelessly astray and

were without any idea of how the disease should be treated and how it is transmitted. One member asked why, as we controlled a person suffering from venereal disease, we should not control the one suffering from tuberculosis. We know quite well that the person suffering from venereal disease is aware that he has it and by wilful act he deliberately infects another person. That is a crime. But tuberculosis is not transmitted in anything like the same way.

For the first 20 years of my professional life I do not suppose I ever passed a day without sitting at the bedside or treating or talking to an active T.B. sufferer, yet I did not contract the disease. There must of necessity be a certain amount of resistance to the infection and there must be certain methods of transmission from one individual to another. I heard one member say it was wrong to allow a T.B. sufferer to travel in a bus. It is most unlikely—unless by means of some catastrophe by which one individual received an overwhelming dose of tubercle—one would be definitely infected by travelling in a bus. Not only would it be most unlikely, but I do not think it could occur.

Generally, the method of the transmission of the disease is a topic that fills medical journals. In fact, the method by which the body responds to this infection is still a matter of discussion in medical circles. We are asking in other Acts that we should compel the isolation of all sufferers from diphtheria and why not, therefore, cause the isolation of T.B. sufferers? When we isolate diphtheria patients, we know it is necessary for a short time; we know the method of infection and the treatment of the disease; and we also know that, under treatment, the patient will be cured within a short period.

On the other hand we know none of these things with regard to tuberculosis. If we are to act in accordance with some of the ideas expressed in this House the T.B. sufferer will be absolutely isolated from the rest of the community. There is no stupidity in the statement that Mr. Watson referred to when he mentioned the lecture at the John Higgins School of Medicine in America. There is no doubt that the nervous condition has a great deal to do with the position, if not with the actual incubation of the disease. It certainly has to do with the spread of the disease in the human being, whether the individual has peace of mind or not. In the medical journals we see requests for psychologists or psychiatrists to be appointed to tuberculosis sanatoria in order to assist in the treatment of the disease. If we are to isolate one section of the community in this way without any idea of how the disease spreads, we will simply undo one injustice and commit another.

I submit there is not the slightest need for compulsion at this stage. From 1860 when the first known records were available, down to 1940, the fall in the actual rate of T.B. in Australia has shown a complete and steady decline. Within a matter of four years of appointing a full-time official to control tuberculosis, we find there has arisen the desire for the power of compulsion. Despite the previous record of 60 years, which has shown tuberculosis to be a disease that is controllable and in connection with which we have adopted proper methods of sanitation and hygiene, we now have had within four years four Bills asking for compulsion.

The first, if I remember aright, was for a request to compel T.B. sufferers to go to hospital. The House discarded that measure without thought. The next time compulsion was sought was for powers that are now in the Act. If an individual had tuberculosis or was suspected to be suffering from it, he could be forced to do certain things. We were so far along the road to compulsion that we said that if the individual were recalcitrant and was infecting his family or failed to carry out the instructions given to him, we should then be allowed to take him before the magistrate and put him in a sanatorium for 12 months.

The next Bill went further still and sought to prescribe that if a man did not behave himself when he was in an institution we would have the right to incarcerate him in a special part of the sanatorium. Now, long before the question of whether the present methods have proved to be failures or not, we are asked to compel people to submit themselves to x-ray examination. That is to close a gap in compulsory treatment. There is no proof whatever of the failure of the voluntary system. If there were and it could be shown that the disease was on the increase, I would be the first to say, "We are in danger, just as we were during the war, and we must control this thing."

But the decline in the incidence of tuberculosis is steady year by year. Figures given to us the other evening show that about 80,000 people have submitted themselves voluntarily to x-ray examinations. That shows the state of mind that exists amongst the public today. It is almost automatic for people to visit the clinic to be x-rayed. The number of patients that I and my brother physicians send to the clinic without any compulsion whatever, is very great. There is no need to take from the people their liberty while we make the progress that is apparent today.

As I said in an earlier speech, what is proposed will interfere with the relationship of practitioner and patient. In replying to my statement, the Minister said that the relationship between doctor and patient at the clinic had been exceedingly good. Do members think for one moment that the relationship will remain good if the power of compulsion is there? I plead

with the medical officers in charge of this matter to realise that the goodwill established amongst the people over the last three or four years will be injured by this constant call for power over the individual.

"Give us power and we will wipe this scourge out"—that is the cry we hear. We have heard the cry down the ages. It was heard from Alexander the Great, from Napoleon and from Hitler. All asked for power, and where did it get them? The granting of power of compulsion over the individual in relation to this particular disease will get us nowhere. Let us analyse for a moment the statement that if we grant this power the State will be rid of tuberculosis within 50 years. In the last 50 years the progress in medicine has been so tremendous that hardly one thing that was regarded as a fact remains a known or proved fact today.

I suggest with all due deference to those in control that they are asking for something that is likely to act in reverse compared with what they desire. I hope the Committee will seriously consider the position before granting any further powers of compulsion over the individual in respect of the treatment of this disease which is one that we all desire, no-one more than I do, to see eliminated in this State.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I can do nothing else but support Dr. Hislop in his suggestion that the clause be deleted from the Bill. I ask members to remember that if the Bill be agreed to, the power of compulsion will apply to everyone over the age of 14 years. The Minister said that the compulsory x-ray examination would be resorted to in respect of certain sections or groups, but it will apply to everyone.

Hon. E. H. Gray: If necessary.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That has nothing to do with it.

Hon. L. Craig: That is not so.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is.

Hon. L. Craig: Read the Bill!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: During the second reading debate the opinion was expressed that the disease could be dealt with by domiciliary treatment. The Minister said that very often an effective cure could be brought about, but he could not say that conclusively.

The Minister for Transport: Of course I could not!

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In the matter of home treatment there is a big factor. The Minister said there were nine clinic nurses who helped in that regard. Who will help them if compulsory x-ray examinations are instituted? If thousands are found to be

active sufferers from the disease as the result of the examinations, where will other nurses be found to assist the nine already engaged in that work? The general practitioners will be called upon to help. Will they be prepared to cope with that task while also attending their ordinary patients?

Another factor is that if a man is suffering from active tuberculosis and is sent home for rest and treatment, he is allowed his pension. Who will pay the doctor who attends him? The Government? The Bill does not say so. The man will have to meet that expense and he will not be able to do so out of his pension and maintain his family as well. On the other hand, if he were sent to the sanatorium, he would receive free treatment.

The Minister referred to the number of nurses in hospitals and sanatoria who contracted tuberculosis and said that during the past few years it has been reduced considerably. But I think he overlooks the fact that the treatment of T.B. patients has improved a great deal in the last ten years, and also that those nurses are in hospitals where they receive the attention of doctors who understand tuberculosis. There is no proof that x-ray examination has reduced the number of nurses in hospitals who have contracted T.B.

The Minister for Transport: But it did. It reduced it by eleven-twelfths.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I cannot understand the Minister saying that the x-ray examination was responsible.

The Minister for Transport: No, I am not saying that. It enabled treatment to be applied.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I admit that. But that treatment would not be applied at the homes of the nurses, but in the hospitals. With regard to infection by contact, I have been told by one who has been nursing in a sanatorium for the past three years that the greater percentage of tuberculosis patients come from country districts and not from crowded city areas which shows the fallacy of the belief in infection by contact.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It has been said many times that figures can prove any thing, and there is no doubt that, in regard to medicine, statistics must be handled very carefully. To make statements of the type the Minister has presented with regard to nurses may convince those who are not used to medical statistics, but will not convince me to any great extent. It may be found that the figures for one period of three years are considerably different from those of the previous three years. We had a period in the Royal Perth Hospital at one stage when tubercle was running rife; then we had a long period when

the number of nurses affected was practically negligible. Then there was another upsurge.

The reason for the figures quoted is that patients in the hospital have for the last three or four years been subjected to x-ray of the chest as a routine part of hospital treatment. It can be called compulsory, if members like; but if I place myself in the hands of a medical institution and say, "Please cure me", then all steps necessary to make a diagnosis of my condition must be taken. So people have been x-rayed and the number of cases found in the Royal Perth Hospital out of those attending is, on an average, 120 per year. They have been sent straight to sanatoria or cared for in the hospital under certain conditions, and the risk to the nursing staff has, to some extent, been lessened. That is one of the causes that give rise to the present sets of figures. But we have no idea whether the next three years will be exactly the same. They may not be, because conditions may alter.

When it comes to the question of tuberculosis in mines, it must be realised that improved conditions have lessened the number of cases. The vast majority were those in which tuberculosis was superimposed upon a particular form of silicosis and the small flocculent type of silicosis, as seen by x-ray, was the type that led to the imposition of tuberculosis. Having taken affected men out of the mines and improved the silicosis conditions, we are not likely to witness any increase in tuberculosis in the mines. When it comes to the question of x-raying those men, it is done for their own protection, because they are in a hazardous industry, which they entered of their own free choice. They were not compelled to be miners, but took on the job and knew the conditions. There are many other directions in which, if we accept certain conditions in the community, we accept certain impositions that go with them.

The rate of improvement in these things must not constantly be regarded as being due to the power of compulsion. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, I think that compulsion would possibly lead to our neglecting what are really essential matters in the control of tuberculosis. Only recently it has been discovered that the tubercle bacillus is really a fungus, and, as a fungus, is most likely to grow in conditions which are unreal and wrong in living. I believe that when we pay greater attention to the light factor regarding rooms of houses and greater attention still to sanitation and hygiene in homes, and when we build better homes for people, we will go a long way towards the control of tuberculosis. Those are things which are so essential and which cannot all be laid at the door of compulsion as being the great factor in the control of the disease.

I want to give an example to show how members can be led astray in dealing with medical problems. The other night, Mr. Fraser instanced the case of a man who went to a hospital suffering from some condition for which it was decided to x-ray him. I think it was indigestion, and they were probably giving him a barium meal. The man said, "While I am here, I will have my chest x-rayed," and they found that he had tuberculosis. Every man is taught from the time he begins studying medicine that if there is any doubt about a person's having indigestion, he should be examined for tuberculosis. That is elementary medicine, and is done every day in the week by members of the profession all over the State. To bring that one case up as a reason for compulsion just shows how dangerous it is to toy with matters of this sort in that way. Statistics and facts in regard to tubercle must be known and understood thoroughly. I sympathise with members who have to vote on this matter. I realise that I shall probably be almost a lone voice, but I shall continue to be a lone voice against compulsion in the handling of disease.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: One point I do not understand is how there can be any reliable statistics with regard to a disease without there being a thorough examination of everybody in the community. Dr. Hislop has told us that tuberculosis is diminishing in the mines. There is proof of that, because every miner is x-rayed. Outside of that, it can only be guesswork, because the only known sufferers are those who go through the hands of the medical profession.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Mr. Strickland raised an interesting point, but the figures I gave were based on the birth-rate per hundred thousand in one country as compared with another. Mr. Baxter, I think, has misread the Act. It provides that the Commissioner may, by notice published in the "Government Gazette," require all persons over the age of 14 of any class or classes specified in the notice to undergo x-ray examination for tuberculosis at such time and place as specified.

As I explained, in actual practice the application is confined to certain classes which are regarded as important, such as contacts attending patients, doctors' cases referred to clinics, old miners, hospital in-patients, and out-patients, and, particularly, migrants. A doctor told me that one batch of migrants arrived who were supposed to have been thoroughly screened before the ship left the port of embarkation. There were, however, 20 cases of T.B. revealed by x-ray examination. The previous ship had had none, showing that in one case there was effective screening and in the other, if there had been any at all, it had been carelessly done.

It has been pointed out by previous speakers that in New South Wales and Queensland there is no compulsion, but it has also been admitted that those two States are behind Western Australia in the development of methods to combat tuberculosis. In 1948 there was a meeting between the Commonwealth Minister for Health and the State Ministers at which it was agreed that compulsory examination throughout Australia was very desirable. Those present agreed to endeavour to bring in legislation for compulsion in their respective States and on that understanding the Commonwealth Minister for Health promised the subsidy under the Federal scheme. Messrs. Baxter and Bennetts mentioned the accommodation position that would arise if examination was made compulsory. Examinations would be applied to the community with discretion, class by class, thus avoiding any overwhelming drain on accommodation. I will quote briefly from what I stated last night. I said:

Mr. Baxter stated that proper home attention to sufferers was impossible and he referred to incurable persons having been discharged from the sanatorium and sent home to mingle amongst other persons and spread the disease. Mr. Baxter considered it would be preferable to provide accommodation for those persons rather than to look for other persons who were not aware that they had the disease. I would like to remind the hon. member that the danger to the community is the unknown case and not the known case. These active cases that have been discharged from Wooroloo are trained in hygiene and in the knowledge of how to prevent the spread of the disease to other people. They are allowed home only where the home conditions have been specially approved. Bed rest treatment is still the main plank in the treatment of tuberculosis although surgical treatment is often also necessary. Patients can rest at home in bed under medical supervision and improve in health. The Chest Clinic has a staff of visiting nurses who visit home patients regularly, the number of visits to each patient being determined by the doctor according to the type of disease.

If there is a bad case, is it not better to locate it and prevent the spread of disease to other members of the family rather than allow it to go unchecked, risking infection of the whole family?

Hon. G. BENNETTS: Dr. Hislop said that tuberculosis could not be contracted by persons travelling in buses with sufferers. In that case, why has the Railway Department a compartment set aside for sufferers, and why is it fumigated? It will be recalled that a few years ago trainee nurses had to spend a period of

training at Wooroloo and so many contracted the disease that in the end they preferred to resign rather than go there. Eventually it was decided that they could complete their training at other Government hospitals.

Goldfields residents fear that if compulsorily examined and found to be infected, they may be put in a colony away from their people for a period. I think separation from his family would worry the sufferer and aggravate his condition. I do not think anyone can contradict Dr. Hislop's opinions on this question, and I feel that the debate should be adjourned so that further information might be obtained.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Minister said I had read the clause wrongly. I stated that it provided for the compulsory x-ray examination of everyone, and I think the Minister was trying to drag a red herring across the trail. The provision makes the Commissioner all-powerful because by notice in the "Government Gazette" he will be able at any time to compel any section of the community to be x-rayed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Mr. Bennetts mentioned trainee nurses at Wooroloo having contracted tuberculosis. For years I have spoken at length on the need for protection for young girls training at Wooroloo. It was my insistence in this regard that resulted in changes there and the institution of the practice of not sending them to Wooroloo until they have reached a certain age and tests have been undergone to see whether they had passed the stage of allergy to tuberculosis. I give way to no-one in this State in my desire to see tubercule controlled and I repeat that I have done more than any other individual, apart from the full-time officers, to bring this about, but I vigorously maintain still that there is no need whatever for compulsion in the matter of x-ray examination.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	7
Majority for	8

Ayes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. A. L. Lotton	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. H. S. W. Parker	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. H. L. Roche	(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7—Section 314 amended:

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of proposed new Sub-section (2) the words "may if he thinks fit" be struck out and the word "shall" inserted in lieu.

I contend that a person suffering from venereal disease at the age of 16 years or younger is sufficiently irresponsible to take the necessary precautions to avoid other persons becoming affected by the disease.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I hope the House will leave this clause as it stands. I think the head of a department would have a very high sense of responsibility and would be very conscious of his duty.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If the Commissioner knows the child is suffering from venereal disease, I think he should tell the parents, but not if he only suspects. If he suspects he should be given the right to tell them if he thinks fit. To make it mandatory when he suspects would be very difficult.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: Even if he suspects, he has a duty to other people living in the house. I know of a case of people living in a house who were affected by venereal disease because all necessary precautions were not taken by the person affected. I appreciate the point made by the Minister that the Commissioner is a responsible man and is fully conscious of his duty. But a matter of this nature would probably be delegated to one of his junior officers. If it was done by the Commissioner himself, I have no doubt that he would carry out his duty in that regard.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am inclined to agree, and look at it this way: If a child of mine were to be sent along for examination for T.B., or anything like that, and later on I were to find out that he had some disease of which I knew nothing, I would feel that the doctor had let me down very badly if he had not told me of his suspicion.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This does not deal with ordinary medical practitioners but with the Commissioner, and the relationship between the parent and the medico does not exist as it would if a medical man were approached for his advice. In Mr. Cunningham's case if a child were taken to a medical man and a contract entered into for that medico to look after the child, then he would most certainly tell the parents of his suspicions.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: That is a case where a parent takes his child to a medical man. What about an infected case going to a medical man of his own free will or possibly being advised to do so? Nobody would regard the

matter more seriously than the parent, who would no doubt be shocked to find the child suffering from this disease. If the person does not take the necessary precautions in his own home, then the danger of infecting other people is aggravated.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Minister explained that this amendment had been included to clarify a situation which occurred recently when the Commissioner took it upon himself to break the secrecy to which he was bound under the Act—

The Minister for Transport: That is so.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: —and to act in the right way by communicating with the parents. In other words, on that occasion the Commissioner broke the provision of the Medical Act, although most people would regard it as the right and proper thing to have done. It is obvious that this amendment is designed solely for the purpose of protecting the Commissioner, when he feels inclined to, or sees fit to, advise parents. I agree with Mr. Boylen that we should go further than that. We want to get it clear that this provision is put into the Bill mainly for the purpose of protecting the Commissioner, when he feels inclined to notify parents.

My view is that if a child under 16 years is suffering from venereal disease or if the Commissioner suspects that he is— and surely we would not suspect unless he had very strong grounds for doing so— it is his obligation to advise the people most vitally concerned, namely, the parents. The Minister has pointed out that the Commissioner is invariably a man of high standing in his profession, and one who is very conscious of his responsibilities to the public. But we want to bear in mind that the Commissioner does not always act individually; he has officers who act on his behalf, and I think that when it comes to the notice of the Commissioner that a child of under 16 years has venereal disease, or is suspected to have it, it is the duty and obligation of the Commissioner to notify the parents.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am inclined to agree with Dr. Hislop. If it is made compulsory, then it would be very difficult when it comes to a matter of suspicion. If it is compulsory for the Commissioner to notify the parents, surely it should only be compulsory for him to do so if he is certain that the child is infected. It would be a terrible thing to have to compulsorily notify parents when a child is suspected, and for it to be found later that he is free of infection. To my way of thinking it does not fit in with the logic of the clause.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Would not you prefer to know whether the child was so infected or not?

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If it was only a matter of suspicion, no. We might well find a man suspecting for the sake of suspecting.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 10, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—AGRICULTURE PROTECTION BOARD.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.30]: Many attempts have been made to overcome the depredations of vermin and eradicate noxious weeds in this State. The Royal Commission received many suggestions from road boards in various parts of the State, and I think we have a Bill before us that will go a long way towards assisting us to overcome some of the problems associated with vermin and noxious weeds. On its own, however, an Act of Parliament will not kill vermin or eradicate noxious weeds. Everything depends upon how the measure is put into effect. No doubt many suggestions will be made by local authorities as to how this legislation should be applied. If we find that in certain areas individuals or local authorities are not doing the job, it will be for the board to go into those areas and do it. For the time being, however, I think this work had better be left to the local authorities and individuals to see how they tackle it.

Many people may consider that the amount of money to be made available to the board is excessive. The sum to be allotted to the board is something like £108,000, which is certainly a lot of money, but those who are acquainted with what is happening in the country will readily understand that it does not take long for £108,000 worth of damage to be done by vermin and noxious weeds. I sincerely hope that if the £108,000 proves to be insufficient, more money will be made available, because this is a job that must be taken seriously and must be tackled in a big way.

I suggest to the Minister that, when he is appointing an inspector under the Vermin Act, he will give him the dual job by making him an inspector of noxious weeds also because the one dovetails in with the other. When an inspector is moving through a district looking after vermin, it is a simple matter for him to give an eye to noxious weeds at the same time, and by having the one inspector for the dual job, some saving in expenditure could be effected.

The main results from this measure will come from the work of the inspectors appointed by the Government to operate in the vermin areas. If the class of inspector is good, then the legislation will prove beneficial, but if the inspector is a man who does not do his job, the results are

not likely to be encouraging. I hope that the Minister will be particularly careful to appoint men who have a knowledge of requirements.

I consider that the rabbit can be controlled without a great deal of trouble. The emu, of course, is quite a different proposition. By the use of the Ripper, followed by Lavacide, and the exercise of vigilance, I think we have an effective method of combating the rabbit pest. One of the difficulties in the past has been that Crown lands have been a breeding place for vermin which from there invade private land that perhaps has already been cleaned up. Under this measure I think the board will ensure that Crown lands are kept reasonably free from vermin, and if this is done, it will be an incentive to the individual farmer to keep his own block clean.

There is an illustration I can give of the effect of vermin eradication on a farm in the Geraldton district. At five o'clock one evening, we were overlooking the property from an eminence and the surface showed just a seething mass of rabbits, which cleaned up all before them. After the rabbits had been dealt with, that farmer, who in 1946 had stripped nothing, got a six-bag crop of oats from 500 acres and was able to shear an extra 30 bales of wool this year. This shows that the outlay for the destruction of vermin does not represent any real cost to the farmer because, by incurring that expenditure to clean up the vermin, he is able to make a lot of money out of his holding. If every farmer realised that in dealing with vermin he is making money and not spending it, we should soon get down to an effective basis. Unfortunately, we are not at present getting rid of the emus. A supply of .303 ammunition is necessary, but it has not been procurable.

The Minister for Agriculture: It will be available.

HON. L. A. LOGAN: The farmers in the outback portions of the State have to bear the brunt of the emu invasion, and for the last six weeks these pests have been doing a tremendous lot of damage. I cannot understand why supplies of ammunition should have been withdrawn at this season of the year or who was responsible for it. Whoever was responsible certainly cannot realise what an immense amount of damage an emu can do. I am not sure that I agree with the Minister in his statement that the maximum amount payable per beak for emus should be only 3s. I should like to know whether, under the new legislation, the local authorities will be entitled to pay an additional amount.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Royal Commission recommended a maximum of 1s. 6d.

HON. L. A. LOGAN: Apparently the Royal Commission did not know everything.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is so.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister will agree that the scarcer emus become, the higher should be the bonus paid. Had we adopted that principle in the past, I do not think we would have been troubled by the number of emus and foxes that we have today. An incentive must be offered, not only to the farmer but also to others to destroy vermin. On many occasions we have got the emus and foxes down to a relatively low level, but then the bonus has practically been taken off and immediately the vermin has increased again. I hope the Government will take that point into consideration.

I do not know how the differentiation between bonus payments in vermin districts will work out. This sort of thing has caused a fair amount of trouble between road boards and now we are asked to apply it to vermin districts, and I think it will cause a certain amount of trouble there, too. If one vermin district pays more than another, the scalps or beaks will be taken to the district offering the higher bonus and that will cause dissension. I hope the Minister will consider that point.

The Minister for Agriculture: We had that experience in the Northern Territory and the Kimberleys and the trouble has been rectified.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We have had trouble in this respect before.

The Minister for Agriculture: I do not see how it can be helped as between boards.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Bill provides that certain money is to be contributed by the Railway Department, including a sum of £500 annually for the destruction of noxious weeds. I cannot see why the Main Roads Department should not be brought into the picture also. It is just as essential that the Main Roads Department should be required to make a contribution as the Railway Department. During the debate reference was made to the control of trapping on a person's property. I am not going so far as Mr. Loton went by saying that I believe in trapping. I do not. At the same time, where there are a lot of rabbits on a property and a man can go in and clean them up, he should be permitted to do so.

I think most of the other points have been covered by previous speakers. There are two complementary Bills, on one of which I have already spoken, and we must of necessity pass this Bill in order that the others may become effective. Once again I impress upon the Minister the need for appointing first class men as inspectors, men who are not afraid to rub road boards up the wrong way when necessary. We have an inspector up my way who is doing the job well, and when necessary, he does not hesitate to rub anyone up the wrong way. He has secured excellent co-operation with the road board and in turn there is good co-operation between the road board and individuals. At the same

time, when it has been necessary to put the screw on he has not hesitated to do it. I commend the Bill to the House and hope it will receive a speedy passage.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [10.45]: The Bill will be hailed throughout the country as something that has been wanted for a long time. The only portion I do not agree with is Clause 8 (d) which was referred to by Mr. Loton and Mr. Logan. It deals with the controlling or prohibiting of the trapping of rabbits on a property by any person other than the owner or occupier. I have had experience of poisoning and trapping rabbits not only in the wheatbelt but in the South-West. I cannot see what good it would do to prohibit trapping. In only very few instances does the owner or occupier of a holding do a colossal amount of trapping. Generally, two or three trappers go on to a property and trap it fairly well. At times poisoning is not practicable. If a person poisons his property thoroughly, trappers will not go on to it. They do not interfere with poisoning. I think it is a foolish clause.

The Minister for Agriculture: It only says they may do it in certain circumstances.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not think it is right that the trapping of rabbits should be interfered with. Rabbits are particularly bad and hard to get at in the South-West which is not like the wheat and sheep areas. In the South-West there are hills covered with bracken, logs and stones and other types of cover that suit the rabbit. There is only a certain type of cleared land that can be poisoned. The rabbits have to be trapped there if they are to be shifted at all.

A method has been adopted there whereby the road board promulgates bylaws in regard to poisoning under which so much poison has to be laid per 100 acres and the poison trails have to be two chains apart on the cleared land to make up for the country missed because of the impossibility of getting a machine on to it. Some of the country is hard even to stand on, especially with the dry grass.

I am pleased to see that on the advisory committee there are to be five members, including the chairman, and that one shall be an officer of the Rural and Industries Bank. In addition, four members are to represent those parts of the State where the agricultural industry is carried on and where the emus and grasshoppers are prevalent. I hope that when the Minister appoints these people he will make a careful selection, particularly in regard to the officer from the Rural and Industries Bank—not that I want to decry any of those officers.

The emus and grasshoppers are a serious menace on the outer edges of our agricultural areas, and the man appointed from the Rural and Industries Bank should

thoroughly understand those parts, and be prepared to say to the board that certain areas should be recommended for re-settlement. A lot of country infested by grasshoppers and emus consists of forfeited areas and that is why the grasshopper is so prevalent. It is good sheep and wheat country. The Minister should appoint an officer who has had experience of those parts and who would be prepared to go ahead and advise the board as I have suggested.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. G. B. Wood—Central—in reply) [10.52]: I am naturally pleased at the way the Bill has been received by members. I said when introducing it that I would be only too glad to consider what I thought were desirable amendments. Some suggestions have been made, and I think I should briefly reply to them. Mr. Tuckey, and some other members, said that £500 was not enough for the Railway Department to contribute on account of noxious weeds. The Bill does not confine the expenditure to £500. That department still has an obligation to get rid of its noxious weeds, but this is a definite charge which will be made. I said that I thought the minimum amount allowed for noxious weeds was not enough. I believe that the board, after it has been functioning for 12 months, will recommend that a greater amount be allocated. The sum of £7,000 to come from Consolidated Revenue is a minimum.

It was pleasing to hear Mr. Tuckey suggest that people, particularly school children, should be educated with regard to noxious weeds. Mr. Loton mentioned the board. There seems to be some antagonism to public servants, the objection being that they would be in the majority. The Bill as presented in another place provided for four public servants, and four others. It was amended there to include five public servants by the addition of the chief warden of fauna. We accepted that amendment, and I had my say, with the Minister in charge of the Bill in another place, in accepting the amendment, on account of the great expenditure of public funds that is involved.

While £105,000 is the minimum which will be allowed under these Bills, I visualise getting a lot more than that from the Treasury. If we have a board that has the confidence of the Treasurer we will get more money, but if we had a board that was not so responsible and wanted to spend the money haphazardly, the Treasurer might not be so inclined to come to light with more money than is provided for by the legislation.

Hon. H. L. Roche: What about the quorum?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am prepared to consider something there. I think we could have a quorum of five, including two nominees, if the number of

members is left at nine. We would then have at least two members who were not public servants. That should overcome the objection of members who think the whole quorum should consist of public servants. Alternatively, we could increase the number to six, but I think the other way would be better.

Hon. H. L. Roche: If you made it four and four, with a quorum of five, they would not all be public servants.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We do not want to make the position so that the nominee members would not bother to come along. The meetings would not be held on the spur of the moment, without notice. Surely the people on the board would have some sense of responsibility.

Hon. A. L. Loton: That is your own idea.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, and I hope it is theirs too. It is logical. People appointed to a board like this should have so much responsibility that they would not leave everything to the Government officials. This is one of the most important things we have done for the betterment of the agricultural industry. I would be hurt and sorry to think that members envisaged, as Mr. Loton apparently does, that those constituting the board would be so lacking in a sense of responsibility that they would stay on their farms and allow the public servants to run the whole show. We will try to tie it up so that the quorum will be safeguarded to the extent of there being at least two nominee members present at each meeting.

I am not keen on the suggestion to submit a panel of names. Mr. Loton is playing a dangerous game indeed if he suggests to the Farmers' Union that these appointments should be made from a panel of names. I did that when I appointed two or three men to the Western Australian Wheat Board. The constitution of the Farmers' Union—and the members are jealous of it—provides that anyone appointed to a board shall be elected. The members of the executive, with whom I was in close collaboration, got into serious trouble from some of their members because they allowed me to appoint two of their members to the Wheat Board. Those people believe it is their prerogative to choose the men by election.

Hon. H. L. Roche: They could still do that, and give you the names.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Anyway, I am not keen on selecting anybody from a panel of names. I also had a similar instance with the Millers' Association with respect to the same board. I asked for a panel of names and was given three names, and I selected the wrong one, according to the association. A lot of pressure was put on me to alter my selection. I have come to the conclusion that if we are appointing somebody from, say, the Pastoralists' Association, it is as well

to let the association appoint him, and the same with the Farmers' Union and the Road Board Association. So I hope the House will not agree to the amendment if it is suggested.

One member mentioned something about bonuses. This is entirely on the lines laid down by the Royal Commission; 6s. for foxes, so much a hundred for kangaroos, and so much for emus. In the Bill we have doubled up on the suggestion of the Royal Commission and made a maximum of 3s. for emus. I agree with members that there should be a big bonus. When I got the Government to agree to some thousands of pounds for a subsidy on bonuses for emus, it made a tremendous difference. There were payments of 2s. from the Government and 1s. out of the vermin fund, while the local authorities put in another 1s., which made a total bonus of 4s. I should think that more emus were cleaned up during that period than for many years before, simply because of the high bonus being paid.

Hon. H. C. Strickland: Is that stabilised?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. We have a maximum of 3s. in the Bill, but if emus become particularly bad again, and we want to clean them up in a certain area where it is not wise to organise big shooting parties, we can put the bonus up to, say, 5s. The local authorities could put in 2s. where they thought necessary, but the maximum available from the protection board is 3s. That is the maximum that can come out of the fund and, in my opinion, it should be enough. However, if it is not enough and we find it desirable to alter the amount, Parliament can be consulted when it meets next year. I fully agree with Mr. Logan about the .303 ammunition. A lot of damage could have been caused through lack of ammunition, but I am glad to say that the position has now been rectified, and the Minister for the Army will see that sufficient .303 ammunition is released for the slaughter of emus.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Quite a lot of damage has already been done this year.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, I realise that, but probably the Department of the Army did not appreciate the need for the ammunition for the killing of emus in this State. All emus are not killed with .303 rifles; shot-guns are used extensively along the fences where people can get close to the birds.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Dogs are effective, too.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Out in the field, a .303 rifle is necessary, because shot-guns are not much use there. Mr. Logan criticised the fact that rates for bonuses could differ in various districts. That would be only in exceptional cases, and I cannot think of any instance where there would be any difference between districts. The Act says

that the bonus must be the same, but it may differ between districts. We found that a bonus of 12s. 6d. was paid in the Northern Territory for dingoes, while it was £1 in the Kimberleys. Of course, all the scalps came from the Northern Territory into the Kimberleys and our fund was being sadly depleted. The department soon woke up to the fact, and it just would not happen again. I do not think that the protection board, other than in exceptional cases, would permit any difference in regard to bonuses. Quite a lot has been said about trapping. I believe that the protection board would exercise the power to prevent trapping only in exceptional circumstances.

Hon. A. L. Loton: But that is not what the Bill says.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, but surely we can give the board credit for some sense; personally, I do. I visualise this as being a good board and I do not think it would willy-nilly prevent the trapping of rabbits. The very objective of the board is to get rid of rabbits, although there might be some occasions when it is necessary, perhaps because of a poison drive, to prevent trapping which might be detrimental to the drive. In those circumstances, the board would say, "Hold your hand for a while in regard to the trapping of rabbits." I intend to read briefly from the report of the Royal Commission. The Bill does not go quite as far as this, but the report states—

Very strong representations were made to us in many quarters to prohibit the professional trapper whom we have already defined in paragraph 18.

We are not prohibiting the professional trapper under this Bill. Personally, if he was prohibited, I think that would be going too far.

We feel that the services of these gentlemen are not desirable or serviceable in the long run as a means of eradicating rabbits.

I agree that they are not, but they are a big help. I have found the professional trapper—and I do not agree with Mr. Logan—to be a great help, particularly during the war years and since that period, when we were bereft of men to do the job. These men are particularly useful within a radius of Perth where the value of rabbit-meat is so high. The professional trapper has done a great job, but nobody in his right senses would say that the professional trapper, or any trapper, would get rid of all rabbits.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Neither does any one process.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, if the hon. member had permitted me to finish, I intended to say, neither does any one process. On some farms in the district with which I am closely asso-

ciated, I have found that farmers' children—especially when the price of rabbits is high—and even the farmers themselves, are prepared to go out and get almost every rabbit on their properties. But professional trappers will not do that. They get 20 or 30 dozen, which will make it pay, while the children of farmers, looking for pocket-money, will get almost every rabbit on their properties. The report continues—

We therefore recommend that the agriculture protection board should have power to regulate rabbit-trapping by any person so as to ensure that suitable methods of following-up are practised.

And so it goes on. We do not go as far as that in the Bill.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Is that a recommendation of the Royal Commission?

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is in the report of the Royal Commission. There were two things in the report with which I did not agree, for various reasons; one concerned the mobile unit and the other was the policy in regard to the professional trapper. However, there is power in the Bill to provide mobile units, if necessary. There is nothing to stop us setting up these units if suitable machinery—such as rippers and so on—becomes available. If it is thought desirable that we should have mobile units to go out and help people who are not able to help themselves in the eradication of rabbits, then they can be purchased and put into use. The question of the appointment of the chairman of the board was also raised, but I think we can safely leave that to the advisory board.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You have the power, too.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, I think the Minister has the final say. There are many good men in the Rural and Industries Bank who would be most suitable for the job. I do not think any member would envisage, say, the accountant in the Perth branch being elected as chairman. But I am sure the chairman will be a countryman, and I know one of the Commissioners who would be a most desirable chairman of the advisory board. I am not saying that he will be the man, because maybe he is a little beyond it, but there are other men who could capably carry out the work.

The question of inspectors is also a most important point. I know from practical experience that a board is, to a large extent, dependent on the type of inspectors it has. I know of an inspector employed by a board with which I was associated. That man was a 100 per cent. policeman, and he would have gone a little too far, even for Mr. Logan. He desired to show his authority too much, and many of the

farmers set out to trick him. I realise it is a terrible thing to say, but I know one man who told me, "I tricked old Ernie. I ran my cart round without any pollard in it, just to make a mark." That sort of thing is no good, but on the other hand, a man who is too lenient is not much use, either.

It is difficult to get a good inspector for vermin, or anything else, but the question of the appointment of a vermin inspector and so on will have the attention of the board. If it is not desirable to have one for weeds as well as vermin, then the matter will receive the attention of the board. All those things will be worked out, and the board will learn as it goes along. I have not the slightest doubt that, whoever is Minister for Agriculture next year, he will come along with several amendments based on the experience gained during the 12 months' operation of the board. This is something new to Western Australia, and I feel sure that the board will do a good job.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—The Agriculture Protection Board of Western Australia:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause (2) the word "nine" be struck out and the word "eight" inserted in lieu.

When the Bill was before another place, the word "eight" was struck out and the word "nine" inserted, and I am led to believe that the Government did not offer a great deal of opposition to that proposal. But it will make the board unwieldy. If we have four public servants and four other members, it will be much more satisfactory. By the addition of another public servant to the board, which amendment was made in another place, the board now numbers five public servants and four other members, one to represent the pastoral industry, one to represent the agricultural industry and two representatives of the local authorities. I am now proposing to restore the board to its original number.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I oppose the amendment. I admit that the original Bill contained provision for eight members. I agreed to the suggestion made in another place that nine members should constitute the board because I considered that number was desirable. I believe we have more chance of obtaining money from the Treasury with a board which has a majority of reliable and experienced public servants on it.

They will all be heads of departments with great experience in their various fields, being the Government Entomologist, the principal weeds officer, a vermin officer, a Treasury official, and the chief warden of fauna. That is a most desirable set of public servants to be on any board. I have already told the hon. member that I would agree to his amendment as to the quorum.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I hope the Committee will agree to this amendment. It seems to me that the board is rather unbalanced with five public servants and only four other people who are intimately concerned. If the Committee agrees to the amendment there is no need then to interfere with the quorum provision because with four public servants and four other people a quorum can only be formed with four members and with at least one member from the other four. The Minister does not put forward a very convincing argument when he says that the Treasury will provide more money because this board is comprised of several public servants. The people appointed as members will be responsible individuals and I can imagine that the Treasurer might have even more confidence in some people appointed from outside than he would in some of the officers who may not be as practical in the expenditure of money as they might be.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: As to the board being unwieldy with nine members, the hon. member perhaps does not know that the Royal Commission recommended that 13 members should be appointed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: You did not provide for 13 members in the original Bill.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I know I did not.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Well!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am only telling the hon. member how we departed from the Royal Commission's recommendation, in answer to the suggestion that nine members were too many. This Bill took a great deal of consideration and trouble. We probably did not think of everything. Originally we considered that seven members were enough and then we put on another road board man. I believe that nine members would form quite a desirable board. However, I will leave the matter in the hands of the Committee.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The Minister is making quite a point of citing the recommendation of the Royal Commission just to suit his own argument. In this instance he points out that the Royal Commission recommended the appointment of 13 members. He then said that seven were originally considered, then it went to eight and then in another place another one was added. I think the Minister would have

agreed to any number that might have been suggested. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: One of the reasons why the increase was made from eight to nine was on account of a member successfully moving in another place an amendment the effect of which was to leave only seven on the board. In that case the voting would not be equal and the chairman would not have a casting vote. In another place it was pointed out that a minority may perhaps be able to prevail where there was not an even vote. I think that had some bearing on the point.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not quite correct. The way the Bill reads now is that the chairman has a deliberative vote only and when the voting is equal the question is resolved in the negative.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in lines 12 and 13 the words "the Chief Warden of Fauna" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 24 after the word "one" the words "shall represent" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Parker will probably tell the Committee that it is inserting too many words. Although I do not think it is necessary, I agree to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 25 after the word "two" the words "shall represent" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, and because of the objection raised by the Minister, I now propose to submit a further amendment. I move—

That at the end of Subclause (3) the following words be added: "and the Minister shall nominate such members from such names as are submitted to him by the executive of the organisations concerned."

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

Clauses 6 and 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Powers and duties of the Protection Board:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (d) the following words be added: "except where a person has the consent of the owner or occupier so to do."

By the insertion of those words I desire to allow any person, who has the consent of the owner or occupier, to trap on the property.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to the amendment. It is obvious that in many instances the owner would not be able to spare time to engage in this work and he would consent to someone else doing it. I congratulate the hon. member on his amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Would I be in order in moving an amendment to provide for an increase in the payment for foxes from 6s. to 10s.?

The CHAIRMAN: Where will the money come from?

Hon. A. R. JONES: From the amount provided under the legislation.

The Minister for Agriculture: But that would be out of order!

The CHAIRMAN: If it would mean an impost upon the public purse, this Chamber has no power to do that.

Hon. A. R. JONES: A sum of money is to be provided and it is to be distributed. Could we not say that the allocation should be in a certain way?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment would mean the payment of an extra amount of money. Last year between 30,000 and 40,000 foxes were destroyed and the increase suggested would mean a lot of extra money. I object to the amendment itself; but apart from that, it is out of order as it imposes a charge on the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN: If it does that, the amendment is out of order.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It would not necessarily mean an increased charge on the Treasury. We could raise the maximum to be paid, but that would not mean that it must necessarily be paid.

The Minister for Agriculture: What would be the good of inserting such an amendment?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We could increase the maximum, but it need not be paid.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has no power to increase the maximum, which would be an added burden on the public purse.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Amendment of Section 47:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Will the Minister give an assurance that properties controlled by the war service land settlement authorities will not be excluded from the operations of this legislation? There might be a dispute between the land settlement board and the protection board.

The Minister for Agriculture: The protection board would confer with the land settlement board.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I think something more definite is required to make sure that the land settlement board will do what is required. I know of an instance where the board neglected to eradicate star thistle that infested one property and did not take steps to get rid of vermin there. It took a long time to get the board to do anything, with the result that the pest had a wonderful start. It was a costly business before the situation was under control. The board should be compelled to undertake such work.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think the position is well tied up in the Bill. Should a dispute arise between the two boards, the matter would be referred to the Government and the necessary action would be taken.

Hon. A. R. Jones: But that takes a long time.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know how it could be attended to in a more direct way or in less time.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: To give the Minister an instance of what happens, during the last three or four months sheep were grazing on a property controlled by the land settlement board. The area was over-run with Cape tulip. The sheep were transferred to a clean property in the Narrogin district. In that case the protection board would have no authority. The sheep were shifted, and the damage was done. Inevitably the wool would be infested with seed and in turn the clean property would be infested.

Hon. A. R. JONES: In view of the fact that noxious weeds come to maturity and shed their seeds in from five to six months, there is necessity for prompt action. If we have to wait until Parliament is in session before power can be brought to bear on the land settlement board to do what is required, there will be too much wasted time and difficulty will be experienced in overcoming the lag.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It will not be necessary to wait until Parliament is in session. Such a matter would be dealt with by the Government itself. Should an argument arise between the land settlement board and the agriculture protection board, the matter would be referred to Cabinet and the position rectified. If that does not work, an alteration could be effected within 12 months.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 23 to 33, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 11.44 p.m.