Act, 1959, does not prescribe the manner in which evidence may be secured for use in proceedings under that Act.

In consequence of this, therefore, it will be apparent that any person, even though he be unsuitable to do so, can engage in securing evidence to be used in divorce proceedings, and any person who wishes to can engage in the business as an inquiry agent for the purpose of securing evidence to be used in any court, without requiring a license. The Commissioner of Police considers this to be most unsatisfactory as it would enable any convicted or other undesirable person to set himself up in business as an inquiry agent.

With the amendments submitted in this Bill it is proposed to amend the law to one of general application covering the whole field of private detection or investigation for reward, without any specific reference to any Act.

Certain exemptions are made to these provisions in that a member of the Police Force, a legal practitioner, and certain others will not require to be licensed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Toms.

House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 1st September, 1964

CONTENTS

Page

BILLS—
- Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 667
  - Com.; Report 671
- Agriculture Protection Board Act Amendment Bill—
  - Intro.; 1r. 663
- Alsatian Dog Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 681
  - Com.; Report 683
- Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 683
  - Com.; Report 685
- Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 664
  - Com.; Report 666
- Forests Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 671
  - Com. 676
- Health Act Amendment Bill—
  - Intro.; 1r. 663
- Milk Act Amendment Bill—
  - Intro.; 1r. 663
- Radioactive Substances Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 685
  - Com.; Report 685
- University of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 666
  - Com.; Report 667
- Vermin Act Amendment Bill—
  - 2r. 663
  - Com.; Report 664

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—
- Alcoholic Content of Beer: Percentage 662
- Apprentices: Increase in Rate of Payment 654
- Drainage of Woodrow Avenue Area, Yokine: Plans and Estimated Cost 652
- Education—
  - Financial Aid for Denominational and State Schools: Reply to Correspondence 662
  - Primary School at Carnarvon: Area of School Grounds 654
  - South Kensington School: Mentally Retarded and Slow Learning Pupils 661
- Fluorine and Fluoridation of Water: Replies to Previous Question 662
- Government Offices under Construction: Safety Precautions against Falling Materials 659
- Houses for Natives: Construction in the North-West 659
- Itinerant Vendors: License Fees 652
- Legislative Assembly Districts Redistribution: Division of North-West Area 661
- Leopold Downs Land—
  - Non-transference to Norwest Development Corporation 661
  - Transfer to Drove Pty. Ltd. 660
- Loans by Private Banks: Keeping of Borrowers' Trading Accounts as a Condition 660
- Mines Department: Use of Mechanical Drills for Prospecting 662
- Old Barracks: Demolition 659
- Ord River Scheme—
  - Capital Outlay 658
  - Farms Allocated and Acreage 658
  - Improvements to Land before Release 658
  - Land for Various Crops 658
- Rural and Industries Bank—
  - E. S. Clementson Interests: Acceptance of Business by Bank 661
  - Keeping of Borrowers' Trading Accounts 660
  - Keeping of E. S. Clementson Trading Account 660, 661
  - Loans to E. S. Clementson Interests: Amounts and Government Backing 661
  - Loans to North-West Companies 660
- Sawmilling at Pemberton—
  - Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies: Liability for Royalty Payments 656
  - Previous Log Intake and Future Plans 656
- T.A.B. Agency 81: Telephone Bets—
  - Auditors' Report on Transaction 657
  - Cancellation of Tickets 657
  - Dismissal of Agent 657
  - Payment of Cheque by Agent 657
  - Questionnaire 657
  - Refund of Money to Bettor 657
  - Refusal of Acceptance by T.A.B. Collating Centre 656
  - Treatment of Ex-agent 657
- Taxi Control Board: Election and Appointment of Representatives 652

CONTENTS—*continued*

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—*continued*	
Unlawful Carnal Knowledge Cases: Number of Offenders and Penalties Imposed	655
Weeds and Seeds Branch— Administration Costs	654
Charges to Clover Producers	654
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Building Projects: Loss of Life	663
Sawmilling at Pemberton—Hawker Sidderley Building Supplies: Liability for Royalty Permits	663
T.A.B. Collating Centre: Refusal to Accept Bets	663

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ITINERANT VENDORS

License Fees

1. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Health:

   (1) Is he aware that in order to prevent or hinder the operations of itinerant vendors of food, some local authorities are endeavouring to fix annual licenses at high figures?

   (2) What is the greatest amount that can be charged?

   (3) What is the highest license fee for which approval has been sought by a local authority, and by which local authority?

   (4) What is the highest figure so far approved?

   (5) Is he aware of concern on the part of fruit and vegetable vendors and others at the current spate of endeavours to step up annual license fees to the point of being prohibitive?

   (6) Have such vendors any protection against excessive charges; and, if so, what?

   Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

   (1) Yes.

   (2) The Health Act permits "reasonable" fees to be fixed for licenses granted under the by-laws. This is officially interpreted as being not more than £10.

   (3) The Belmont Shire Council has sought a fee of £100, except for vendors of fruit, vegetables and fish, who would be charged £5

   (4) £10.

   (5) No.

   (6) The Commissioner of Public Health can refuse to confirm a fee which is considered unreasonable.

DRAINAGE OF WOODROW AVENUE AREA, YOKINE

Plans and Estimated Cost

2. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

   (1) Are there any firm plans for drainage of the Woodrow Avenue, Yokine, area?

   (2) If so, what are they and what is the time schedule, especially for completion?

   (3) What is the estimated cost of the work?

   Mr. WILD replied:

   (1) Yes.

   (2) In the current financial year a pumping station will be constructed in Wordsworth Avenue with a rising main to Dog Swamp and temporary drains will be built to drain water from Woodrow Avenue to Wordsworth Avenue. Next financial year permanent drains will be laid.

   (3) The estimated cost for the 1964-65 programme is £34,000. The estimate for the 1965-66 programme is not yet available.

TAXI CONTROL BOARD

Election and Appointment of Representatives

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

   Respecting the election and appointment of representatives of taxi-car owners and operators to the Taxi Control Board—

   (1) What list was used to show who were entitled to consideration for entitlement to vote?

   (2) What steps were taken to ascertain whether alleged members of the W.A. Taxi Operators' Association or other taxi-car owners and operators were still engaged in the industry?

   (3) How many owners and operators were excluded from the balloting list on the ground that they were members of the association?

   (4) What is the definition of a member of that association?

   (5) Has he a copy of its rules?

   (6) If so, will he supply one? If not, will he obtain and supply one?

   (7) What check was made as to the accuracy of the membership roll of the association?

(8) If a check was made, how many names were found of—
  (a) persons who had never paid a membership fee to the association;
  (b) persons who had paid no membership fees for some years since joining;
  (c) person who having been members, had resigned prior to the conduct of the ballot?

(9) Were any complaints lodged by persons who claimed they were wrongfully shown as members of the association, thereby being denied the right to participate in the ballot?

(10) How many such complaints were made?

(11) What steps were taken to check the validity of these complaints?

(12) Will he now investigate when a membership fee was last paid to the association by all those listed as being members, and advise how many have paid nothing for—
  (a) one year;
  (b) two years;
  (c) three years;
  (d) four years;
  (e) five years;
  (f) more than five years?

(13) If not, why not?

(14) How many ballot papers were issued?

(15) How many votes were cast?

(16) How many, from the list used, were eligible to vote?

(17) Who were the candidates and how many votes did each receive?

(18) Who were returned as the successful candidates?

(19) What positions were held in the association by the two persons elected to the board?

(20) When did they relinquish those positions?

(21) When were nominations called for appointments to the board?

(22) When did nominations close?

(23) When was the election held?

(24) Is he completely satisfied that the voting list employed was a true and correct list, or does he agree that numbers of eligible persons were disfranchised?

(25) If of the latter opinion, will he investigate just how an inaccurate list came to be prepared and used?

(26) Is there any manner in which the position can be rectified if the foregoing suggestions are reasonably in accordance with fact, and if so will he outline the course to be followed?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) A roll of electors was prepared pursuant to regulation No. 9 of the Taxi Control Board (Elections) Regulations, 1964.

(2) None. This is not required under the regulations.

(3) 230.

(4) A member of the association means a member as defined under the constitution of the W.A. Taxi Operators' Association.

(5) Yes.

(6) Yes.

(7) None. The Commissioner of Transport has no authority to check the membership roll of the association. The roll of members produced was certified in conformity with the regulations mentioned in No. (1).

(8) Answered by No. (7).

(9) Yes.

(10) Four written complaints.

(11) The question of complainants' membership was referred to the association which reaffirmed the complainants' membership.

(12) No.

(13) The Minister is not given the authority to do so.

(14) 887.

(15) 567 were cast.

(16) 887.

(17) First count:

A. A. Clifford	216
W. H. Harmsworth	2
J. P. Healy	77
W. Herbert	50
R. H. Macfarlane	8
G. D. McEwen	95
C. A. Renshaw	15
E. T. Sunnucks	97
	560

(18) Messrs. A. A. Clifford and J. P. Healy.

(19) A. A. Clifford—Nil.
J. P. Healy—Secretary.

(20) Mr. Healy resigned as a member of the association on the 18th March, 1964, but continued his appointment as secretary.

(21) By the Chief Electoral Officer in the *Government Gazette*, the 6th March, 1964, and notice in *The West Australian*, the 7th March, 1964.

(22) Noon on the 26th March, 1964.

(23) The 30th April, 1964.

(24) The roll of persons eligible to vote was compiled in accordance with the regulations.

(25) and (26) Answered by No. (24). I have a copy of the constitution of the W.A. Taxi Operators' Association which I wish to table.

The paper was tabled.

PRIMARY SCHOOL AT CARNARVON

Area of School Grounds

4. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Education:

(1) What is the area of the primary school grounds at Carnarvon?

(2) Is this area considered to be adequate for the present number of children enrolled?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) Approximately five acres.

(2) We prefer a school site to be larger than this, but in view of the adjoining sports ground it is considered that the Carnarvon primary school site is adequate.

WEEDS AND SEEDS BRANCH

Administration Costs

5. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

What is—

(a) total cost of running the Weeds and Seeds Branch of the Department of Agriculture;

(b) total costs to Weeds and Seeds Branch of—

(i) certification of paddocks for clover seed production;

(ii) total cost of inspectors employed in sheds sampling and sealing clover in bags;

(iii) total cost of germination tests in department's laboratories?

Charges to Clover Producers

(c) Total amount charged to clover producers for—

(i) wages of inspectors in sheds;

(ii) charges made to producers for certification of pure strains?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The following information relates to 1963-64:—

(a) £75,836.

(b) Accurate figures cannot be given, mainly because of combined duties. The following are approximate:—

(i) £3,700.

(ii) £3,700.

(iii) £2,250.

(c) Accurate figures would take considerable time to extract but would approximate the following:—

(i) £1,200.

(ii) £12,000.

APPRENTICES

Increase in Rate of Payment

6. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Works:

(1) As State Government dissatisfaction is expressed in *The West Australian* of the 21st August, 1964, regarding insufficient numbers of apprentices registering for employment, will he recommend as an inducement to recruitment in Government departments the payment of a percentage of the tradesman rate instead of the present basic wage percentage to—

(a) making all trades that much more financially attractive;

(b) setting an example to private and local government employers to follow State Government policy in this matter;

(c) obtain tradesmen at less cost to the community than importing them and their families as migrants?

(2) If his reply is to the effect that apprentices' wages are the business of Industrial Court determination, what prevents the Government from granting the suggested increases by administrative action?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) and (2) There is no need at this stage for any inducement to recruitment for apprentices in Government departments as recently there have been more applicants than vacancies.

The suggestion of a percentage of the tradesman's rate instead of the basic wage has been argued by the unions on several occasions before the Court of Arbitration and refused. The reasons for these refusals and the difficulties as far as our industrial

provisions are concerned are clearly demonstrated in the decisions given in volumes 38, page 267, and 43, page 189, of the *West Australian Industrial Gazette.*

With the creation of an Apprenticeship Council, all facets of the system will be investigated trade by trade, resulting, it is hoped, in an increase in the number of apprentices employed in industry.

UNLAWFUL CARNAL KNOWLEDGE CASES

Number of Offenders and Penalties Imposed

7. Mr. GRAHAM: asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) Respecting the offence of unlawful carnal knowledge and charges arising therefrom and heard by courts since the 1st July, 1962—

(a) How many offenders were found to be guilty?

(b) Of this number, how many had a previous conviction for a sex offence?

(c) What was the penalty in each case the subject of question (b)?

(d) Of those offenders who had no previous sex conviction, what were the terms of imprisonment in each case, other than the one in which the penalty was two years' imprisonment plus 12 strokes of the birch?

(e) In how many cases did the penalty involve no term of imprisonment whatsoever?

(f) Are there instances where persons who had already been convicted of sex offences were subsequently found guilty of unlawful carnal knowledge, yet received no prison sentence?

(2) Other than the instance mentioned in (1) (d), are there any cases where a person without previous conviction for a sex offence and subsequently found guilty of unlawful carnal knowledge of a girl under the age of 16 years has been awarded the maximum term of two years' imprisonment plus a birching?

(3) If so, how many, when, and who was on the bench?

(4) Will he supply the information contained in the replies to the foregoing to the leader writer of *The West Australian?*

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) (a) A total of 163 persons were found guilty, comprising 98 adults and 65 juveniles. All, with the exception of one charge, were dealt with in children's courts.

(b) Of the 163 total, 18 offenders had a previous conviction for a sex crime.

(c) Of the 18 who had a previous conviction for a sex offence, the penalties were as follows:—No imprisonment—7 (6 juveniles and 1 adult); three months' imprisonment—1 (adult); six months' imprisonment—5 (adults); nine months' imprisonment—1 (adult); twelve months' imprisonment—2 (adults); *eighteen months' imprisonment—1 (adult); thirty months' imprisonment—1 (adult) (on two charges); total—18.

(d) 145 offenders had no previous sex conviction. Of this total, 31 were sentenced to terms of imprisonment, as follows:—Three months' imprisonment—5 (1 juvenile and 4 adults); four months' imprisonment—5 (adults); six months' imprisonment—6 (adults); nine months' imprisonment—3 (adults); twelve months' imprisonment—7 (adults); fifteen months' imprisonment—2 (adults) (one offender dealt with Supreme Court on his own election to be tried by a jury); *eighteen months' imprisonment—3 (adults); total—31.

(e) No term of imprisonment was imposed upon 121 of the grand total of 163 persons, as per question (a).

(f) No term of imprisonment was imposed upon seven of the 18 persons who had already been convicted of sex offences and were subsequently found guilty of unlawful carnal knowledge, as set out under (c).

(2) and (3) Other than the instance mentioned in question No. 1 (d), there are no other cases on record during this period.

(4) The information, having been supplied in Parliament, is now available to Press and public alike.

* The maximum sentence under subsection (3) of section 20B of the Child Welfare Act, where sentence is imposed by a children's court on a person over 18 years,

is 18 months. The other maximum penalties which can be imposed for this offence are:

(a) By children's courts:
  (i) Where offender is under 16—3 months.
  (ii) Where offender is over 16 and under 18—6 months.

(b) By Supreme Court:
  (i) Where the girl is under 16—5 years.
  (ii) Where the girl is under 13—life.
  (iii) Where offender is under 21—2 years.

With or without whipping in each case.

SAWMILLING AT PEMBERTON

Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies: Liability for Royalty Payments

8. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Forests:

On Tuesday, the 11th August, 1964, he informed the House in answer to a series of questions concerning conditions at Pemberton mill owned by Hawker Siddeley Company that:—

(a) "Action is actively under consideration" to impose the conditions of paragraph (1) of regulation No. 57 of Forest Regulations of the Forests Act, viz.: "where a permit holder fails to maintain his log intake in accordance with the conditions set forth in his permit, he shall pay at least 60 per centum of the royalty computed on his maximum authorised intake," and

(b) The question is also under consideration of requesting the conservator to investigate the position with respect to imposing the provisions of paragraph (2) of regulation 57 which reads: "Where in the opinion of the conservator a permit holder fails to maintain a log intake for what the conservator in his discretion considers an unreasonable period the conservator may reduce the area proportionately"—

(1) Is he in a position to inform the House in regard to (a) what action, if any, has been taken?

(2) Has an account for £11,008 been rendered to Hawker Siddeley by the Forests Department?

Previous Log Intake and Future Plans

(3) As Hawker Siddeley Company failed to maintain a log intake for some four years does the conservator consider this an unreasonable period?

(4) What proposals have been made to the Forests Department by Hawker Siddeley?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) and (2) Yes. Hawker Siddeley has been advised in writing of its liabilities for royalty payments under Forests Act regulation No. 57.

(3) Hawker Siddeley's log intake has fallen below the 60 per cent. provided for under Forests Act regulation No. 57 only during the past two years.

In view of plans submitted by Hawker Siddeley for a replacement of the burnt-out Pemberton mill by a modern, highly-mechanised mill, it is not considered that this is an unreasonable period, having regard to the problems involved in planning such a mill and securing the right equipment.

(4) Numerous consultations over the past two years between the Conservator of Forests and Hawker Siddeley have resulted in proposals being submitted with plans for future operations.

T.A.B. AGENCY 81: TELEPHONE BETS

Refusal of Acceptance by T.A.B. Collating Centre

9. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Did the T.A.B. agent at Agency 81 on the 8th December, 1962, take two telephone bets of £50 from a bettor for investment on the horses, Gloucester Chief and Gallant Mark which were competing in the Hilton Park Handicap to be run at Richmond Raceway that night?

(2) Did the agent machine tickets for the bets?

(3) When the agent rang the collating centre of the T.A.B. did that centre refuse to accept the bets?

(4) Did the agent, in accordance with the procedure permitted by the board, lend to the bettor the £100 to enable him to make the bets by telephone?

(5) Was not the agent, therefore, because of the board's refusal of the bets, put in the position that if either horse won he personally

would have to pay the bettor and if both horses were beaten he would have to stand the loss if the bettor failed to pay for the bets?

(6) Have there been any other cases of a similar nature?

Cancellation of Tickets

(7) Several minutes after the horses Gloucester Chief and Gallant Mark, the subject of the two bets, had been beaten in the Hilton Park Handicap, did an employee of the Totalisator Agency Board at the collating centre ring the agent at Agency 81 and inquire if the tickets for the refused bets had been machined and then cancelled?

(8) Upon being informed that the tickets had been machined but not cancelled did the employee from the collating centre instruct the agent to cancel the tickets?

(9) What was the reason for instructing the agent to cancel the tickets if it were other than to show that the bets had not been accepted by the board?

Payment of Cheque by Agent

(10) Later, did Mr. Bryth, investigation officer, T.A.B., tell the agent that although he had personally fielded the bets he could not keep the money?

(11) Following this advice, did the agent make an appointment to see the chairman, Mr. Maher, and upon the latter's insistence upon the former's paying over of the money, a cheque for £96 5s. was paid in?

(12) Did not this cheque for £96 5s. represent the amount involved for the two wagers on Gloucester Chief and Gallant Mark which the board refused to accept, less the agent's commission?

(13) Did not the agent argue that as he had to stand any loss which could result from the bets which the board refused he was entitled to the money for the bets and not the board?

(14) Was it not until Mr. Maher said he would terminate the agent's employment if he did not pay over the money that the latter paid in his cheque for £96 5s.?

Questionnaire

(15) Did Mr. Maher hand two questionnaires to the agent and ask him to give one to the bettor concerned?

(16) Will he supply a copy of the questionnaire?

Refund of Money to Bettor

(17) Did the bettor ask unsuccessfully for his money for the cancelled bets to be refunded?

(18) Why has it not been refunded in view of the fact that the bets were refused by the board which is the only authority legally empowered to accept them?

Dismissal of Agent

(19) Did Mr. Maher tell the agent that he did not want to get rid of him, but the board had instructed him to dispense with the agent's services?

(20) Did Mr. Maher at first suspend the agent and subsequently dismiss him?

(21) Were the members of the board aware of the details of the two bets on Gloucester Chief and Gallant Mark taken at Agency 81 but not accepted by the collating centre and of the fact that the chairman had demanded and obtained the £100, less commission, following a threat to sack the agent if he did not hand over the money?

(22) Were the members of the board aware also that the chairman had refused to refund to the bettor the £100 for the cancelled bets?

(23) Will he reconcile the answers which he gave to Nos. (4), (6) (7) of question No. 20 on Wednesday, the 12th August (when he said that the board retained no money from cancelled bets) with the answers to these questions?

Treatment of Ex-agent

(24) Does he not think that the ex-agent, who is a soldier pensioner, was treated harshly and ungratefully considering that through his agency the board profited by £96 5s. for bets which it declined to accept and which it instructed were to be cancelled?

(25) Does he propose to do any more about the matter now than he did in February and March, 1963, when it was first brought under his notice?

(26) If "Yes," what does he propose to do?

Auditors' Report on Transaction

(27) Did the auditors, Messrs. McLaren & Stewart, report on the transactions?

(28) If not, why did they not do so?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes, in the belief that the bets had not been accepted by its agent.

(4) It is not known for certain as to who supplied the money to cover the bets or how they were placed, but the bets were in fact paid for.

(5) No.

(6) Not as far as known or as can be remembered.

(7) Yes, but these were not the only questions asked of the agent at the time.

(8) It is believed that the agent was not instructed to cancel the tickets but that the matter would be looked into later.

(9) Answered by No. (8) above.

(10) No, but the agent was informed that the money did not belong to him.

(11) Yes, but the agent saw the chairman at the request of the chairman.

(12) Yes, but the bets had been accepted by the board through its agent.

(13) Yes.

(14) No.

(15) No, but the agent and the bettor concerned were asked to complete statutory declarations along certain lines under the Evidence Act, 1906.

(16) No.

(17) The bettor unsuccessfully asked for a return of the money on the bets accepted by the board through its agent.

(18) Because the bets were accepted by the board through its agent.

(19) No, the chairman informed the agent that in lieu of dismissing him as directed by the board, he would merely suspend the agent to give him an opportunity of placing further evidence before the board in the form of a statutory declaration.

(20) Yes, but the dismissal was at the direction of the board.

(21) The board was fully informed of such true facts surrounding the acceptance of these two bets as were known, but there was no threat to sack the agent.

(22) Yes, the board made the decision that the backer was not entitled to a refund.

(23) No reconciliation is necessary.

(24) No; but the acceptance of the bets was complete.

(25) to (27) No.

(28) Because the matter was properly handled by the board and its staff.

ORD RIVER SCHEME

Land for Various Crops

10. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) What area of land has been set aside for development in the Ord River scheme, declared suited to the production of—

(a) cotton;

(b) rice;

(c) sugar cane;

(d) safflower;

(e) other purposes?

(2) Is this area to be brought into production in several stages? If so, what area is contained in each stage?

Farms Allocated and Acreage

(3) How many farms have been allocated to date?

(4) What is the average acreage of each unit?

(5) Is this acreage to be the size pattern for all future allocations?

Improvements to Land before Release

(6) What improvements were effected by the Government and at what cost on each location before being handed over to settlers?

(7) Is this amount repayable by the settler on an extended terms basis? If not how are the costs absorbed?

Capital Outlay

(8) What is the capital outlay on the Ord scheme to date—

(a) State Government;

(b) Commonwealth Government?

(9) Is each farm unit handed over to the settler fully developed or is he faced with further developmental capital outlay?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) About 175,000 acres of irrigable land are expected to be suitable for growing cotton, rice, sugar cane, safflower, and other proven crops, subject to final soil tests on certain small areas.

(2) The area is being developed in two stages. Stage one consists of a gross area of approximately 29,000 acres and is being progressively allocated. This area is irrigated from the already completed diversion dam. Stage two comprises the remainder and cannot be developed until the main dam is built.

(3) Twenty.

(4) The former pilot farm is approximately 2,400 acres and the remaining 19 farms average approximately 668 acres.

(5) An average farm size of 660 acres is expected to be maintained for the balance of stage one. Subsequent farm sizes have yet to be determined.

(6) The Government, on request, will carry out clearing, burning, picking up after burning, ploughing, rooting, cultivating, grading, and ditching on two-thirds of the property. The cost to the settlers is not to exceed £20 per acre.

(7) Interest on £20 per acre is paid during the first five years. Capital cost is repayable over the next 25 years in equal half-yearly instalments.

(8) Capital outlay to the 30th June, 1964—

(a) State—£2,386,716

(b) Commonwealth—£4,895,559.

(9) No. The farmer will be required to develop the remaining one-third of his farm plus further land preparation, and provision of irrigation control structures, turnouts, syphons, culverts, etc., on that area developed by the Government.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Safety Precautions against Falling Materials

11. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it a fact that nuts and bolts, a spanner and other materials have been falling from the upper floors of the new State Government offices building endangering the lives of the men working on the lower floors?

(2) If so, what safety precautions are being taken to protect the men working below?

(3) Would he confer with the constructors to enforce that the safety precautions to be taken will be of the highest nature?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) I understand that there have been cases of falling objects.

(2) The Scaffolding Branch of the Department of Labour convened a conference on the site with representatives of the contractor, architect, subcontractors and unions to discuss overall safety on the site. As a result of this conference a qualified safety engineer gave three safety addresses on the site, followed by representatives of the Department of Labour showing safety films. In addition, the contractor arranged the employment of a qualified person to watch safety on the job.

(3) This has already been done by the scaffolding departmental representatives who are keeping a keen watch on this project, and they report that the contractor is making a maximum effort to observe safe working methods.

HOUSES FOR NATIVES

Construction in the North-West

12. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

How many houses for native families will be built this financial year in the towns of—

Broome;
Derby;
Wyndham;
Halls Creek;
Fitzroy Crossing;
Kununurra?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

	Type III	Type V
Broome	 3	5
Derby	 3	5
Wyndham		3
Halls Creek	 3	

Fitzroy Crossing—Nil.

Kununurra—Provision of housing at Kununurra is being investigated.

OLD BARRACKS

Demolition

13. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has any decision yet been made regarding the future of the "Old Barracks"?

(2) If so, will the buildings—

(a) be completely demolished;

(b) be partly demolished;

(c) portion re-erected elsewhere?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) and (b) All buildings will be completely demolished, except the archway which will be left to enable a final decision to be made whether it should remain or be demolished.

(c) It is not proposed to re-erect any portion of the buildings elsewhere, but arrangements will be made to make available to the Historical Society a quantity of the face bricks for its use.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK

Loans to North-West Companies

14. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for the North-West:

In connection with the various transactions relating to the Broome Freezing & Chilling Works Pty. Ltd., Drove Pty. Ltd., Norwest Development Corporation Ltd. and Kimberley Meats (1964) Pty. Ltd., in what way will the transfer of indebtedness to the Rural and Industries Bank "speed the repayment of what was owed" as claimed by him in a public statement?

Mr. COURT replied:

It was not a question of transferring indebtedness to the Rural and Industries Bank. Broome Freezing & Chilling Works Pty. Ltd. was already indebted to the bank. The reason the change in major shareholding in this company is expected to speed the repayment of what was owed was that it was possible to enter into a repayment programme designed to liquidate the indebtedness by 1971. Under the previous major share ownership the Government was advised that the Government would need to arrange substantial sums, firstly to meet specifications for meat export to America on an urgency basis, and then to bring the works up to the required capacity and standard. The then major shareholders made it clear to the Government they had no available resources of their own from which they could expect either to provide development capital or its repayment.

LOANS BY PRIVATE BANKS

Keeping of Borrowers' Trading Accounts as a Condition

15. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

In all the banking experience upon which he relied for justification of his attitude in refusing to answer whether the Government had directed the Rural and Industries Bank to make credit available to E. S. Clementson's interests, had he known or heard of any instances of a private bank lending substantial sums to a borrower without insisting that the latter allow the lending bank to keep the trading account?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

It would be the general rule for the lending bank to expect the trading account.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK

Keeping of E. S. Clementson Trading Account

16. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Why has not the Rural and Industries Bank which has provided hundreds of thousands of pounds of finance for the benefit of E. S. Clementson's interests insisted upon having the trading account as a condition precedent to the granting of financial accommodation to those interests?

(2) Would it not be in accordance with "accepted banking principles and ethics" for the Rural and Industries Bank to insist on having the keeping of the trading account?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) In view of the wide publicity given this matter since it was raised in Parliament, the client concerned has consented to information being made available to the House —so conforming with "accepted banking principles and ethics"— that it conducts an operative and valuable trading account with the Rural and Industries Bank of W.A. Further—and again with the client's consent—I can inform the honourable member that in the normal course of business a substantial credit balance has been maintained in this client's trading account with the bank.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

Keeping of Borrowers' Trading Accounts

17. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Is it the practice of the Rural and Industries Bank to require borrowers to have their trading accounts kept by it?

(2) Are there any instances in which the Rural and Industries Bank has the keeping of the trading account but a private bank has provided the necessary financial accommodation to enable the business to operate?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) Yes; it is the general practice.

(2) Yes.

LEOPOLD DOWNS LAND

Transfer to Drove Pty. Ltd.

18. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Did he personally sign the transfer of land from Leopold Downs to Drove Pty. Ltd.?

(2) If "No," who did?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) No.

(2) The transfer was signed by the Officer-in-Charge, Registration and Deeds Branch, who has authority under section 143 of the Land Act.

Non-transference to Norwest Development Corporation

19. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

What was the reason Leopold Downs could not be transferred to Norwest Development Corporation Ltd. as was at first intended?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

Norwest Development Corporation Ltd. was not stated as the transferee for Leopold Downs. The transfer submitted to the Lands Department was in the name of Drove Pty. Ltd.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK

Keeping of E. S. Clementson Trading Account

20. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Is it dealing fairly with the State to put the Rural and Industries Bank in a position of carrying the debts of the E. S. Clemenston interests with its attendant risk of loss and allow a private bank which refused to make the accommodation available to benefit from the keeping of the trading account?

(2) Is not such conduct "contrary to accepted banking principles and ethics" and likely to "undermine public confidence in the bank"?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) and (2) Please refer to my reply to question No. 16 on today's notice paper.

Loans to E. S. Clementson Interests: Amounts and Government Backing

21. Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:

(1) Which of the loans, if any, made by the Rural and Industries Bank to E. S. Clementson's interests are backed by a Government guarantee?

(2) What is the amount involved?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) No fresh loans were made. The loan continued to the company, the major shareholders of which were changed.

(2) The amount involved is £200,000, and is to be repaid between January, 1965, and January, 1971. Furthermore, the new arrangement is an improvement in that it relieves the Government of finding new capital for expansion —as would have been the case with the previous owner, who had limited resources for essential development. This means the Government faces no new commitments and can look forward to complete repayment within six years.

E. S. Clementson Interests: Acceptance of Business by Bank

22. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

Will he state, unequivocally, whether or not any Minister in the Government exerted pressure on the Rural and Industries Bank to accept the business of E. S. Clementson concerning the Broome Freezing & Chilling Works Pty. Ltd. and related transactions, under the terms and conditions which obtain?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No pressure was exerted by any Minister of the Crown on the Board of Commissioners of the bank which made its own decision relating to the bank's own funds.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS REDISTRIBUTION

Division of North-West Area

23. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) When any future redistribution of Legislative Assembly boundaries takes place under the Electoral Districts Act, will the North-West Area as defined in section 11A subsection (1) (e) be divided into three Assembly districts?

(2) If not, why not?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) When any future redistribution of Legislative Assembly boundaries takes place under the Electoral Districts Act as it is at present, the North-West Area as defined in section IIA, subsection (1) (e) will not be divided into three Assembly districts.

(2) The Electoral Districts Act, 1947-1963, does not provide for it.

SOUTH KENSINGTON SCHOOL

Mentally Retarded and Slow Learning Pupils

24. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Education:

Further to my question, being No. (1) on the notice paper of Thursday of last week—

Does he agree there is no difference between a child who has no appreciation of what is being

said, when spoken to, and a child who understands fully what is being said when spoken to?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

There is obviously a difference between the two types of children mentioned.

However, when deciding the appropriate type of education for a child it is necessary to take many complex factors into consideration.

FINANCIAL AID FOR DENOMINATIONAL AND STATE SCHOOLS

Reply to Correspondence

25. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is he in receipt of correspondence from me dated the 31st July, 1964, and the 3rd August, 1964, regarding State aid for independent schools and increased financial aid for State primary schools respectively?

(2) If so, when can I expect a reply containing the information sought?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) A reply to the former letter is in course. A reply to the latter was written on the 26th August, 1964.

ALCOHOLIC CONTENT OF BEER

Percentage

26. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What percentage is the alcoholic content of beer being brewed and sold in Western Australia?

(2) Is it the Government's intention to take the necessary steps to have the alcoholic content reduced?

(3) If not, why not?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Approximately 4.25 per cent. (i.e. equivalent to 8.5 per cent. proof spirit).

(2) and (3) No. The present alcoholic content is similar to that in other States and there is no public demand for a reduction.

MINES DEPARTMENT

Use of Mechanical Drills for Prospecting

27. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) What year did the Mines Department first purchase mechanical drills for use in prospecting for gold and other minerals?

(2) How many drills were in operation at the end of the first three years of the scheme?

(3) How many drills now come under this section?

(4) What footage per drill has been achieved in each of the years since inception of the scheme?

(5) What has been the annual expenditure?

(6) What fields were examined?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I ask that this question be postponed. I discussed the position with the Minister for Mines this afternoon and he asked me to say that every endeavour was being made to secure the information, but that a lot of research was necessary. He hopes to have the answer in the near future, and it is for that reason I have asked that the question be postponed from day to day. As soon as I am provided with the answer I will let the honourable member have it.

FLUORINE AND FLUORIDATION OF WATER

Replies to Previous Question

28. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Minister for Health):

On Tuesday, the 4th August, 1964, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked a series of questions regarding fluoridation, and I replied to the effect that the necessary inquiries would be made. The answers to the five questions he asked are now given as follows:—

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) The main reason appears to be that several sources of "ground water" in Denmark already contain one part per million or more of fluoride.

(4) Yes, a Select Committee of four persons did so recommend, but the report is still being examined.

(5) It is not necessarily significant that four members of a State Legislature should not be in favour of fluoridation at the moment.

The series of questions referred to above appears on page 22 of Hansard No. 2, as No. 1A (1), (2), and (3); and No. 1B (1) and (2).

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BUILDING PROJECTS

Loss of Life

1. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Works:

   Is it a fact that on such large building projects as the new State Government building on the Observatory site for every £1,000,000 worth of building there is an anticipated loss of one life?

   Mr. WILD replied:

   I am completely without knowledge of this, but I will ascertain whether it is so and inform the honourable member tomorrow.

T.A.B. COLLATING CENTRE

Refusal to Accept Bets

2. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Police:

   I would refer the Minister to question No. 9 (3) asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. Am I to understand from the Minister's reply that the collating centre does reject bets or refuse to accept them from agents of the T.A.B.?

   If that is the case, and seeing that the T.A.B. has a monopoly of betting, where can the punter get a bet?

   Mr. CRAIG replied:

   For reasons that will be obvious to the honourable member, the board must naturally have discretionary power to refuse a bet if it feels inclined to do so. In this instance the agent sought permission to place the bet after the start of the race; but, as I said previously, the board has discretionary power, because agents are required to transmit the bets to the collating centre within a certain period of time so that the collating centre can transfer these bets to the on course totalisator.

3. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Police:

   I presume that if the bet is transmitted within a specified time there will be no question of its being refused by the collating centre?

   Mr. CRAIG replied:

   No; although there is a specified time laid down to enable the bulk of the money or the investments received by the agency to be transferred to the on course totalisator. The agent is permitted, in the normal way, to take bets virtually up to the start of the race.

SAWMILLING AT PEMBERTON

Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies: Liability for Royalty Payments

4. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Forests:

   I would refer the Minister to question No. 8 (b) (2) on today's notice paper, and ask if he is in a position to state whether the amount has been met or not; and, if not, why not?

   Mr. BOVELL replied:

   I am not in a position to state at this moment whether or not the amount has been met.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Milk Act Amendment Bill.
2. Agriculture Protection Board Act Amendment Bill.

   Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.

3. Health Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health), and read a first time.

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn) [4.59 p.m.]: This Bill contains two small amendments, the first of which seeks to raise the rate from the present amount of 3d. on unimproved capital value, to 6d.

I understand that the Pastoralists & Graziers Association is quite happy about this amount of increase. I have no feelings at all against the raising of the rate, provided it does not apply to other sections of people who normally pay vermin rates. I understand that the Minister, in his introduction, said it was for pastoral areas only; and I take it that will be the position.

However, as the amount is to be based on the unimproved values of pastoral properties, which are very low, the total that will be collected from this source will not be very large, although the rate is to be doubled. With the commitments which the department must face in increasing proportions from now on, it will soon find that the rate of 3d. should be increased a little higher. I suppose we should be thankful for small mercies, and be content with the rate at the present level.

The second amendment contained in the Bill appears to be a wise one also. It deals with an important principle. All vermin, whether they be animals, birds, or insects, are to be regarded as vermin wherever they are at large. I think that is the principle which has prompted the second amendment—that because those creatures are regarded as vermin at all times, they should undoubtedly come under the control of the Vermin Act, wherever they may be found.

Goats have been mentioned specifically. It is well known that once these animals are allowed to roam freely in the open country they breed quickly and reach pest proportions in a very short time. In relation to pastoral holdings in particular, this pest becomes quite a nuisance and interferes with the husbandry of sheep generally.

Any animal that is released indiscriminately becomes a pest in a very short period of time, whether it be a goat, or a donkey. For a number of years donkeys have reached pest proportions in the north-west, around Widgiemooltha, and in the northern part of the Merredin-Yilgarn electorate. For quite a number of years these animals have been found in great numbers, and they have been a nuisance and have been responsible for causing much damage to waterholes, fences, and other station property.

In the north-west camels were released at the time they went out of use. Together with horses and other transport animals, camels gave way to modern forms of transport. Since their release they have become a great nuisance. Gradually they have been destroyed, but only after considerable expense on the part of many people in the north-west. I think the same can be said of sparrows and rabbits; we have had them in pest proportions for several years.

Whatever else this amendment is designed to do in regard to controlling the situation where pests are found, it must achieve a good result. I have pleasure in supporting the two amendments contained in the Bill.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.4 p.m.]: The House is probably fully aware of the work which is being done by the Agriculture Protection Board. However, I wish to make several points in this debate; because the passing of this legislation indicates the desire of the pastoralists to assist the Government in keeping under control vermin in the north-west of the State and in the South-West Land Division.

The pastoralists appreciate the position. The Government has made special grants for the purpose of overcoming the difficulty in the north-west—the ridding of the country of vermin. From time to time kangaroos, donkeys, and goats have become pests, and they have to be kept under control. The pastoralists have agreed to the proposed increase in the existing rate up to a maximum of 6d. in the pound. They have requested that the rate be increased to 4d., firstly; so on this occasion it will not be based on the maximum of 6d.

The idea is that in the future, if necessary, the rate can be increased to 6d. Members may recall that two or three years ago we passed amending legislation to increase the rate to 3d. in the pound. The Farmers' Union, and farmers generally, agreed to the increase on the last occasion, and we amended the legislation to enable a greater sum to be collected from farmers in the South-West Land Division. That indicates that farmers appreciate the importance of controlling vermin.

When farmers and pastoralists consider it is their responsibility to keep vermin under control, the Government will give them support in bringing forward the necessary legislation. Members representing farming and pastoral electorates will appreciate the importance of this legislation. Because of the great demand which exists at the present time for primary products, we should try to obtain the maximum of production from the activities of the primary producers.

If we make no effort to reduce the vermin which are roaming the countryside, then we are not carrying out the job for which we have been elected; that is, to bring about the maximum production of food from our agricultural and pastoral areas. With the great demand for food from overseas countries, it is up to us to see that everything possible is done to control pests and noxious weeds, although the latter is not covered by the legislation before us. Anything we can do to reduce these to a minimum should be done. I am pleased that the pastoralists have agreed to the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary):—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [5.11 p.m.]: Since the Minister introduced this amending Bill the other evening I have had a look through the proposed amendment and its

effect on the Fire Brigades Act. I feel to some extent one is obliged to have a look at the original amendment introduced by the Minister last year, in view of his remarks on introducing this measure the other evening when he had this to say—

> There was no legal fault with the first purpose of the legislation, but the second purpose did not carry out its function. To that extent I misled the House, and the present amending legislation has had to be introduced to rectify the situation.

I have looked at the original measure, and there is no doubt that the words proposed by the Minister in this Bill can probably be included in the definition of "insurance company"; and that, of course, as the Minister has set out to do, will bring the State Government Insurance Office legally within the realm of the original amendment. However, as a member of the Opposition, I feel I should draw the attention of the House, and the Minister, to the very serious position that is arising as a consequence of this amendment.

As I see it, if this Bill goes through, and it becomes a legal obligation on the State Government Insurance Office to pay to the Fire Brigades Board a proportion of its premiums, it will mean that the State Government Insurance Office will have to pay between £5,000 and £6,000 to the Board.

I have been forcibly reminded that since the last session of Parliament premium rates have gone up. So, virtually speaking, it means that vehicle owners in the metropolitan area, and probably many of those in the country areas, who are supposed to get some benefit from this amendment, will now get no benefit at all. Yet their premiums have been increased to give the extra money to the State Government Insurance Office, which, in turn, will pay it to the Fire Brigades Board. So I feel I have an obligation to draw the attention of the House to this position.

I might say this: When the original amendment was before another place last year, one member, speaking on the Bill, had this to say—

> It is a Bill which sneaks a little money from here, and a little money from there, at the cost of other people; and a very benevolent Government, at the expense of the contributor, lessens its contribution and says, "What jolly good boys are we." In effect the insurance companies have an increment of 8 per cent. on their contributions. The poor local authorities, which have been complaining bitterly about their contributions for years—and I notice the Minister of Local Government pricks his ears when I say that—have the munificent amount of 2 per cent. deducted from their contributions; but the Government comes in and lowers its contributions by 6 per cent.

So it would appear that the Treasury is going to save 6 per cent., but it will be passed on to the State Government Insurance Office to pay it; and the vehicle owners of the metropolitan area and country districts will be obliged to find another £5,000 a year for the conduct of the Fire Brigades Board.

If that were all it meant there would probably be no harm about it; but, as I see it, a lot of harm will be done, because the State Government Insurance Office annual report for the last year available, 1963, points out that three departments are making a loss; and one of those departments is the motor vehicle comprehensive department. So I feel the members of this House, both on the Government side and on the Opposition side, have to realise what could happen if the State Government Insurance Office is forced into making payments to the Fire Brigades Board. The State Government Insurance Office is already making losses in three departments out of four; and it is only a matter of time when very serious financial repercussions could come to that institution.

That would not be the worst of it; because the very fact that the State Government Insurance Office is in existence, means it is keeping premiums in regard to some classes of policies down to a minimum. But if the State Government Insurance Office is not able to carry on because of losses, then I hate to think of what will happen in the future; because at the present time other companies have to compete with the State Government Insurance Office. The employers indemnity industrial diseases section lost £63,863 in 1962-63; the motor vehicle comprehensive insurance section lost £103; and the students accident section lost £300. In other words, there was a loss of £64,266 in conducting the three departments. If it were not for the fact that the employers indemnity general account section made a profit, the State Government Insurance Office would probably have been in dire straits.

Therefore I am reluctantly going to support this amendment because of the impasse in which the Minister will be if the amendment is not passed. I presume the Fire Brigades Board and the other departments involved have been told this money will be forthcoming; and no doubt they will have planned their operations on that basis. Therefore, if this legislation does not go through, it appears that the Fire Brigades Board could be in a difficult position.

In order to make it legal for the State Government Insurance Office to pay money to the Fire Brigades Board, it is necessary that this amendment be passed;

that is, so that the State Government Insurance Office can be brought under the definition of "insurance company" under part I of the Fire Brigades Act; but, as I have said, it is with some reluctance that I support the amendment. It occurs to me that if the Government is going to encourage this type of legislation, the sooner the general public realises that the co-operative system is carrying on insurance in this State and spends, I suppose, 90 per cent. of its profits in this State, the sooner the State and the insured will be served by this Parliament. Therefore, as I said before, I shall reluctantly support this amendment; but I do think it is my job as a member of the Opposition to draw attention to what can happen to the State Government Insurance Office if this rot is allowed to continue.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) [5.20 p.m.]: Very briefly, I would like to thank the honourable member for his contribution to this debate. The situation that I give to the House at this point of time is no different from the one I gave last year, with the exception that I trust on this occasion the legislation is clear enough so there will be no doubt as to the legal validity of the State Government Insurance Office making a contribution to the W.A. Fire Brigades Board.

Members will no doubt recall that the general principle of the legislation introduced last year was to strike an average of all the Australian States in regard to the contributions towards fire brigades by the State Government, local government, and insurance companies. As a result of the legislation, and the change in formula that was effected, the insurance companies' contribution was to be increased and the contributions of the State Government and local government were to be decreased. That was the general principle as understood by the honourable member, and I feel it is desirable this matter of the S.G.I.O. should be straightened out. I thank the honourable member for his support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Premier):—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [5.24 p.m]: This very short Bill proposes to amend section 40 of the Act. I think the purpose of the amendment will become very clear if first of all I read section 40, as follows:—

> The provisions of this Act, and all the benefits, advantages, and privileges of the University, shall extend to women equally with men.

It is very interesting to know that provision was passed through this Parliament in the year 1911. At the time women did not have rights in many fields equal with the rights given to men; so it is indeed a very great compliment to the parliamentarians of 1911 that they were as progressive as they were in this matter. They laid it down in the law that all the benefits, advantages, and privileges of the University should extend to women equally with men.

I am certain they never imagined the law as they then approved it would, in 1963 and 1964, create the difficulty which has now arisen and which the contents of the Bill before us are calculated to overcome. Presumably the activities of the University in these days, being as diversified and widespread as they are, cannot always be given to women equally with men, although the opportunities for women may be on the same basis as for men.

However, the Treasurer in explaining the underlying reason for the amendment contained in this Bill, told us that certain people, in bequests made to the University, stipulated that the money so provided should be used for specific purposes. Clearly the controllers of the University would not be able to meet the existing requirements of section 40 of the Act if the bequests in question were to be honoured and carried out as they would legally have to be in accordance with the provisions laid down in the respective bequests.

So this amendment aims to relax the total requirement of the existing section 40 and to allow the Senate of the University a degree of discretion to enable these bequests which are made from time to time to the University to be fully availed of. I would think this amendment would be acceptable to members of the House on both sides, and therefore would have unanimous approval, not only in this House, but also—if I may dare to speak on their behalf—of all members in another place.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.29 p.m.]: I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his comments. I agree it is not a controversial Bill; but one would hope that the measure having removed the problem that faces the senate in respect of its acceptance of certain bequests to which were attached certain conditions as to its use,

maybe we will see requests from primary and secondary industry to the University for the specific purpose of providing scholarships, and, indeed, the means by which some of our young people might be especially trained for those industries.

In other countries, universities from time to time receive large sums of money left as bequests by wealthy people; and I can think of no better use for this money from large estates, or parts of estates. There can be no better monument to our pioneers than a bequest of money which has been obtained from the great natural wealth of this country.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn) [5.34 p.m.]: These amendments to the Agricultural Products Act will no doubt meet with the approval of all those members who have given some thought to this legislation. If the amending Bill achieves what the Minister said it is designed to achieve; namely, the prevention of the sale of immature and substandard fruit, then the legislation will be a success.

Mr. Nalder: We have made progress with similar legislation.

Mr. KELLY: I am sure the general public will be very appreciative if these amendments become law, and if they are thoroughly and totally policed. It is with this section of the Act that we have had difficulty. As a matter of fact, I have a clear recollection of the Minister accepting a challenge from me last year in connection with the sale of faulty apples in the Metropolitan Markets. I am sure the Minister's feeling on seeing the condition of the fruit that was being sold must have been one of disgust, particularly when he realised that such poor fruit had not only got into the market, but was being sold by some retailers.

Mr. Nalder: This is to try to overcome that.

Mr. KELLY: I smiled to myself when I first saw this legislation, because I realised that although apples were not mentioned, they were definitely the type of fruit which came under the Bill.

Speaking of the Act, generally, in my opinion the present regulations governing downgrading of fruit are ineffective and inconclusive unless, as I said earlier, they are policed much more carefully than they have been in the past. On occasions there has been a hue and cry on the part of the public because of the quality of the fruit, which indicates clearly that the inspectorial section has not been clothed with sufficient powers, or is not going deeply enough into the matter of the public being supplied, through the markets, with poor quality or unripe fruit.

Mr. Nalder: I think the first point you made is the important one.

Mr. KELLY: I think it is. There has been too much latitude in policing the regulations under the Act. Naturally, the inspectors, like everyone else, are only human. It is not their desire to cast a lot of fruit out of the market once it has reached the floor of the market, because many things are at stake, such as the livelihood of a lot of people. These amendments will prevent unscrupulous retailers from obtaining poor types of fruit from the Metropolitan Markets.

One of the failings is the downgrading of products. Although I realise that grading is most effective and is necessary from the point of view of the market, it is perhaps the wrong approach to the problem of eliminating the sale of immature and poor quality fruit. Of course, this applies also to other products, although it applies mainly to fruit because of the large amount of deterioration that occurs over a short period. Much of the fruit that in the past has been picked in an unripe condition has never reached the ripened stage. It is a poor advertisement for the grower to allow fruit of that type to reach the market. At times when fruit has been scarce a fair amount of poor quality fruit has been marketed, and the high prices that have been asked have offered no incentive to people to purchase such fruit.

Under the provisions of this Bill inspectors will be called upon to be more conscious of the quality of the fruit. This legislation could, in my opinion, give the inspectors the necessary power to exercise a lot of judgment and commonsense in the practice of downgrading and its application to the market generally.

We should aim at upgrading rather than allow the market to become saturated with lower-grade fruit. The lower grades are eventually brought down to the quality of products which should be cast out of the market altogether. I think the lowest grade permissible should be no lower than good quality products. After all, the people are paying a lot of money for the produce they purchase, unless it is on some fixed basis. Where there is a possibility of a very sharp fluctuation, then the

quality should not go below "good" because anything else is inferior and should not be marketed.

I was pleased to read in the Minister's comments the attitude of the viticulturists, many of whom are marketing immature grapes. This has been a sour point for a long time, and many people have been upset. The majority of growers tend to pick a lot of the fruit much earlier than it should be picked. Naturally, they want to get the extra price offering at the beginning of the season. These grapes are no good to anybody, because they cannot be eaten unless one is happy about getting a terrific stomach upset. That is all they will do; they will not satisfy the craving for grapes of those who buy them.

Apart from any other consideration, I think that grapes marketed in that condition are a severe commercial loss, and a loss for all time. They should not reach the market. It seems to be a great pity when one considers the demand for the grapes we have in this country. It is a shame that we have ever got to this position, and I know it has been going on for a number of years. It is nothing new.

I think that this legislation giving power to inspectors to remove immature fruit from the floor of the market, and power to confiscate, plus the possibility of a fine, will undoubtedly have a deterrent effect on many people who have been taking advantage of the market and sending in a few sly green ones at the beginning of the season. In future, those people will have a second thought before sending that fruit to the market.

In this regard, I do not think that is the only position we have to watch. A tremendous quantity of grapes are sold in various other ways, sometimes right at the beginning of the season. Frequently we will see an alluring notice in *The West Australian*, and other papers, advertising grapes at a shilling or two below par. Many are sold direct from the orchard, and many are sold at the side of the road. Some are hawked direct to the householder's door.

I consider that if we are going to be severe and have these amendments do what we hope will be done, we have to police all avenues whereby grapes are getting to the retail market in a roundabout way; and for that to be done, the Minister would only have to indicate to his inspectors that it was necessary for some degree of supervision to be carried out in the various orchards. It might be necessary to have an extra inspector or two, although there are not a great many orchards. If the methods of selling which I have outlined are allowed to continue they will defeat, to some extent, the good which this legislation can do. The sales are not "under the lap" sales. They are advertised, but the method is an indiscriminate one.

The provision allowing for the taking of samples as soon as fruit is placed on the floor of the market, will have a deterrent effect, too. Once the fruit has gone under the auctioneer's hammer and the buyer has taken it away, that is the end of it. If it is possible to have a closer survey of the fruit and samples taken before that stage is reached, and if the action of those who are in charge is prompt and smart, then the fruit would be withdrawn and the inspector would have the protection of this anticipated legislation.

Another very wise safeguard is that ministerial approval must be obtained before any of those actions takes place. I do not mean the action of actually taking a sample, because the inspector does not have to have ministerial authority for that, but the action of repacking, regrading, or destruction or disposal. The legislation will cover those, and other, activities, which can occur and for which inspectors are partially responsible. Any of those actions must have the Minister's sanction before becoming absolute. This protection will be a safeguard, not only to the inspectors, but also the growers. They will know that their fruit is being justly handled, and any decision rests finally with the Minister.

The last matter I wish to touch on is that of the penalty. I think it is wise that the penalty should be the amount mentioned in this Bill—£20. Anything less than that would not have the required deterrent effect. I think that many of the growers who, in the past, have taken advantage of the lax conditions which did exist, knowing full well that they would be able to get away with no risk of a penalty, will now fall into line. They have previously been in a position of false security in this regard. I think the main application of this Bill could be directed at the stone fruit.

This measure should have a salutary effect on the industry generally, and I shall be very happy to support the amendments.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [5.49 p.m.]: I commend the Minister for bringing forward this Bill, and I would like to say a few words on behalf of some of the growers. It is often thought by the consumers that the growers, as a whole, are a greedy, voracious lot and want the best they can get out of the market. It is true, they do want the best from the market. Unfortunately, we always have a few growers who try to foist something on to the market that is not of sufficient standard to be consumed, and for which a reasonable price is paid.

I hope this legislation will permit the inspection of fruit in the retail shops, because a lot of fruit does not go through

the markets, as such, and if a grower wants to be unscrupulous he sells to the retail shops without the fruit having to pass an inspection. Therefore I hope the Minister will be able to assure us that fruit in the shops in the metropolitan area, or in any other shops where perishable products in particular are sold, will be inspected so that those growers who do supply a reasonable article will be protected against the few unscrupulous ones who try to take advantage of the consumers' lack of knowledge. Frequently people who buy such fruit do not know until they get home that it is really unfit for consumption. We have all seen fruit such as I have just mentioned sold at different shops.

I agree with the member for Merredin-Yilgarn that most of the trouble is caused by the early picking of fruit in an effort to catch an early market. Unfortunately the growers ruin the market for themselves because the sale of immature fruit reacts to their detriment when the public refuses to buy.

I suppose the terrific cost of a case of fruit, between the time it is picked and the time it gets on to the market, is not generally known. I have made the point at different times that if a grower desires to give a friend a case of Granny Smith apples for Christmas, the cost of that case of apples, without taking into account the growing of the fruit or any other outlay, would be in the vicinity of £1. That is the actual cash outlay; and when one considers the market can be ruined because of the sale of inferior or immature and unsuitable fruit which is being foisted on to the public, one realises that the growers who do observe the regulations are at a distinct disadvantage.

Because of this I think anything we as a Parliament can do to protect the consuming public from the sale of unsuitable produce should be done, and I commend the Minister for bringing this legislation forward and hope it will be passed.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [5.53 p.m.]: I wish to take the opportunity of making one or two comments on this measure because, very largely, it permits of a great deal of discretion being left to the inspectors who are to police the provisions of the Act. My purpose in making these comments is to suggest that a good deal of care and tact must be exercised by inspectors when policing a measure such as this; because its definitions are fairly wide and the wording, regarding what an inspector may or may not do, is fairly general; for the Bill contains phrasing such as this—

> . . . and in any case the inspector may take, without payment therefor, samples of the agricultural products in sufficient quantity to permit the inspector to determine whether the agricultural products in his opinion, comply with the requirements of this Act.

We know with other Acts which deal with agricultural products, and their inspection by various inspectors appointed by boards such as the Milk Board, the Potato Board, the Onion Board, and so on, that frequently a conflict of opinion arises as to whether the quality of a product measures up to standard. In these dealings the general harmony is sometimes upset because of the tactlessness of an inspector.

I think when an inspector is dealing with produce grown by some person—and after all the sale of this produce is his livelihood—he should exercise a great deal of care and tact, and the discretion which he is given under the Act must not in any way be abused. I take this opportunity of issuing a warning, because we know, from previous experience, that a good deal of discontent can be created among growers, and people handling agricultural products, if the inspectors dealing with them and policing the provisions of the various Acts are not careful and tactful in their handling of the people concerned.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.55 p.m.]: I thank members who have spoken to this amending legislation and I want to make some comments on the points that have been made. First of all, in a way this is experimental legislation; we want to try it out to see how it works. In my view the member for Merredin-Yilgarn was on the right track when he said that the point which matters with legislation of this kind is the quality of the product that is being brought to the market for sale.

The situation that has existed over the years was mentioned by the honourable member when he referred to the temptation there is, at the opening of a season, for some growers to market immature fruit. Probably every member has to a degree been caught by the marketing of immature fruit. One will go into a shop and one will see the first fruit of the season; but frequently, if one buys the fruit and takes it home, it is found to be sour, and cannot be eaten.

In this regard I am referring particularly to grapes, because one cannot sample grapes. If someone picks a grape off the bunch it disfigures the bunch; and, in any case, it is not permitted. The selling of immature fruit also brings with it quite a few problems. Children who eat immature grapes sometimes become sick; and one thing often leads to another. The idea is for this legislation to be given a trial to see if it will bring about the desired results.

Mr. Kelly: I think it will, if it is policed wisely.

Mr. NALDER: First of all it is to try to stop growers from picking immature grapes. We hope that result will be achieved. However, if growers do pick immature grapes, and sell them at the

market, the inspector will have power, under this legislation, to take samples of the grapes and have them tested.

Mr. Kelly: Will the growers be warned at all?

Mr. NALDER: Publicity will be given to this legislation. I understand the Grape Growers' Association will notify its members; and, as a matter of fact, it is very keen to have the legislation put into effect because it realises what is going on. If the first grapes that come on to the market are immature, a buyer-resistance is built up against buying grapes in the future that are up to standard. I said when I introduced the Bill that because some of the cases of early season grapes—and there might be only a few of them—have been sour, buyers have become reluctant to buy them until such time as they know the season is well advanced and they are absolutely certain the grapes are ripe.

There are only a few growers who send immature fruit to the market, and they apparently do so in the hope that the competition will be such that they will be able to get a price which is really beyond a fair price for the product that is being sold.

Mr. Norton: Has not Victoria had this legislation for many years, particularly in regard to citrus fruits?

Mr. NALDER: That may be so; but in this State this is the first move that has been made in this regard. I am not aware of similar legislation operating in any other State, but it may be.

Mr. Norton: In Victoria, particularly in regard to citrus fruit.

Mr. NALDER: I might mention the interest that has been shown in this type of legislation, not only in this State but also in other countries in regard to our produce which is sold overseas. Last year I had the privilege of visiting some of the countries to the north of Australia.

The object of the trip was to see if we could sell more of our Western Australian products. On our arrival at Singapore we found there was a buyer resistance to some grapes exported from Western Australia. On seeking the reason we found that of the consignments from Western Australia to Singapore there was a small percentage which contained immature grapes and which were a little under-Standard; and that, although a case was supposed to be 30 lb. net weight, there were a few which were only 28 lb. net weight. This had affected the market to a point where the whole consignment was being treated as 28 lb. packs.

Although there were some growers who were determined to put up a good product, and some were prepared to put a few extra ounces—even up to ½ lb.—of grapes in the pack, there were one or two growers who were not playing the game. This had the effect of depreciating the whole grape consignment, and they were being more or less hawked around the Singapore market.

Mr. Jamieson: What were they packed in?

Mr. NALDER: In 30 lb. cases.

Mr. Jamieson: Were they packed in cork dust?

Mr. NALDER: No; most of them were packed in a type of wood pulp material which was spread over the grapes to prevent their bruising and general deterioration. It was not the packing that was in dispute.

Mr. Jamieson: Usually, the cork dust costs more than the grapes.

Mr. NALDER: It was not the packing that was at fault, but the product that was packed. When we discovered this we decided that, as an exporting State, we could not afford to let it continue. As a result, a decision was reached to inspect all consignments of grapes to Singapore. Each grower had to submit his pack for inspection and for weighing; and I am happy to say that after arrangements were made for the importer's representative to come to see us we had no difficulty whatsoever in selling the grapes that were available for export, because they were first inspected and guaranteed. In fact, the importers were prepared to pay a couple of dollars more when they knew they were getting a quality product.

The same applies to the home market. If we produce quality goods we must market them properly, and this legislation is designed for that purpose only; that is, to create a market and retain it. We hope that all grape growers, and growers of other primary products will keep this in mind. We hope that grape growers will not market immature fruit, because if they do they must accept the consequences. The cost of destroying any grapes that do not come up to standard will be borne by the grower. I make this comment because this is experimental legislation designed only to ensure that the product produced is sold to the best advantage.

Mr. W. Hegney: Will the fruit be withdrawn and destroyed on the certificate of the inspector?

Mr. NALDER: Yes. The inspector will work to a standard which, I understand, is ascertained as a result of certain tests to determine whether the fruit is ripe enough for human consumption.

Mr. Rowberry: What type of tests?

Mr. NALDER: I am not in a position to go into any details on that aspect, but I understand there is a test made. If the grape does not pass the test, it is withdrawn. I am given to understand that the grape must have a certain sugar content before it is permitted to be sold. I am also led to believe that the test is

quite a simple one. The whole of the consignment is not affected, but only a few grapes are taken from the case for testing, and if they do not conform to the standard they are destroyed.

Mr. Jamieson: They have a certificate for the ripeness of each type.

Mr. NALDER: We will find that out.

Mr. Jamieson: It will have.

Mr. NALDER: I appreciate that the growers will find out what is a ripe grape, or what is not.

Mr. Jamieson: You will have to, if it has a sugar test.

Mr. NALDER: The honourable member may know more about that than I do. There is another point. When grapes are sold direct to the retailer there will be some responsibility, I think, on him to ensure that when he is sampling the product he does not buy an immature grape.

As I say, this will be tried out this year. We do not intend to spend much money on inspectorial staff. We will certainly have a sufficient number of inspectors to handle the necessary work, and the points made by the member for Wellington will be considered. We endeavour to do this with every board, committee, or inspector governed by legislation. The inspectors are trained and, in most cases, I think they do the job for which they are appointed. There have been some points of criticism, but I think the complaints have been few and far between and, on the whole, the inspectors have carried out their duties satisfactorily.

In this instance I have no fear, because I feel sure the position will be covered satisfactorily and that the officers we have at the markets will ensure that the legislation is policed fairly. I do not anticipate much difficulty, because the trouble mainly occurs when the season opens. When one or two of the growers are brought to heel, we will possibly not have a recurrence of the trouble. We will wait with a good deal of anticipation to see how the legislation works; and I hope it will achieve the objective we desire. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Forests):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [6.10 p.m.]: This Bill sets out to amend the Forests Act in certain directions. It contains provisions to amend the conditions of employment of the Conservator of Forests and of the Deputy Conservator of Forests. The Bill further provides, in the case of the dedication of Crown land to forests, that after publication in the *Government Gazette* the papers will lie on the Table of the House for 10 days. There are further provisions in the Bill which seek to protect certain officers under the Public Service Act.

I would point out that I have no objection to any of the amendments in the measure; but I understand the appointment of the Conservator of Forests for seven years has occasioned some doubt in the Crown Law Department, particularly with reference to that part of the Bill which states—

> shall hold office for a term of seven years from the date of his appointment and thereafter is eligible for reappointment . . .

From that it would seem that he would be eligible for reappointment for seven years. Apparently in some cases the Crown Law Department has held that because of the age factor this would not be convenient or proper; and accordingly we have this amendment before the House. I have no objection to the amendment I have just quoted, but I do have some objection to that dealing with the appointment of the Deputy Conservator.

When legislation sets out in detail exactly what must be done, then it is not possible to do anything but what is stated in that legislation. Let us consider the Act as it is now. We find that in the case of the illness, indisposition, or absence of the conservator the Government may appoint some person—any person—to act as his deputy. But now we have the position where a Deputy Conservator of Forests is to be appointed, and he will act as deputy in the absence of the conservator. But what happens if both the Deputy Conservator of Forests and the Conservator of Forests are ill, absent, or indisposed? Does the legislation provide for such an eventuality?

As I have pointed out, the trouble with legislation that is too elaborate or too detailed—legislation which sets out everything that can be done—is that it is not sufficiently elastic. Previously this contingency was covered by any person being appointed to act as the deputy conservator, provided the Governor approved of such appointment.

Now we have the appointment of a deputy conservator to that office, and we have determined what that office shall be. I have no objection to that. But where do we stop in the appointment of deputies? Do we go on for ever to appoint a deputy conservator to the deputy conservator, and so on?

There is provision in the Act which enables someone who has given long and faithful service to the Forests Department to act as Conservator of Forests; and I am reminded that this is an allusion to an ancient custom which exhorts us to remove not the ancient landmarks, because they are old.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The provision in the Bill which deals with the preservation of existing and accrued rights of other appointees to the office of conservator states—

> If a person appointed to the office of Conservator was, immediately before his appointment, an officer within the meaning of the Public Service Act, 1904—
>
> (a) he retains his existing and accruing rights.

Members will agree that the conservator, or any appointee, should not have those rights prejudiced because of promotion or transfer to another branch of the Public Service. We have no objection to this provision.

The next provision in the Bill, which deals with the rededication of land from Crown forests to State forests, ought to be explained by the Minister. The provision in the Bill states—

> If each House of Parliament passes a resolution, of which notice has been given within the first ten sitting days of the House after a copy of an Order in Council has been laid on the Table of the House pursuant to this section, that the Order in Council be disallowed, the Order in Council thereupon ceases to have effect but, subject to this Act and the regulations, the disallowance of the Order in Council does not affect or invalidate anything done in good faith by the Minister, or any officer exercising any powers or performing any duties under this Act relating to the land referred to in the Order in Council, before the passing of the resolution.

I want to know why there is need for desperate haste, and why it is necessary for the Minister or any officer exercising powers under the Act to take action before parliamentary approval has been obtained. There is no need for haste in the rededication of forest land or Crown land. This land will not deteriorate, and no-one will run away with it. Rededication could probably wait until the required action has been taken by Parliament after the publication of the order in the *Gazette*, and after tabling the notice within 10 days of the first sitting. Possibly the Minister will tell us why it is necessary to validate action taken by him or his officer. If there is a dire necessity or emergency that could arise in the transfer of such land, the Minister should indicate the circumstances. I commend the Bill to the House.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta) [7.35 p.m.]: I would like to make a few observations on this measure. In respect of the first amendment in the Bill relating to the appointment of the Conservator of Forests, I have no objection to the general principle; namely, that after the first appointment of seven years reappointments can be made for periods not exceeding seven years; in other words, to make it perfectly clear that the second or subsequent appointments can be for a term of less than seven years.

I hope and trust it is not the intention of the Minister to use this provision for the purpose of running counter to the generally accepted practice in the matter of Public Service appointments, realising immediately this is not an appointment under the Public Service Act, but is one in respect of which the conditions generally run parallel with those applying to officers who are subject to that Act.

If my recollections are reasonably accurate the term of the present incumbent of the position of Conservator of Forests expires in 1967, at which time he will be 63½ years of age. I readily admit some provision should be made to enable the Minister to make an appointment of, say, 18 months, in order that this officer—for whom I have the highest regard—should be permitted to complete his time, in the same manner as any other public servant is permitted. I hope and trust we are not giving any suggestion to the Minister that he has the endorsement of Parliament, if this Bill is agreed to, that the appointment should continue until the present occupant attained the age of about 70 years; in other words, a new appointment for six years would take him to 69½ years of age.

At the same time, according to certain interpretation of the Forests Act as it is at the moment, it may be thought this worthy officer will have to lay down his tools of office when he is 63½ years of age. I am 100 per cent. with the Minister, if this amendment seeks to meet the position as would be created then, or to deal with similar situations in the future.

My only other comment is on the proposal that, where the Conservator of Forests, with the approval of the Minister and the Governor, desires to dedicate Crown land as State forests, such a proposal there will be introduced a procedure under which it will be possible for Parliament to disallow the dedication.

This is an entirely new provision, so far as the Forests Act of Western Australia is concerned. I suggest the present provision has been made as exclusive as it is because of a realisation on the part of those who knew and who drafted the legislation that there is, unfortunately, in Western Australia an almost completely

abysmal ignorance of the value, importance, and future of the timber industry of Western Australia. Because we have become accustomed to bushlands, far too many consider there is ample timber available without having any appreciation of the fact that, before many years go by, a great deal of the timber requirements of Western Australia will have to be imported. That is without making provision for quite a number of new industries using timber as the basis of their production coming to Western Australia to set up their establishments.

The position is serious; and it was only because of the farsightedness of those who were the architects of our legislation that the position in Western Australia is not worse today than, in fact, it is. After so many years of willy-nilly land settlement, irrespective of the best interests of the State, it is true to say today that approximately 20 per cent. of the timber which is produced for commercial purposes still comes from private property; comes from land which should still be under the control of the Forests Department—and should be State forest forever. But unfortunately there are those who have felt in the past that the only good land in Western Australia is cleared land —that if it is growing forests, then the land is being wasted; that it would be far better for crops to be grown and stock to be reared on this land which is growing some of the most valuable timber which is grown anywhere in the world.

I have dilated on this question on other occasions, and I say no more, except that to me this appears to be the thin end of the wedge. We are already aware that notwithstanding the fact we have a Conservator of Forests who is, I should say, without compare in the Commonwealth of Australia—and it would be difficult to equal him anywhere in the British Commonwealth—this Government set up a tribunal of a forestry officer, about No. 50 or lower in the line of succession; an orchard farmer; and a licensed surveyor. This tribunal was set up for the purpose of deciding in respect of Crown lands and timber reserves whether those lands should be placed under the control of the Conservator of Forests or whether they should be made available for selection.

I say—I think I said it on another occasion—that this was a studied insult against one of the most highly qualified and practical and experienced foresters it has been our good fortune to have in the State of Western Australia. His duty, to a very large extent, has been seconded to these other people who, by the greatest stretch of imagination, could in no way compare with him. This was done notwithstanding also that there was a land utilisation committee comprising some half-dozen of the highest placed officials in the Public Service of Western Australia, on which the Forests Department had one voice only, that of the Conservator of Forests.

But this Government decided that was no good to it. The Conservator of Forests, who had such a grip on his subject and the requirements of the State, apparently in the mind of the present Minister for Forests, was able to bamboozle the other five members of that committee that it was not possible for too much land to be dedicated as State forest or held as timber reserves. The Minister was afraid that too much vacant Crown land in the lower south-west—too great a proportion of it—might be dedicated as State forest.

So when there is this proposition submitted to us: that instead of the procedure which has been in vogue for well-nigh 50 years, of the Minister approving the recommendations of the Conservator of Forests and subsequently that approval receiving the endorsement of the Governor-in-Council, it is now proposed that Parliament should have the power of veto. I would like to ask the Minister point blank: Why is this being done? Is this another backdoor action on the part of the Government to curb the interests which the Conservator of Forests has?—not personal interest, but a State or a national interest.

What is the necessity for saying, when it is decided by our chief technical professional officer that a certain area should be dedicated as State forest, and afterwards it has been approved by the Minister, countersigned by the Premier, and subsequently the Governor, that that is not sufficient—that approval is necessary by a majority of members of both Houses of Parliament—who, perchance, have no knowledge or appreciation of our forests or the timber industry, or who, perhaps, are subject to pressures from certain groups and certain interests who desire access to certain portions of land?

I think this is a dangerous provision; and it is because of the importance of this matter, that it has been the law of the land for so long that at the whim of a Minister or a Government that land, when it has once been vested in the Forests Department to become State forest, cannot be cancelled without the approval of Parliament; and it strikes me this is a reversal of form—this is a step to make it easier for Parliament to defeat the best interests of the State.

I know, in saying this, that, perhaps, I can be chided with displaying a lack of confidence in the majority of members of both Chambers of this Parliament. But no, I am a realist and I am aware of what pressure groups can do. If there be an area of land—shall we say, 20,000 acres—that is carrying native timber of some value or which, with regeneration of forests, the planting of pines, or by some other means, can be developed into a valuable national asset, that land, as it stands

at the present moment, will not only provide us with some of our material in the future, but is something which preserves our water from undue salinity; and never let us forget that the availability of water is probably the measuring stick of the number of people who ultimately will be able to live a decent existence in the State of Western Australia.

Because State forest land is non-ratable, we immediately get pressure from the local authorities who are more interested in the few pounds in rates per annum they might get from a certain area if it is thrown open for selection and developed into farms than they are with the long-term benefits to the State of Western Australia.

Secondly, because of pressure from the chamber of commerce in a certain town, looking after the interests of the people who conduct businesses within that town; and because of pressure from the Farmers' Union and perhaps the Returned Servicemen's League, and other bodies, which between them run into very many hundreds of votes and could have the effect of making or unmaking a government, depending on how they vote in a certain area, it is easy to see how the best interests of the State would be sacrificed for less worthy purposes.

So I would want the most compelling arguments to satisfy me that there is any need for this new process which the Minister proposes to introduce. I challenge him to show where the existing Act, which has been on the Statute book since 1918, has disclosed any defect that requires remedying in the manner the Minister suggests. However, assuming (a) he has the numbers, and/or (b) he has the arguments—in other words is able, contrary to the best interests of the State—to push this matter through, I would ask him to have a look at the drafting of clause 4 under which it is proposed that certain documents shall be tabled for 10 sitting days, and each House of Parliament must give notice within a period of 10 days for the disallowance of the order.

What are the reasons for his departing from a procedure which is set down in the Interpretation Act under which there is a period of six sitting days during which the Minister shall lay papers on the Table of the House, and, following that, a period of 14 sitting days in which members are required, if they so desire, to give notice for disallowance?

Apropos of that point, I would say that the more standardised and simplified we can have our procedure, the less the prospect is of there being confusion and members missing the bus.

I have already indicated the procedure as laid down in the Interpretation Act in the matter of the tabling and disallowance of regulations. We are aware that under the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, there was a period of 21 sitting days stipulated, and now the Minister proposes a period of 10 sitting days during which certain action can be taken.

Again, unless there are very good reasons to convince me otherwise, my thought in the matter is that the Minister should conform to the standard pattern. Here let me indicate to him and to the Government—and perhaps they can feel pleased about it—that because of this confusion between 21 sitting days in a certain case and 14, as laid down in the Interpretation Act, by one day I have missed the opportunity of moving for the disallowance of certain regulations. I am not unduly worried about that because there is another course which can be taken. However, I do not think that we should lay down varying periods which can only have the effect of complicating matters, particularly for newer members who seek to take certain action.

So I conclude on the note that I will require powerful argument before I, for one, will agree to any watering down or whittling away of the powers—the very real powers and the very necessary powers—of the Conservator of Forests in the first instance, and the others whose responsibility it has been over the years to dedicate State forests. If this be another example of the attitude of the Minister and the Government of how forestry and timber are second rate and other uses for our land and our timber belt are paramount, then he can expect my most vigorous opposition.

Meanwhile I await with some anxiety and interest the reasons for this new venture on the part of the Minister, reasons which he most certainly did not supply us with in the introduction of the measure.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Forests) [7.56 p.m.]: In reply to the second reading debate I would first of all refer to a matter raised by the member for Warren in regard to the need for the laying on the Table of the House the dedications of State forest, and the fact that action could not be delayed until the matter had been dealt with by the House.

The reason for such a provision can be best illustrated, I think, by this example: Suppose, for instance, in December, 1964, after Parliament has adjourned, the Governor, by Order-in-Council, dedicates certain Crown land as State forest, and Parliament does not sit again until July or August of 1965. It might be that, after the dedication, and before the Order-in-Council could be disallowed, if it was to be disallowed, the Minister or officers during that period had exercised certain powers under the Forests Act in regard to permits, licenses, etc.; and, having done so, it would be necessary for those permits and licenses to continue.

A license to remove timber, a sawmilling permit, and other such operations which come within the orbit of the Forests Act, might have been granted, and therefore as they were granted in good faith they should be honoured. That is the reason it is necessary to have the provision protecting the Minister and officers of the department in regard to anything they may have done in good faith in that intervening period.

Mr. Rowberry interjected.

Mr. BOVELL: Well, it might be in the interests of the State that these permits be granted and contracts entered into, and it is considered necessary that the provisions should be included in the Bill.

Mr. Graham: But permits have never come to Parliament, and they will not under this new procedure.

Mr. BOVELL: I know. I do not think the member for Balcatta could have been listening. The fact is—as he knows, having been a former Minister for Forests—that certain actions are taken by the Minister and the conservator, and having dedicated the Crown lands in the normal way—by an Order-in-Executive-Council—the conservator or the Minister enters into a contract in regard to those lands; and then the dedication papers are tabled and Parliament in its wisdom decides that the lands should not be dedicated. Those contracts entered into in the intervening period when Parliament is not in session should be and will be honoured. I think that should be quite clear. It is to me.

Mr. Graham: No, because it would not make any difference whether it was Crown land, timber reserve, or State forest. That does not come into it at all.

Mr. BOVELL: This is the advice of the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman, and I prefer to take his advice.

Mr. Tonkin: You would! You know what his advice was about the betting Act.

Mr. BOVELL: We happen to be talking about the Forests Act at present.

Mr. Tonkin: It was the same man though.

Mr. BOVELL: The member for Balcatta raises what I would say is a point which every member of this House and this Parliament should resent; and that is that Parliament should not have the opportunity of knowing what is going on. If the Minister asked for land to be dedicated as State forest, and it was so dedicated there would be some reason for it; and, no doubt, as the member for Balcatta would know, the Government would support the Minister in his action. But in view of the development of the State and the fact that individual members of Parliament want to know what is happening in their electorates, the Government considers it is only fair for Parliament and for members of Parliament to know what land is being dedicated as State forest.

I will agree with the member for Balcatta to this extent: that the timber industry is one of the State's most valuable industries. As a matter of fact, I think it ranks third in importance. Furthermore, at the instigation of the Prime Minister, an Australian forestry council was recently formed. The Minister for—

Mr. Hawke: Forests.

Mr. BOVELL: No. The Minister for National Development is the chairman and the Minister for Territories is a member. Each State Minister for Forests is also a member. This council has been formed because of the vital importance to Australia of its forests. Therefore I agree with the member for Balcatta to the extent that the timber industry in Western Australia is a vital one.

Mr. Brand: The Government recognises it as such.

Mr. BOVELL: If course it does! With regard to denying Parliament the right of having information, the member for Balcatta should be the last person in this House to want a system which would deny members, individual and collective, the right of knowing, within the executive of Government—

Mr. Graham: No member of Parliament has ever asked for this. That is why I am wondering why you are doing it. You are suspect.

Mr. BOVELL: —what is happening; or of Parliament being kept informed of what is going on—

Mr. Graham: That wouldn't be the real reason.

Mr. BOVELL: —at the request of members interested in districts which are vitally concerned in this matter.

Mr. Graham: I can think of a dozen simpler ways of notifying them without opening the gates.

Mr. BOVELL: It is incredible that the member for Balcatta should want to deny a system that would supply all the information that Parliament could require. The more information that we can give to Parliament, the better for our system of democracy.

Mr. Graham: Platitudes!

Mr. Hawke: This proposal goes further than that.

Mr. BOVELL: Concerning the Crown land tribunal, I want to remind the member for Balcatta that the Premier, in his 1959 policy speech, informed the electors of this State—

Mr. Hawke: That taxation was at breaking point.

Mr. BOVELL: —that if the Government were returned—the Leader of the Opposition cannot draw red herrings across my path like that—he would appoint a

tribunal which would recommend to the Government utilisation of certain land within the State. Not only did the electors of 1959 endorse that policy, but they re-endorsed it three years later, in 1962. Therefore the member for Balcatta is endeavouring to cut across the wishes of the people and to cut across—

Mr. Graham: That will be the day!

Mr. BOVELL: —our system of democracy.

Mr. Brand: No comment!

Mr. BOVELL: In regard to the disallowance, if both Houses of Parliament decide that the Order-in-Council shall be disallowed, it will cease to exist. I know of no reason why Parliament should not be given this opportunity of reviewing dedications. I explained in my introductory remarks that Parliament was required to authorise excisions, and this legislation is based on a similar principle.

Mr. Graham: No it's not!

Mr. BOVELL: I have therefore moved that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Graham: Very poor!

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Bovell (Minister for Forests) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 20 amended—

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister has still not indicated to us the reason for this new process, or who was the instigator of the thought. I should have thought that the Minister—who has occupied his present position for some 5½ years —would by now have a fuller appreciation of the importance of this industry than is conveyed by his platitudinous words which we hear from time to time.

I prefer to judge the Minister by his actions, which have been in the direction of reducing to a minimum the additional areas to be dedicated as State forest. He can indicate to me thousands of acres which have become State forest since he has been Minister, but they represent only a drop in the ocean. We get down to a personal basis when we consider this acreage compared with the areas which were dedicated when his predecessor was Minister for Forests for an almost similar term.

We do know of the statement by the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, that a tribunal would be appointed for a certain purpose. This gives emphasis to my point. The average person in the community has no conception whatsoever of what the timber industry means to Western Australia. Unfortunately—I do not say this critically—I deplore the fact that to a very large extent the same applies to the members of this Parliament.

Mr. Bovell: That is a reflection on the members of this Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a summary of the situation. Unfortunately, I feel that the present Minister for Forests can be numbered among them.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Are you?

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope not; because; (a), I was born in the country; (b), I worked for very many years in the Forests Department; and (c) I was Minister for Forests for a period of six years. I think those three factors should have had some effect, if anything can have some effect, on my outlook; that because of those experiences I should have learned something.

I have already indicated that this Government has shown that it is more important that there should be land settlement schemes, as they are called. This might be a play on words, perhaps; but, unfortunately, many parts of the land have been settled! They are not worth two bob as agricultural areas and they have been despoiled for a period of half a century or more so far as a timber proposition is concerned. In the process, many millions of moneys belonging to the State have been wasted; the hearts of many settlers have been broken; and, indeed, their bank balances have been broken, because of this fetish for land settlement without having regard for the purposes for which the land is best suited.

Mr. Brand: Which area are you thinking of particularly, and of what era?

Mr. GRAHAM: Unfortunately this has gone on for several generations.

Mr. Brand: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: But I would have thought, as it is becoming increasingly obvious that there is a limit to our timber, and we will be in desperate straits before long, even for such elementary requirements as fence posts, that over the years Governments would have learned that whilst it might be more spectacular to put in bulldozers and establish 20, 50, or 100 farmers, looking at it in the long term, and in the best interests of the State, it is palpably wrong.

Furthermore, in a great many parts of the State where timber can best be grown, although it may be possible to settle 100 farmers and their families, there would be a far greater number of people gainfully employed in tending the forests and operating sawmills if that land were to remain as State forests. Now the Minister, after his previous record, albeit based on what the Premier said when he was Leader of the Opposition, is proposing to make it more difficult for additional parcels of land to be dedicated as State forests.

It is all very well to talk glibly about as much information as possible being given to members. An Order-in-Council will be laid on the Table of the House, and there will be very few capable of understanding its implications, and the only persons who are likely to have any knowledge of what it really means are those members who are drawn from the timber country—only about half a dozen members. Those who represent the metropolitan area, the north-west, the goldfields, or the agricultural districts, will be those who in the majority will say "Yea" or "Nay." Indeed, if those who come from the timber country voted against a proposal they would be in a hopeless minority.

In 1918 this Act—and in respect of its major principles very few amendments have been made—was drawn by farsighted men, not only in the Public Service, but also in this Parliament, and I pay a tribute to the one who steered it through Parliament at the time. The Minister has not been able to indicate to us any injustice that has been done in respect of the area or to the parliamentary representative concerned. Why then this escape clause? Why this proposal to allow members of Parliament to interfere? If the Minister can give us not one reason but a number of cogent reasons why this change should be made, we might go along with him.

But he has not done that; and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, one must deduce this is a further instalment of the process of this Government in making it more and more difficult for land to be dedicated as State forest—for Crown land to be dedicated as State forest. Let nobody think for a moment that this is a process under which private land is to be compulsorily acquired and behind the back of Parliament created State forests! No; this is land which already belongs to the Crown.

I put the question to the Minister again: Why is he doing this? Who has called for it? From our experiences in the past, what is the necessity for it? If he can supply me with sound reasons as an answer to those questions, I will, even with some reluctance, be prepared to go along with him; but not otherwise.

I ask him to give attention to the point I made about the time factor of laying papers on the table and subsequently giving notice to disallow. If there are no good reasons for that, will he accept an amendment to make the times conform with what appears in the Interpretation Act in regard to regulations? I hope the Minister will agree to clause 4 being deleted. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. BOVELL: The main question asked by the honourable member was why this portion of the legislation is being introduced. It is to keep members of Parliament informed on what areas of land have been dedicated as State forests; to allow Parliament to know what is happening to Crown lands that have been dedicated as State forests.

Mr. Hawke: The proposal in the Bill goes further than that.

Mr. BOVELL: No; it does not. It gives members a right which should be theirs at all times, and I will uphold their right to disagree, if they so desire, with anything that the Executive might have done.

Mr. Hawke: With anything?

Mr. BOVELL: Yes.

Mr. Hawke: Good! We will try you out.

Mr. Graham: In regard to every sawmilling permit, for instance?

Mr. BOVELL: If Parliament in its wisdom—that is, the majority of members, under which our democratic system works—decides something, that is final; and the Leader of the Opposition knows it as well as I do.

Mr. Graham: Rubbish!

Mr. Hawke: Will you bring every Executive Council decision to Parliament and give Parliament the right to disallow it?

Mr. BOVELL: Not necessarily.

Mr. Hawke: Of course you wouldn't!

Mr. BOVELL: In this case the amendment is designed to keep Parliament informed on what is happening to Crown land in individual electorates.

Mr. Graham: Who requested this?

Mr. BOVELL: The Government.

Mr. Graham: That is what I thought.

Mr. BOVELL: In regard to the second matter, the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman framed the clause dealing with times for the tabling of these papers, and I do not intend to agree to any alteration of it. It was not prompted by me. The matter was submitted to the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman and the schedule of times is as submitted by him without any direction from the Government.

Mr. Graham: Will you discuss it with him and if it can be made—

Mr. BOVELL: No; I will not. He submitted it, and the Bill is before Parliament. I am quite prepared to accept the submissions that he has made. If I had directed the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman to include the times to be allowed for disallowance I would, perhaps, agree to the suggestion made by the member for Balcatta.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister blindly accepts whatever he puts up.

Mr. BOVELL: I do not blindly accept what he puts up.

Mr. Hawke: You do in this instance.

Mr. BOVELL: The Chief Parliamentary Draftsman submitted it entirely by himself and I intend to agree to it.

Mr. Hawke: Blind acceptance!

Mr. ROWBERRY: Earlier in this debate the Minister said that the reason for this clause was that it had been requested by members representing the areas which would be affected by it. I make known to the Chamber that I made no request for such an amendment; and possibly there is more millable timber in my electorate than in any other. On this matter it could be argued that before revocations or dedications come before this Chamber once every session for the approval of Parliament, it is right and proper that the dedication of Crown land to forest land should likewise come before Parliament in the same circumstances and by the same methods.

I do not think the Minister has quite answered the point put forward by the member for Balcatta; namely, that the existing provision in the Act has stood the test of time, and that no real injustice has been done to anybody under it. Before the Minister changes legislation which has worked extremely well in the interests of people vitally concerned in the timber industry, it is incumbent upon him to give members of this Chamber some cogent reasons.

If Parliament and the people in the past have been content that the Minister and the conservator should make the decision on the dedication of Crown land to forest land, a better explanation is required than that which has been made for this present amendment. I think the member for Balcatta is on sound ground, because I, too, have been disturbed in the past over certain recommendations made by the Crown lands tribunal appointed by the Government. This recommendation to the Government was a semi-secret sort of document, and as a member representing an area in which a large amount of land is revoked or dedicated, I was kept very much in the dark as to what lands were being dedicated or revoked. In fact, I had to use a bit of subterfuge to obtain this information from the Minister at the time. It was only because, fortunately, I had been listening to a debate in another place that I knew this Bill was to be introduced.

When I asked the Minister for a copy of the report that had been quoted in another place, I was told by him that there was no such recommendation; that the Crown lands tribunal had not made any submissions to the Government. When I told the Minister that I had heard quotations from this document made in another place he eventually agreed to let me peruse it. In these circumstances we become suspicious; motives are subject to grave suspicion. I do not like to hold that idea of any Minister or any member of the Government, or at least I do not like to express it publicly. Therefore it is incumbent upon the Minister to give a more lucid exposition, or a more acceptable explanation, of the amendment to the Act contemplated in clause 4.

Mr. Bovell: I have given adequate explanation.

Mr. GRAHAM: Just as I suspected; there is no reason for this amendment other than that the Government desires to make it easier for the requirements of Western Australia to be sacrificed.

Mr. Bovell: Rubbish!

Mr. GRAHAM: It is easy to say something of that nature. We have the Minister, in all seriousness, telling us that this amendment represents a courtesy to Parliament to allow members to be informed on what is transpiring. There is a reference to the Order-in-Council being published in the *Government Gazette*, copies of which are available to members of Parliament. If he wanted to go one further he could provide for such to be laid on the Table of the House. If the Government were sincere, surely a decision by this Crown lands tribunal would be laid upon the Table of the House within 10 days of its arriving at a decision; because land belongs to the Crown, whether it is vacant Crown land, a timber reserve, or a State forest. All such land is still the property of the Crown, and the timber on it is being protected.

However, under this tribunal, which was appointed without parliamentary sanction—

Mr. Bovell: Sanctioned by the people.

Mr. GRAHAM: —and running counter to the intent of the Forests Act, instead of the Conservator of Forests being the prime man in timber and timber country, we now have this polyglot arrangement which I mentioned before, under which the tribunal says "Yea" or "Nay" and the Minister accepts.

Further, when the land in any locality is decreed by this body as being unsuitable for forestry purposes, but more suited to agricultural purposes, it is made available for selection; and, after it has been settled, either wholly or in part, it ceases to be valuable from a forestry viewpoint. So, notwithstanding legislation, but merely on an administrative decision, the ownership of land is being decreed for all time; and there is no need for this Government to bring that to Parliament. Oh no! In regard to whether land that belongs to the Crown should be retained for the best possible use, that question, in the view of the Government, becomes all important; and not only should that be reported to Parliament, but the way should be made easier than now to dedicate an area from State forest and allow the Minister at his whim to declare that the land can be used for other purposes.

Mr. Bovell: That is not forest land, but Crown land. I did that as Minister for Lands and not as Minister for Forests.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister is only using words. It is Crown land which, if this becomes law, will hereafter by Order-in-Council be dedicated as State forest, with the proviso the Minister seeks to insert, that the two Houses may revoke that proposition; and, the two Houses having revoked it, the Minister can do what he likes with the land. He could make it available for selection.

It would seem that the Minister does not know much about his department or the Act under which he operates. He told us that some words appearing later in the clause were there for the purpose of protecting the Minister and the Conservator of Forests, who may have to issue permits, and contracts, and the rest. If the Minister does not know, let me here and now tell him that the Conservator of Forests issues permits practically every day of the week over Crown land, over timber reserves, and over other State forests; indeed he issues them over private property, and it matters not whether the designation of the land changes from one category to the other, the permit is still in existence, and is just as legally valid as it was in its former state.

Mr. Bovell: You had better argue that with the Crown Law Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: Apparently everything is blamed on the Crown Law Department.

Mr. Bovell: I am taking the advice of the Crown Law Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: After five and a half years the Minister should know something about the Act he is charged with administering. If he does not know that, then he does not know the first thing about forestry processes.

Mr. Bovell: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister can go to his professional advisers tomorrow, and if he can fault me in one word I have just told him I will be prepared to apologise to him and the House. But if he finds the Conservator of Forests upholds what I have just said, will the Minister apologise to me and to the House?

Mr. Bovell: You do not know—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! We will have one speech at a time.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister is very wisely silent.

Mr. Bovell: The Chairman has just silenced me.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister knows he is ignorant of the Act and the procedures of the Forests Department. The Crown Law Department has thought of a number —10 days here and 10 days there—and the Minister accepts that, even though there is no rhyme or reason for it. Does not the Minister understand his Bill? Did not he inquire of his legal adviser as to the reason for 10 days? Why not two days, or 50 days?

It is all very well for legal luminaries to whom every Statute is known, but we are laymen whose task it is not only to legislate, but to amend and disallow regulations. In one instance I have given tonight we find that in one Statute a period of 21 sitting days is allowed for notice to be given; under the Interpretation Act, which applies to all notices, 14 sitting days are permitted members; and now, for no reason at all, except that it is printed as 10 days, the Minister denies me the right to suggest and give effect to the proposition that this provision should be made to conform to the established procedure of Parliament

I do not know whether the Minister is becoming so paltry in his outlook that he thinks there might be some loss of face if he allows an "i" to be undotted or a "t" to be uncrossed. Surely commonsense dictates that we should follow a common pattern and procedure, unless there is good reason for departure.

I have already told the Minister I dislike the proposition intensely. If the Minister doubts my statement I ask him, and the Premier, with whom he is engaged in debate *sotto voce* at the moment, to have a look at section 36 of the Interpretation Act. If the Minister has no reason at all for the first proposition I have outlined, other than that it is what the Government wants; and if he has no reason for the time factor being completely at variance with that of every other Statute in Western Australia, except to say it is what the Crown Law Department said, where do we go? Is this a deliberative Chamber; or is this an example of the Minister showing how pigheaded and how silly he can be?

Mr. HAWKE: It was not my intention to participate in the debate on this clause. The Minister has, however, adopted a rather peculiar approach to the arguments put forward. He first tried to justify the provision in the clause for the placing of Executive Council decisions on the Table of each House of Parliament and giving members of Parliament the right to disallow, on the principle that he, the Minister, would always be prepared to accept a majority decision of both Houses of Parliament upon any issue, because that was democratic.

As most members know hundreds, probably thousands, of decisions go through Executive Council in a year. Very few of them have to be laid on the Table of the House and become subject to disallowance on motion in each House.

When the Minister was asked whether he would apply this lately-born enthusiasm of his to allow members of Parliament to disallow all and sundry in relation to decisions of Executive Council, he rather

slowly, but nevertheless surely, went into reverse gear—he certainly went into neutral. His reply was, "Not necessarily so." Obviously he would not agree to the proposition, because it would so interfere with the smooth working of Government departments as to bring about confusion and chaos. The reason why the Minister has brought the proposal in the Bill to Parliament and the reason why he insists upon its being accepted without alteration has nothing whatever to do with giving members of Parliament in each House the democratic right to express themselves and to either allow or disallow the appropriate decisions as made previously in Executive Council.

The Minister has failed to put forward any convincing excuse in justification for this proposal. He was in much worse form in relation to the 10 sitting days proposition. When I asked where this proposition came from, he replied that it came from the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman.

When the Minister was asked whether he would discuss with the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman the question whether 14 days might not be more appropriate he decisively and almost contemptuously answered "No." Surely the suggestion made to the Minister on this point is reasonable and is worthy of action by him. He should accept an amendment to substitute 14 days for the 10 days appearing in the Bill. In all common sense 14 days would be a reasonable proposition.

It is probable that the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman decided on the 10-day period as being sufficient for a proper study of any such order, and for any move to be made. I doubt very much if he gave any consideration to making this period uniform with what is provided in similar circumstances in other Acts. I am certain that any approach to him on this point would result in instant approval for the substitution of 14 days for the 10 days.

Mr. BOVELL: This matter has been submitted to the Crown Law Department, and the period of 10 days was decided on by the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman. I do not know his reasons for it. In view of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition I propose to move for the deletion of the word "ten" on page 3, with a view to inserting the word "fourteen".

Mr. Graham: According to the Interpretation Act, appearing on page 230 of our Standing Orders, the period should be six sitting days next following such publication.

Mr. BOVELL: I am looking at that. I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 34—Delete the word "ten" and substitute the word "six."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. BOVELL: I move an amendment—

Page 4, line 3—Delete the word "ten" and substitute the word "fourteen."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. ROWBERRY: My objection to the clause still stands. It does not matter whether timber is growing on Crown land, State forests, or private land, the timber belongs to the Crown and it should be operated by the Forests Department. There is the question of whether the land should be dedicated to the production of timber, or be alienated for the purpose of agriculture.

In the present case the groups which are exerting the greatest pressure will create the greatest impact on the Government; and the Government will, no doubt, decide that the land is not to be dedicated as State forests.

If Western Australia is to have a paper pulping industry, it is vital for the Forests Department to control all the land it is capable of absorbing so that it can make provision for the planting of softwood, which is so necessary in the implementation of this industry.

I read an article a few weeks ago in which a member of the Forests Department stated that what was required was a great annual increase in the planting of soft timber, but I am wondering whether the additional acreage for this purpose is available to the department. I do not know whether in the long run the land dedicated to State forests would not be of more value to the State if it were turned over for agricultural, pastoral, or similar purposes.

I am concerned, because I know pressure has been brought to bear in the past to alienate forest land. It would not matter very much in the case of karri forest, or other forest, if this land were alienated because these trees will grow again; but that is not the case with jarrah. Jarrah timber is precious, because once jarrah country has been cleared and turned over to the plough or pasture, the land cannot again be used for the growing of jarrah. So the question is this: Should Parliament make a decision in regard to something about which it does not have an accurate and scientific knowledge to adjudicate? I do not want to be accused of being inconsistent, but there are numerous instances where the minority is right. In fact, in most cases, the minority is right.

Mr. Graham: Certainly at the last election.

Mr. ROWBERRY: One only has to have regard to mathematics or any of the higher sciences to know that what I say is correct. At the present time the Conservator of Forests makes a decision which, in his opinion, is in the best interests of the State.

In many cases, under the regulations of the Forests Act, the opinion of the Conservator of Forests is final. There is no appeal to Parliament. There is no provision for laying these matters on the Table of the House; nor is there provision in the regulations for the revocation of the conservator's opinion. The *status quo* as it exists now is quite adequate to deal with the situation, and it has done so in the past. Therefore I can see no reason for changing it.

Mr. Graham: I wonder what the Conservator of Forests thinks about this move.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I am concerned with what the Forests Department and the conservator himself think about it.

Mr. Graham: I wonder if the Minister will tell us.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Minister did not say that the conservator required this amendment, or requested that it be introduced; but he did say that certain members of Parliament requested it, which makes me smell a rat. Until then I was quite satisfied that everything was fair and aboveboard; but when the Minister said it had been requested by certain members of Parliament—and it had not been requested by the member who represents probably one of the largest timber areas in the State—I smelt a rat. Because of that, I maintain my opposition to this clause.

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

Ayes—21

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller)*

Noes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. H. May
	(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Curran
Mr. Burt	Mr. Hall
Mr. Runciman	Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. Nimmo	Mr. Fletcher

Majority for—1.

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

(26)

ALSATIAN DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta) [9 p.m.]: Members will recall that when the Government introduced the original Bill considerable hostility was expressed by speakers from the Opposition side of the House. It was felt the Minister was going to all sorts of unnecessary excesses. The Minister, however, was adamant in his stand against the German shepherd dog or Alsatian, as it is more commonly termed amongst those other than owners of such type of dog.

In my view the debate at the time was significant as to the attitude of the Minister and his department in the fact that this breed of dog was mercilessly condemned when, in point of fact, there was no substantial evidence against it. I well recall subsequently asking some questions of the Minister as to whether he would table the papers upon which were based his assertions and the viewpoint of the Agriculture Protection Board. The Minister used some sort of device or excuse by saying the records were intermingled with a whole host of files and therefore could not be extracted or easily located. And yet upon these mythical papers a case was made out for a more severe form of treatment in Western Australia than anywhere else in the world.

I should say these minor amendments embodied in the Bill before us are something in the nature of a death-bed repentance, the Minister realising that he went to excesses when the legislation was introduced into Parliament. The people who espouse the cause of the German shepherd dog are merely asking for a fair trial—a proper and independent investigation into this breed of dog, together with other breeds of dogs, to see whether it can be sustained that any particular breed should have a more rigorous form of control or supervision than is meted out to dogs generally.

I do not know why the Minister did not, in order to protect himself or reassure himself, or in order to ascertain the truth, undertake a searching inquiry into this dog menace generally. I understand some formal submissions or approaches are to be made to the Minister with that object in view, and I hope and trust the Minister will agree to perhaps not a Select Committee of members, but an independent tribunal to investigate and inquire generally into this matter.

Mr. Nalder: That has been passed on to the Minister for Local Government who has the control of that particular section.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought it would have been a function of the Government to decide whether it would appoint an independent body to investigate this question.

Mr. Nalder: All matters except this one under the Agriculture Protection Board come under the Minister for Local Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Government is moving in the direction I have indicated, then I say the owners of German shepherd dogs will be prepared to abide by an adverse decision if that be the finding; but they take the strongest exception to this condemnation of their pets when, as they describe it, there is no warrant for it.

Perhaps I could read the introductory paragraph to what is called "The Case for the Alsatian or German Shepherd Dog for the Orange Alsatian Protection Association" prepared by a gentleman named Mr. A. D. Parsons. It reads as follows:—

> The Case against the Alsatian or German Shepherd Dog is now many years old. It is more than possible that the original arguments against the breed have been forgotten. All that we know in Australia today is that the Alsatian is regarded as a pariah killer dog and a dog that if let loose will cause untold destruction. That is the story which has built up about the Alsatian over the years. It has followed the breed to almost every country of the world. In nearly every country it has been disproved. It has not been disproved in Australia. In fact, Australia was, and is, the most vicious slanderer.

Here let me interpolate to say at the bottom of the class stands Western Australia. To continue—

> It has been a basic point of British Justice, that, in a trial by jury, rumour and hearsay are inadmissable. It is facts that are required. In the case of the Alsatian there is not and never has been any attempt to justify the maligning of the breed by any responsible body. Innumerable people have made foolish statements and contributed many stories about the Alsatian which are not true.
>
> In no other country in the world has any law been enacted to outlaw the Alsatian. It has never been necessary to do it. It was not necessary in Australia and it is not necessary now. The law which outlaws the Alsatian breed, and the ban which prohibits its import into Australia are both wrong. They are wrong in theory and they are wrong in practice. They should be removed from the laws of our country.

Mr. Nalder: This is not banning the Alsatian dog. It is an amendment to the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am aware of that; and that is why I have indicated that the Minister, for some reasons best known to himself, allowed himself to be taken up the garden path, and at the end of the trail there was hook, line, and sinker, and the Minister accommodated the lot.

Mr. Nalder: That is your opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course it is my opinion; but the fact of it is the Minister has not any evidence to back up the drastic action he took.

Mr. Nalder: Of course I have!

Mr. GRAHAM: He has no evidence.

Mr. Nalder: I have given it to the House, too.

Mr. GRAHAM: I asked the Minister; I appealed to the Minister; I put questions on the notice paper. I desired his evidence to be produced, and he did not produce one line of evidence to me—not one line!

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! I think we had better get on with the Bill. It does seem to me that this is a bit outside the scope of the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the general point; and in that state of affairs lies the genesis of the Bill which is before us—hook, line, and sinker. Perhaps a little bit of the sinker is being regurgitated.

Mr. Nalder: Have you ever agreed to any amendment of any Bill that you have introduced to meet the—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Never!

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course!

Mr. Nalder: That is just the case. Did you read the debate in the other place about the disallowance of the regulations last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; I read the debate on the Bill.

Mr. Nalder: If you read the debate on the disallowance of the regulations in the other place—

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; I read that too.

Mr. Nalder: You would not be talking like that if you had.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why not?

Mr. Nalder: Because it is a matter of co-operation.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The member for Balcatta.

Mr. GRAHAM: It will be recalled that there was not a great deal of co-operation in this Chamber, and this is the only one over which I can have any influence—and let me say here and now, very little influence at that! But it was pointed out repeatedly from this side of the House

that the Minister was going to excesses. Now we have an admission that he went too far on that occasion.

I suggest that time will indicate that there are very many more ameliorations which will have to be made in the terms of the legislation before it reaches anything approaching fairness and commonsense. I suggest further that if the Minister and the Government will agree to a full inquiry into the dog problem generally with, if the Minister cares, special emphasis on Alsatians or German shepherd dogs, he will have to retract still further.

Perchance I am a little unfair in pointing the finger so definitely at the Minister, because he surely was not the author of the parent Bill which is now an Act of Parliament; but the criticism is upon his head for allowing himself to be duped by his departmental officers.

Mr. Nalder: I accept that responsibility.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister cannot avoid it. The Minister for Lands had no evidence to back up what he was doing, and the Minister for Agriculture is in precisely the same position. I again make the offer to the Minister that if he can disprove what I am saying, I will be prepared to withdraw and apologise to him for casting aspersions upon his honourable person; but equally and in the opposite direction the Minister should apologise—not to me because I care not for apologies—to the German Shepherd Dog Association and its members.

Mr. Nalder: They are quite happy now with this amending Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: That, of course, is completely removed from the facts. The president of the association is within the precincts of this Chamber, or he was until a short period ago. If the Minister considers that he is satisfied with the legislation, even embodying these amendments, he can have another guess. He is as incensed as ever he was.

Mr. Nalder: He didn't say so last year when I met him.

Mr. GRAHAM: Indeed, I fancy this evening that he is about to have talks with a supporter of the Government with a view to having approaches made to the Minister for a more realistic and commonsense attitude towards this matter.

Mr. Nalder: We have heard nothing from them for 12 months—not a thing; because I promised to do what is embodied in this legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM: In view of the attitude of the Minister, were I an ardent member of that association I think I should regard it as a waste of time to approach him.

Mr. Nalder: It wasn't a waste of time. I met them last year and they agreed to these amendments.

Mr. GRAHAM: If what I am saying was not being taken down by *Hansard* I would express succinctly my summation of what I think about the Bill and its overall effect. Perhaps I am doing the Bill and myself less than justice by devoting this amount of time to it; because in only a couple of minor terms does the legislation provide for some alleviation of the most restrictive conditions and untenable charges which were imposed upon these people—the owners of this type of dog—and which, indeed, still apply.

I therefore suggest that none of us can have any opposition to the Bill; but at the same time it does not get to the kernel of the problem. It leaves unchanged the general situation; namely, that the Alsatian Dog Act is an Act which, in its present form—or anything approaching it—should never be amongst our Statutes. I look to the day when the Minister or his successor will have an opportunity of being better advised and informed; and I suggest the way is for a full inquiry to be made into the dog menace, or the dog situation, or whatever the Minister likes to call it. If that is done, there is no doubt whatsoever that the Alsatian Dog Act will be repealed and something on a far better basis placed on the Statute book in its stead.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. H. MAY (Collie) [9.18 p.m.]: This Bill is a very small one—or, as one of our previous Ministers on this side of the House used to say, "This is only a little Bill." The Bill contains five amendments to the Anzac Day Act which have been proved to have become necessary, by effluxion of time, since the Bill was introduced—in 1960, I think it was.

The first amendment widens the scope of the definition of sports. Previously the definition applied only to football matches, and racing and trotting meetings. It is now proposed to include all sports on Anzac Day, and they will come under the definition of sports. In consequence they will be subject to the conditions of the Act.

A second amendment deals with racing and trotting clubs. Under the original Act, racing and trotting clubs throughout the State were responsible for depositing with the trust 100 per cent. of the takings

from a race meeting. It has been found, over the period that the Act has been in operation, that the provision is unjust to country racing associations; and, from my own experience of country races, I realise that country clubs have been penalised inasmuch as attendances are quite small except at a very few country race meetings and in consequence country clubs have been placed in a very unfavourable position.

This amendment will mean that 100 per cent. of the proceeds of any race meeting or trotting meeting in the metropolitan area—and that is within a radius of 30 miles of the G.P.O., Perth—will still have to be paid to the trust, but the country clubs will be called upon to pay only 60 per cent. of their takings from any racing or trotting meeting on Anzac Day.

The third amendment will fill a gap that has existed in the original Act in regard to donations, devises, and bequests to the trust. At the moment there is no provision to allow them to be paid into the Anzac Day trust fund, but the amendment will allow donations, bequests, and so on to be paid into the fund and become available for use by the administrators of the fund. In the same amendment there is a provision regarding the distribution of proceeds to existing homes for ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen. There was some doubt about the provision in the original Act, and over the years it has caused some confusion. The proposal in the Bill will mean that funds can be used for the building of new homes for ex-servicemen and women; but also they can be used for the purpose of renovations, and so on, of existing establishments.

The fourth amendment merely corrects a printer's error in the original Act and does not need any further comment.

The fifth and final amendment to the principal Act is in regard to the trust's powers to enforce payment of moneys to the fund. Under the Act as it stands the trust can prosecute, but it cannot enforce payment by racing clubs or sporting organisations which fail to pay their complement to the trust. Under the amendment it is proposed that the trust shall still have power to prosecute; and also it will be given further power to enable it to enforce payment of proceeds to the fund. Apparently in the past certain sporting organisations have not been up to scratch in this regard.

I have talked with the officials of the R.S.L.—at least, one official—regarding the Bill, and there is total agreement so far as that organisation is concerned. The amendments will make for better working of the legislation and will straighten out some of the anomalies which have been found to exist since the Act has been in operation. As a consequence of the assurance I have had from the league, and my study of the Bill, I propose to support the second reading.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [9.25 p.m.]: I listened to the member for Collie speaking to the second reading but I did not hear him touch on one aspect dealt with by the Premier when he introduced the measure—I refer to Sunday sport. As I understand the Bill, it corrects a provison in the parent Act in that it is not clear whether, under the Act as it stands, it covers sporting organisations that hold their fixtures on Sundays. As Anzac Day next year falls on a Sunday it was thought this aspect needed tidying up.

Perhaps it does and perhaps it does not; but I would point out to the Premier that the policing of Sunday sporting activities, particularly as a considerable number take place in the country, might be a difficult job. I should imagine if the funds which the Anzac Day organisation receives were to be investigated it would be found that the bulk of the money comes from the metropolitan area where it is reasonably easy to keep activities under fairly constant survey and account for what is going on.

If the R.S.L., or the local branch of the R.S.L. in each town, whether it be in Collie or anywhere else, police the position next year, or whenever Anzac Day falls on a Sunday, to make sure that the correct amount of money is collected on that day and paid into the fund, it will mean a heavy responsibility for the people concerned. I think this policing of sporting fixtures held in the country will be more of a headache than most people think, and maybe it will cause more work than is warranted.

Now that the Chief Secretary has agreed to allow amateur sporting organisations in the metropolitan area to charge for admission to sporting fixtures on Sundays their funds will be fairly easy to check. However, I am not too sure whether a match between the Norseman Football Club and the Esperance Football Club, for instance, would be quite as easy to check as thoroughly as it is possible in the metropolitan area to ensure that the requirements of the Act were being observed.

I believe that if the Act is to cover Sunday sport, generally, as much responsibility should be placed on the people in charge of sporting fixtures in the country as there is on those running the Sunday National Football League competition, and they should have to fill in returns, make declarations, and do whatever is required under the Act. I think something along those lines should be done rather than simply to have an Act that in the long run cannot be policed throughout the State but only in one section of it.

I would like some assurance from the Premier that, if the Bill is passed, all sections of the community which run Sunday sporting fixtures, both in the metropolitan area and in the country, will have

to make out returns and see that those returns are forwarded to the committee in charge of the fund so that it will receive its correct share of the takings.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [9.29 p.m.]: I thank the member for Collie for his support of the Bill; and, regarding the point raised by the member for Beeloo, I think the first amendment, which clarifies the definition of "sport," is a step in the direction that he would like us to go. The amendment clarifies the meaning of "sport" and, in addition to what is already laid down, it means motorcars and so on. It also provides for the situation where, even though people are admitted free, there may be some collection at the end of the fixture.

I presume that in bringing this amendment forward the trust has it in mind to close as many gaps as possible in order to ensure that those who do run sporting fixtures not only on Sunday afternoons but also on all other Anzac Days contribute the percentage required by the Act. I can only give an assurance to the extent that once the Act has been clarified, those who are responsible for policing it will do it to the extent that it allows. I, realising that there have been few comments made on this amending Bill, and also little criticism of the legislation since its introduction, regard this as a clear indication that the Act has worked well and has been satisfactory to all concerned. Also, the Victorian legislation has been quite satisfactory since it was first introduced.

Not a great deal of money has been contributed to the trust, but it has meant quite a lot to those organisations and bodies which have, as their main aim, the welfare of returned soldier organisations and the youth organisations, such as Legacy. I think some £20,000 will be distributed this year. As yet, the various allocations have not been received. A decision has not been made, but in due course it will be publicised.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 27th August, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [9.34 p.m.]: This Bill contains two amendments to the principal Act, both of which will improve its working. The first amendment seeks to make a change in the personnel of the council, whereby the appointment of the chairman is slightly altered. The Commissioner of Public Health will still be the chairman, who can appoint a deputy as chairman; but, if this amendment is passed, instead of the deputy chairman being the Deputy Commissioner of Public Health, it will be a medical practitioner appointed by the Commissioner of Public Health. I think this is a good move because such a medical practitioner will be a permanent employee of the department and will be able to devote far more time to the job than will the commissioner or his deputy. I have no hesitation, therefore, in supporting this part of the Bill.

The second portion of the measure deals with X-ray machines and other such machines which give off radiation, particularly those used by dentists and doctors. These machines were not covered by the original legislation; and last year, or the year before, they were covered by the Act so that they would be registered in the same way as other similar machines. However, there was no compulsion upon anyone to have them registered, and there was no provision for a penalty for failure to register.

That is all this measure seeks to do: to include X-ray and other machines used by dentists and doctors. Under the Bill it will be compulsory for them to register such machines, and if they fail to do so they will be subject to penalty. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 9.39 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 2nd September, 1964

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—3r.	694
Alsatian Dog Act Amendment Bill—3r.	694
Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill—3r.	694
Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill—3r.	694
Forests Act Amendment Bill—Report	694
Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill—2r.	716
Radioactive Substances Act Amendment Bill—3r.	694