Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 6th October, 1960

CONTENTS

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PINE TIMBER

Growth and Use of Pinus Pinaster

1. Mr. NULSEN asked the Minister for Forests:

   (1) Is *Pinus pinaster* (pine timber) saleable in Western Australia and/or interstate or overseas? If so, to what extent?

   (2) Could not considerable quantities of this type of pine be sown with the view to its becoming a good source of revenue to the State?

   (3) Will he have inquiries made to see whether it is a good commercial proposition for the State in the future?

   (4) Has he any plans for increased planting on a considerable scale?

   Mr. BOVELL replied:

   (1) Yes. The timber of *Pinus pinaster* is readily saleable in Western Australia. Last year the Forests Department sold over 610,000 cubic feet of this pine, chiefly for case-making.

   (2) Yes. The Forests Department has approximately 20,000 acres of *Pinus pinaster* and is planting at the rate of 700 to 1,000 acres per year.

   (3) Inquiries have been made and it is considered that *Pinus pinaster* planting is a good commercial proposition for the State provided suitable soils close to a market are selected, but it is not so profitable as the faster-growing *Pinus radiata*.

   (4) Yes. The Forests Department expects to continue planting at the rate of 1,000 acres per year of *Pinus pinaster* and 1,500 acres per year of *Pinus radiata*.

2. *This question was postponed.*

BRANDS ACT

Enforcement of Provisions

3. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has he seen the statement by Mr. C. R. Toop (Chief Veterinary Surgeon) in *The Farmers' Weekly* of the 29th September, that "the Brands Act will be strictly enforced"?

(2) Did Mr. Toop have an assurance from the Government that the Act would, in fact, be enforced?

(3) If not, was he entitled to assume that it would in view of the fact that this Government makes exceptions and does not carry out a law if it is inexpedient for it to do so?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Answered by No. (2).

WATER-RATE ASSESSMENTS

Valuations by Taxation Department

4. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to have all valuations required for land-resumption purposes for the Public Works Department and the Main Roads Department, carried out by the Commonwealth Taxation Department as is proposed for the Water Supply Department?

(2) If not, what is the essential difference which makes it desirable with regard to one department, but not another?

(3) Is it not a matter of insufficient staff and not incapacity on the part of the members of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department's team of valuers which prevents the department from making a complete valuation of the metropolitan area every year?

(4) Is it proposed that when the new arrangement is instituted and valuations are made by the Taxation Department the metropolitan area will be actually revalued every year?

(5) What was the estimated cost in 1959-60 of having the revaluations made of properties in the metropolitan area?

(6) What is the estimated annual charge to be made to the Government by the Commonwealth Taxation Department for the valuations which it will be required to carry out?

(7) Why would it not have been preferable to provide adequate valuing staff to enable the Water Supply Department to make a complete revaluation of properties each year if this is considered necessary?

(8) When revaluations are made by the Taxation Department for the Water Supply Department, will dissatisfied ratepayers still be able to appeal against the valuation placed upon their properties?

(9) In cases of appeal, will the department have check-valuations made?

(10) If so, will they be made by a State officer?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) and (2) No.

(3) Yes. The capacity of the members of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department was not under question.

(4) No final decision has been made, but it is anticipated that the metropolitan area will be revalued every third year.

(5) £6,850.

(6) This has not yet been determined.

(7) Trained staff are always hard to obtain and retain; furthermore, in view of the probable decision to revalue only every third year, there would be insufficient work for the officers during the intervening period.

(8) Yes—to the Taxation Department.

(9) No.

(10) Answered by No. (9).

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT

Valuations

5. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has he seen in *The Farmers' Weekly* of the 29th September a letter from Mr. G. F. Wills, Frankland, in which he stated that "War service land settlement valuations are fantastic"?

(2) Is there room for dissatisfaction with regard to the valuation in question?

(3) What officers have made the valuations?

(4) Does he consider that the job of making these valuations should be given to the Commonwealth Taxation Department as the Government proposes to do with valuations for the Metropolitan Water Supply Department?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Yes; but the name is "Mills," not "Wills."

(2) No; but the lessees issued with valuations at Many Peaks have the right of objection to the Minister.

(3) The Chairman of the Land Settlement Board, and the Commonwealth Deputy Director of War Service Land Settlement.

(4) The legislation provides for valuations to be made by officers appointed by the Commonwealth and State and the valuations are made strictly in accordance with the legislation.

6. *This question was postponed.*

TRAFFIC ACT

Policing of Regulation No. 240

7. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Police:

What methods do the Police Department use to police traffic Regulation No. 240, subregulation (6), as amended?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

Chiefly policed by the Police Department heavy haulage section, comprising four vans each manned by two officers, and equipped with tested speedometers and loadometers.

Inside the metropolitan area, also policed by all members of the patrol staff.

8. *This question was postponed.*

DONNELLY RIVER AREA

Settlement of South Coastal Plains

9. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) When were investigations commenced into the south coastal plains westwards from the Donnelly River?

(2) What stage has been reached with settlement in this area?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) Scott River subdivision—November, 1956.

Scott River North subdivision—June, 1959.

Lake Jasper locality—February, 1959.

(2) Scott River (First opening, 10 blocks).—June, 1958.

Scott River North: 13 blocks approved for opening—that is, made available for selection—in November, 1960.

Lake Jasper: No action towards design (except that roads have been located) on account of land having soil deficiency.

TRAFFIC ACT

Policing of Lighting Equipment Regulations

10. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Police:

What methods are used by the Police Department to police Division No. (3) of the traffic regulations, with special reference to that part which deals with lamps, reflectors, and lighting equipment?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

All vehicles are checked by competent police examiners prior to original registration. Light testing is conducted on a voluntary basis twice monthly. Two fully-equipped vehicle checking vans and all patrol staff continually carry out spot road checks and serve "unfit" notices on unroadworthy vehicles.

STIRLING HIGHWAY MEDIAN STRIP

Effect on Neighbouring Streets

11. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Have any streets running parallel, or at right angles, to that part of Stirling Highway on which the median strip is situated, shown signs of deterioration since the strip was installed?

(2) If so, will he name the streets, and state to what extent the surface deterioration is directly attributable to the passage of heavy vehicles; and further, will he inform the House what methods were used to determine this?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) No inspection of these local authorities' roads was made by the Main Roads Department prior to the strip being installed. Consequently it is not possible to determine whether any deterioration has occurred.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

KALGOORLIE TRAIN

Improvements in Facilities

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has consideration been given to improving comfort facilities for passengers travelling on the train to Kalgoorlie in any of the following ways:—

(a) Provision of power points in all compartments for purpose of electric razors;

(b) combating cold draughts experienced during winter months by passengers occupying upper sleeping berths;

(c) provision of handbasins in all second-class compartments;

(d) alteration of second-class coaches to allow for convenient preparation and serving of a cup of tea or coffee for passengers;

(e) a variety in the type of biscuit at present being served with a cup of tea, etc.;

(f) means of serving cold drinking water to passengers travelling in second-class coaches, other than from water bags at present in use?

(2) If so, are any such improvements planned to be carried out in the near future?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes. Also on other main-line passenger services.

(2) Planning is for a gradual improvement.

13. *This question was postponed.*

KALGOORLIE POLICE STATION

Improvements

14. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Has he had inquiries made into the subject of improvements and alterations to the Kalgoorlie Police Station, along the lines suggested by my previous question this year?

(2) If so, has any decision been reached as to if and when such work will be commenced?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No. The positon is not considered of sufficient urgency, having regard to other requirements.

15. *This question was postponed.*

TAYLORINA

Eradication

16. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the Agricultural Department declared taylorina a secondary noxious weed in Albany?

(2) If so, can he indicate at this juncture whether the department will assist with finance for the eradication of taylorina in Albany, or will assistance be by way of advice?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Taylorina was declared a secondary noxious weed for the Municipality of Albany at the request of the municipal council.

(2) The department will continue to help with advice regarding control measures, but no financial assistance is contemplated.

WATER RATES

Validity of Rating System

17. Mr. TONKIN asked the Attorney-General:

(1) Were there any grounds additional to those stated by him in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, the 28th September, upon which he based his assertion that the system that has been adopted by the Metropolitan Water Supply Department over a great period of years is contrary to the terms of the Metropolitan Water Supply Act?

(2) If so, what are the additional grounds?

(3) Has the rating by the Metropolitan Water Supply Department in fact been invalid as asserted by him?

Mr. WATTS replied:

Nos. (1) to (3): I do not feel it is desirable to reply to this question on the basis of grounds additional to those stated on Wednesday, the 28th September, but rather to say that in an opinion given by the Solicitor-General on the 21st September, it is stated, *inter alia*, and I quote—

> I am informed by the Under Secretary, Water Supply Department, that most of the annual valuations have been ascertained under section 74 (2) of the Act which requires a sum equal to the estimated full value for the rental of the land, less the amount of all rates and taxes and a deduction of 20 per centum for repairs, insurance and other outgoings. Instead of ascertaining the rates and taxes in respect of any ratable land the department arbitrarily allows a reduction of 20 per cent. in respect of rates and taxes and a further 20 per cent. in respect of repairs, insurance and other outgoings. The department then assesses the annual value at 60 per cent. of the balance then remaining. In my opinion this practice is not authorised by section 74 (2).

In the same opinion the Solicitor-General went on to say, and I quote—

> The department under section 74 (3) in relation to different land within the same district makes assessments at different

percentages of the capital value in the land in fee simple. It is not clear that this practice is authorised and I would therefore suggest an amendment to section 74.

In an opinion subsequently given on the 26th September by the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman, after referring to the terms of section 74 (2) he states, *inter alia*, and I quote—

> It appears that instead of deducting the actual amount of all rates and taxes a percentage of 20 per cent. of the rent was arbitrarily fixed. This practice is contrary to the Act. In some districts 60 per cent. was used and in others 75 per cent. of the estimated full fair average amount of the rent of the subject land as the basis of the annual value.

In suggesting desirable amendments to the Act, the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman went on to say, and I quote—

> All amounts payable or purported to be payable in respect of rates made and levied under the Act for any year up to and including the 30th June, 1961, and demanded or collected whether before or after the operation of the amending Act should be deemed to have been lawfully imposed and lawfully demanded or collected.

STIRLING HIGHWAY MEDIAN STRIP

Representations for Construction

18. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Before the construction of the median strip in Stirling Highway, had any overtures been made for such a strip from any parliamentarian whose electorate either bordered or contained part of the Stirling Highway?

(2) If so, when and by whom were such representations made?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The 6th August, 1959, by H. W. Crommelin, M.L.A., for a median strip.

PARKING

William Street Restrictions

19. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Transport:

When is it anticipated that parking restrictions will be applied on both sides of William Street between Newcastle Street and Brisbane Street?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

On the 28th September, 1960, regulations were published in the *Government Gazette* limiting parking in William Street to two hours between Newcastle and Brisbane Streets between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.

WATER RATES

Appeals by Ratepayers against Increases

20. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

In view of the many protests being voiced throughout the metropolitan area in regard to increased water rates, will he state the procedure for ratepayers who wish to appeal against the rating now operating?

Mr. WILD replied:

There is no provision in the governing Act for an appeal against rating, but sections 85 to 89 of the Act provide for appeals against the valuation placed on a property.

STATE BRICKWORKS

Publicising of Products

21. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has the State Building Supplies an exhibit at the Royal Show?

(2) If not, will he state reasons why the opportunity has not been taken to fully publicise the advantages of using the products of the State brickworks?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes, in Centenary Pavilion.

(2) The decision on the nature of an exhibit is a matter for the management. Bricks have not been featured in this exhibit as orders and demand for premium bricks are ahead of ability to supply.

FISHING VESSELS

Losses, Cost of Searches, and Lives Lost

22. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Police:

(1) How many cases of lost fishing vessels were reported for the years 1956-57, 1957-58, and 1959-60?

(2) What was the total cost to the Government by way of searching for lost fishing vessels?

(3) How many lives were lost as a result of fishing vessels being lost?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) 1956-57—3 searches
1957-58—2 searches
1959-60—9 searches

(2) 1956-57—£20
1957-58—£103
1959-60—£2,290

(3) 1956-57—No lives lost
1957-58—No lives lost
1959-60—No lives lost

23. *This question was postponed.*

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Housing Needs, 1956-1960

24. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) What were the estimated housing needs in Western Australia for the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 taking into account migration and marriages?

Non-residential Buildings, 1956-1960, and Cost

(2) What was the number of non-residential buildings erected in this State for the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960, including factories, hospitals, offices, shops, hotels, motels, and schools?

(3) What amount was spent on the erection of non-residential buildings for the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) It is presumed that the question pertains to the housing requirements of the whole population of Western Australia and is not limited to those people who are entitled to make demand on the State Housing Commission.

Since the question requests information on need and not demand, the following information is provided accordingly:—

Calendar Year.

1956	4,900
1957	4,800
1958	4,900
1959	5,000
1960	5,150

On the other hand, the Department of National Development's method of calculating need does not provide for inclusion of backlog over previous years.

For information, the following figures are provided which show the number of houses and flats completed during the financial years in question:—

1955-56	8,344
1956-57	5,395
1957-58	6,367
1958-59	6,058
1959-60	6,260

(2) Number of non-residential buildings completed—

1955-56	1,126
1956-57	888
1957-58	902
1958-59	883
1959-60	922

(3) The amount actually spent on non-residential buildings in any one year is not obtainable from the Bureau of Census and Statistics. The following figures relate to the value of buildings completed in the financial years:—

	£
1955-56	9,854,000
1956-57	8,146,000
1957-58	8,643,000
1958-59	12,637,000
1959-60	11,900,000

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

GASCOYNE RIVER

Tabling of Furphy Report on Water Conservation

1. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

Has he received any report from Messrs. Scott and Furphy in respect of the visit of Mr. Furphy to Carnarvon when he surveyed the Gascoyne River on the matter of further water conservation?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will he table the report; if the answer is in the negative, when can the report be expected?

Mr. WILD replied:

A report has been received, but it has not been given full consideration as yet. When it has been fully considered, I shall give consideration to tabling it.

WATER-RATE ASSESSMENTS

Appeals Against Valuations by Taxation Department

2. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Arising out of the answers he gave to Question No. 4 on today's notice paper, as he has stated an appeal would be possible to the Taxation Department, is he aware that under the existing legislation no such appeal is possible?

(2) As that is the position, does he realise that an amendment of the Act will be necessary before it will be possible for ratepayers to appeal?

(3) Is is proposed to amend the Act this year?

Mr. WILD replied:

When a final decision is known, following representations made to the Commonwealth Government, such matters will be taken into consideration.

STIRLING HIGHWAY MEDIAN STRIP

Representations for Construction

3. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Transport:

Arising out of the Minister's answer to Question No. 18 on today's notice paper, in which he was asked by the member for Beeloo whether any overtures had been made for a median strip, in Stirling Highway, will the Minister give me an assurance that the representations which I made for some type of median strip in Stirling Highway were in no way connected with the type of median strip that is now being constructed?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

In fairness to the honourable member I must say that, as far as I can recall his remarks, he did not specify any particular type of strip at the time. I would not like it to be understood that the department regards the representations which the honourable member made as being responsible for the design of the present median strip in Stirling Highway.

PAWNBROKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

On motion by Mr. Oldfield, Bill introduced, and read a first time.

BILLS (5)—THIRD READING

1. Esperance Lands Agreement Bill.

On motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

2. Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Bill.

On motion by Mr. Wild (Minister for Works), Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

3. Local Authorities, British Empire and Commonwealth Games Contributions Authorisation Bill.

On motion by Mr. Watts (Attorney-General), Bill read a third time and passed.

4. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill.

On motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

5. Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill.

On motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary), Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport) [2.41]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of this Bill is to overcome difficulties which have arisen in respect to the bond requirement of the used-car-dealer legislation, which was passed by Parliament in 1957.

By and large, this legislation has put the whole business of secondhand car dealing on a much better basis than hitherto. However, section 22AC, which requires every applicant for a used-car dealer's license to furnish a bond or security to the value of £3,000 has proved unsatisfactory and unworkable. Although dealers are prepared to take out the necessary bond and pay the premium, they have had great difficulty in securing appropriate cover, and the conditions under which a bond is available have proved most unreasonable.

The Commissioner of Police is satisfied that there are ample safeguards in the legislation even if the bond requirement is not enforced; and for the reasons I have mentioned, it is recommended that the portion of the Act requiring dealers to provide a bond be deleted.

Another minor difficulty has been experienced, inasmuch as dealers who have a number of branches are not required to keep a register at each branch or place of business; and in order that vehicles can be speedily traced, the keeping of a register at all premises is essential and is provided for in the amending Bill.

The 1958 amendment to the Act which prohibits the transfer of taxi plates requires an amendment. At present, some taxi owners are selling their vehicles at exorbitant prices and merely leasing the plates, which defeats the purpose of the Act. It is considered desirable that some regulation of leasing, with a penalty for non-observance, should be provided; and also the authority to permit a transfer in a genuine case of chronic illness or advanced years.

Regulation-making power to prescribe provisions relating to the use and hiring of taxis generally is also included in the Bill. To prevent cruising and with a view to obviating congestion and assisting traffic flow in the central city area, it is proposed to establish single taxi stands in Hay Street, Murray Street, Wellington Street, and St. George's Terrace, with feeder ranks on the outskirts from which taxis will proceed progressively.

Representations have been made by the Taxi Owners' Association for an increased flagfall rate and for a standard mileage rate; but having regard to the effect the increased flagfall rate would have on the short-distance passenger, the Government is opposed to any increase in flagfall. The present regulations provide for 1s. 6d. per mile minimum and a 2s. per mile maximum; and the Government is agreeable that a standard rate of 1s. 6d. per mile should operate. I might add that there is definite evidence that owners of taxis value their plates as high as £500 or £600, which seems to indicate that the operation of taxis cannot be so unprofitable as some members of the association have indicated.

It is considered that the ban on cruising on the establishment of the single taxi stands will reduce owners' running costs. The Government is agreeable to increase the present charge of 12s. per hour waiting time to 15s., which is calculated on the basis of 3d. for each five minutes which the driver is required to wait. Such charge shall not include any accident, or emergency, or mechanical failure.

It is also proposed that a charge of 3s. be permitted when a taxi is engaged and then not used; and where a taxicar is called by telephone or radio, a charge of 1s. may be made to cover dead running. A variation in the flat-rate charge of 6d. for each 28 lb. irrespective of distance to a charge of 6d. for each two miles for every 56 lb. weight is also envisaged. There is no specific requirement in the Act to require taxis to be equipped with taximeters; and in order to validate the proposed new regulation, such a provision is deemed advisable.

It is also considered undesirable that taxis should be used either internally or externally as a medium for exhibiting advertising matter. In order that persons desirous of engaging a taxi can obtain all information regarding charges and conditions of hire, it is proposed that every taxi driver shall carry in his taxi and produce upon request a booklet containing all the regulations pertaining to taxis. To this end, the Government is at present rewriting the existing regulations with a view to printing sufficient copies for issue.

Perhaps I should make it clear that these provisions are not contained in the Bill, but it is necessary to widen the regulation-making power to enable such regulations to be made. When they are made they will, of course, be gazetted and laid on the Table of the House, and will be open for disallowance by either House of Parliament for the statutory period.

Another important amendment increases the amount specifically provided for traffic lights and signs from £40,000 to £60,000 per annum. Provision is made in the Bill for the acceptance in Western Australia of license certificates for vehicles licensed in other States and *vice versa* as *prima facie* proof of such licenses; and also for the stamping of a number on a vehicle chassis—particularly caravans and trailers—to prevent unlawful changing of plates.

It is also proposed to dispense with the licensing of pushcycles; and to discontinue requiring vehicles with W.A.G. plates to display a registration certificate. A clause has also been included to permit of the renewal of an extraordinary license.

On motion by Mr. Rowberry, debate adjourned.

DAIRY CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 4th October.

MR. HALL (Albany) [2.50]: I commend this measure to the House because I feel it is making the step forward which the people in the industry have been seeking for a long time. As the Minister said, this is the fourth time since 1947 that such a Bill providing compensation has been before the House.

There are probably some features in the Bill which will not entirely meet the requirements of those in the industry, the most important one, in my opinion, being that in regard to the compensation to be paid for the stock slaughtered. In 1947 the following was stated in the House:—

> The actual amount one can receive for a reactor to T.B. is £20.

The honourable member then went on to state that 43 per cent. tested were reactors. One was a valuable bull. If a prize bull had to be replaced today, the amount mentioned in the Bill—£35—would be absolutely insufficient. If we perused the market prices of cattle today, I am sure that we would not find any decent beast procurable for £35. A beast for that price would probably be a butcher's delight, but certainly no dairyman would appreciate such an animal for breeding purposes.

Another portion of the Bill contains the provision that any cattle suspected to be suffering from a disease must be destroyed. I would hate to be the owner of a first-class beast which was suspected of having a disease and have to see it destroyed. It is obvious that you, Mr. Speaker, as a primary producer, would realise the unfairness of destroying a beast merely because it was suspected of having a disease.

Imagine the situation if we took the same attitude in regard to the medical field! The procedure is that if anyone is suspected of suffering from a serious disease, a second medical opinion is obtained; and sometimes even a specialist is called in.

I think much the same system should be adopted in regard to our beef and dairy cattle. If an animal is suspected of having T.B., it should be subjected to a second test

by another officer before it is destroyed. That would be a protection for the producer and the industry, and would be an advantage to the State.

After all, it would be impossible for every inspector to be perfect in regard to his diagnoses, because some people have more intelligence than others; some more ability than others; and some more natural adaptability than others in facing up to certain situations. It is for this reason that I ask the Minister to give some consideration to the matter of giving to this industry the protection it should have.

The Minister mentioned that something like £200,000 is being spent in Great Britain per annum for the slaughter of beasts. This Bill should provide for the eradication of the disease, but it is providing for the eradication of the industry. If more research were undertaken with regard to animals, the same as has been done for humans, greater protection would be afforded the industry.

The slaughtering of humans would not have eradicated T.B., and I do not think it is the answer in this case. Certainly, the compensation will ease some of the heartaches and heartbreaks caused through the condemnation of beasts, but I believe that investigation into the eradication of the disease, rather than the eradication of the animal, should be made.

It must be remembered that the slaughtering of beasts unnecessarily will only increase the price of beef, which is very high at the moment because of its scarcity. The stage is already being reached where the purchase of beef is becoming impossible for the basic-wage earner.

The provision for compensation for the carcase is a good one. I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that if he studies the situation in Germany he will find that there is what they call the free bank system which, if adopted here, would provide a lucrative market. The idea is that, by sterilising these beasts, the meat can be canned or sold in certain shops known as free bank system shops. The meat is retailed in those shops at a much cheaper price than the high-quality meat. It is guaranteed to be pure, however, and is edible because it has been sterilised.

If the same system were adopted here, we would find that it would provide a lucrative export market later on, because our neighbours would be quite ready to accept the meat which had been processed and sterilised. Particularly would this apply to the countries where malnutrition is very rife, and where the opportunity of obtaining meat is very limited.

As I said at the outset, I commend this measure to the House, as it will meet a long-unfulfilled need in the dairying industry. The Minister has assured me that he has the full support of our primary producers in this matter.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Harvey) [2.59]: This measure has been requested mainly by the farming community concerned with the production of butterfat. There are, however, a number of features which I think need some clarification. For instance, we find that many of the dairymen producing butterfat are also running a beef herd. That applies, too, in a number of instances to the wholemilk producer. He is running his wholemilk herd, plus a beef herd, and at the moment has to have only his dairy herd tested.

From the wording of this Bill I understand that such a person will have to have every beast on his property T.B.-tested. Of course there will be many instances where a farmer will have only a small dairy herd and a small number of beef cattle, thus making a contribution on the basis of 2d. in the £ on butterfat value. Under the compensation scheme he will have a large number of cattle for which he will make no contribution. I suggest that the wisest thing to do under those circumstances would be to T.B.-test only those cattle concerned with the actual dairy. Such animals as oxen and steers should not come within the scope of this Bill. Otherwise I feel that all sorts of anomalies will creep into it.

But generally I anticipate that a T.B.-testing scheme associated with the butterfat industry will be run on very similar lines to those of the whole-milk producing dairy, and all the cows in the dairy herds will be regularly T.B.-tested. The initial scheme is to test those cows which are then in the milking herd, or associated with the milking herd; and, as time progresses and new stock is brought into the milking herd, the new stock will be included in the regular testing.

I think that if that system is applied to T.B.-testing of butterfat cattle, all the cattle which it is desired to have T.B.-tested will be done in that manner; and I feel that will give quite a good coverage and will achieve what the Minister seeks in bringing into being a T.B.-testing scheme for butterfat dairy cattle. Any other comments I might make on this measure could, I feel, be left to the Committee stage when we could seek clarification on some of the points in the various clauses.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [3.2]: I support the Bill. There are, however, two items which I would like the Minister to clear up. One concerns the dairy cattle industry compensation fund. I see that the definition of "fund" means The Dairy Cattle Industry (Butter Fat) Compensation Fund. Why exclude whole-milk dairy cattle?

Mr. Nalder: They are already covered under the Milk Act.

Mr. ROWBERRY: My second point is this: Line 15 of page 4 of the Bill states—

> The Chief Inspector or inspector may order any diseased dairy cattle or any dairy cattle suspected to be suffering from disease to be destroyed.

Like the member for Albany, I cannot see any justice in destroying cattle that are suspected of being diseased, when we have the means of ascertaining whether cattle are diseased or not.

Mr. Nalder: The honourable member should read that particular clause in conjunction with the preceding clause.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Bill says—

> "disease," in relation to dairy cattle, means tuberculosis or actinomycosis and any other disease of cattle which the Governor by proclamation declares to be a disease for the purposes of this Act; and "diseased" has a corresponding meaning.

If we know there is a disease, we know beyond suspicion that it is a disease; otherwise, we have no right to say that it is a disease. That is my objection to this Bill; namely, this "suspicion." I think this section could be amended to bring it above suspicion; and I intend to move in Committee an amendment to that effect, in order to give the Minister an opportunity of clarifying the position.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture—in reply) [3.5]: I think I can assist the House in clearing up one or two points raised by the member for Albany and the member for Warren. First of all, the cattle compensation fund will in no way cut across the whole-milk. As I stated, when moving the second reading, this measure in no way conflicts with the measure which caters for the whole-milk industry. The Bill applies entirely to butterfat producers, and this compensation fund will be used to pay for diseased cattle; and the diseases will be named by regulation or by proclamation by the Governor.

At the moment, the Bill covers the two diseases mentioned by the honourable member; and if at any stage in the future it is necessary to proclaim any other disease, it will be added to this Act so that the owner of cattle condemned for a certain disease, as proclaimed, will be compensated for those cattle.

Concerning cattle being slaughtered indiscriminately—I am not too sure that was the word used by the honourable member—I think members should read the previous clause. The matter is well and truly covered there. Where an officer, who is testing for the disease, proves that cattle are diseased, or if he has a suspicion they are diseased, he first of all must communicate with the Chief Inspector. Members will see here that there is provision for further consideration to be given to whether stock are diseased or not.

It may be that in a herd of cattle a test is made, and a percentage—perhaps a large percentage—of the herd found to be suffering from this disease, or found to have contracted the disease in some way or other. The test may prove that perhaps only a percentage of the stock are reactors; but the officer could have a suspicion that one or two other animals, or a number of animals, that have been tested but do not immediately react, could be suffering from the disease.

He would therefore immediately report the matter to his chief inspector, who would then go to the property and further investigate the stock. But he would not go there and indiscriminately have cattle slaughtered. However, some cattle may be suspected of being carriers or of being affected, and the chief inspector—with justification—could order the slaughter of the cattle.

There is no fear of cattle being sent to slaughter without a really good reason; and before we endeavour to amend this legislation, or the clause, I feel we must give full consideration to the previous clauses that I have mentioned.

The member for Albany has referred to the amount of compensation. I have given quite a lot of thought to this matter. Members may recollect that last year Parliament, at the request of the producers, agreed to raise the amount paid for compensation in the whole-milk industry; and it was raised from £30 to £35. Of course, I must point out that if the compensation figure is increased, it is also quite possible that the sum contributed by the producers will have to be increased; because we have to keep a balance in the fund.

In case of new legislation such as this, I think it would be wise to keep the figure in both Acts somewhere near the same—at least initially—until we have an opportunity to give further consideration to it, and until we have found out just how much is in the fund. At this stage I think we would be wise to agree to a figure of £35; and if, next year, there is a demand for an increase, the fund is in a sound position, and the producers are prepared to increase their contribution to the fund, we can give serious consideration to it.

I think most members will agree that we should allow the legislation to be given a trial, and to amend it next year if necessary. I hope the House will agree to pass this measure in its present form; and if so, I will be quite happy to give consideration to the position in 12 months' time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5—Interpretation:

Mr. I. W. MANNING: In my view the use of the words "ox, steer" in this clause are unnecessary, because most of the stock which will come within the ambit of these words will be stock which is ready for market at the age of 2 and 2½ years. The incidence of T.B. in that type of cattle would be very rare indeed; and to include such stock in the legislation would mean that we would be T.B.-testing a lot of cattle without any need, and there would be no real advantage in doing it. I would like to know whether the Minister will allow those words to be deleted from the legislation.

Mr. NALDER: I hope that the present wording of the clause will remain; and I shall explain the reason for the inclusion of the two words mentioned by the member for Harvey. It could be that a dairy farmer has mostly dairy cattle on his property, and only three or four steers. On inspection it may be found that 50 per cent. of the herd is condemned as suffering from T.B. If the two words are taken out of the provision, and the three or four steers that the dairy farmer has are suffering from T.B., he could claim no compensation for them. By allowing the words to remain in the clause, a dairy farmer in such a case would be covered if any oxen or steers on his property were found to be reactors.

Mr. May: They should all be tested whether they are steers or not.

Mr. NALDER: That is correct; but if these words are struck out a dairy farmer would not be paid for those types of cattle if they were found to be suffering from T.B. If the clause is allowed to remain as it is at present worded, a farmer will be covered for all cattle on his property.

Mr. May: They should be tested in any case.

Mr. NALDER: They would be tested; but if the words are deleted a dairy farmer would not be able to obtain compensation for those types of stock if they were found to be reactors.

Mr. May: Evidently the member for Harvey has no steers.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am sorry this Bill came on so quickly because we have not had a chance to discuss it with those in the country who are interested in it.

Mr. Nalder: You had all day yesterday.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: Parliament was not sitting, and there was no opportunity of discussing it with those who are interested in it.

Mr. Tonkin: Move for an adjournment and we will support you.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: That might be an idea. This Bill provides that a compensation fund will be set up comprising levies on butterfat and a subsidy from the Government. After listening to the member for Harvey the thought struck me—and I think it applies more particularly to dairy farmers in districts in the southern areas, such as in Warren—that there are a number of dairy farmers who dairy in an extensive way for part of the year, and also deal in stock. They produce steers and fatten them. I am wondering how those steers can be tested.

I presume that no matter what number of steers they may purchase and fatten, so long as they are contributors to this fund they are covered by it. This could mean that the Government and the fund could be up for a lot of money; and I think the position should be clarified. If the Minister is not clear on this point, I think we might postpone further discussion on the matter at least until next week so that we can have a chance to look at it and see what it really means.

Mr. NALDER: The point raised by the member for Murray does not enter into this discussion. He mentioned the position of dairy farmers who would purchase steers for fattening during that period of the year in which he was not engaged in dairying. That issue would not be considered under this legislation. Those animals would be treated as beef cattle. A dairyman, in this regard, would be carrying the risks himself, because those cattle would be raised solely for fattening and sent to market, with the owner taking the risk that any of the cattle might be condemned on arrival.

I am convinced that the Government's position will be well looked after under this measure. We would not be doing the dairying industry any service if we delayed the Bill. The dairy farmers' section of the Farmers' Union is very eager for this measure to pass and wholeheartedly supports it. I assure the member for Murray that the question he raised is well covered.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I agree with the Minister's contention, but I can also sympathise with the member for Harvey and the member for Murray, as practical farmers, in appreciating the difficulty of obtaining butterfat, or whole milk, from oxen and steers. However, they are principally beef cattle; and when their carcases are sent to market, the public's interests are completely safeguarded because those carcases are examined by inspectors. Therefore the only cattle that remain to be covered are those included in this Bill. I agree with the Minister that no good purpose would be served by delaying the Bill. I am quite satisfied that the definition of oxen and steers should remain in the Bill.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: If the farmers have told the Minister that they desire this legislation, I do not wish to delay the Bill. At the same time, should there be a weakness, a farmer could go to the market and

purchase stock with the idea of fattening them, and that might be the major portion of his business.

I ask the Minister whether this would be the position: No matter how many stock a farmer bought outside, even if they were not dairy cattle, provided he contributed to the fund he would receive compensation for them. Would that be the position? If it is, I do not know how one would differentiate in those circumstances. How would one know what cattle the farmer had bred himself or what cattle he had purchased for fattening? Apparently, as long as a man is contributing to the fund he is entitled to compensation; and it does not make any difference whether he is a dairy farmer or a raiser of beef cattle.

Mr. NALDER: To me, the position is reasonably clear. The person who is dairying and contributing to the fund will be able to claim compensation for those cattle that he is using for dairying. If he is engaged in dairying in only a small way, his contributions will be small and he can receive compensation only for those cattle used for dairying purposes. If most of a farmer's efforts are directed towards beef-cattle raising, that would constitute a separate part of his industry, and therefore the beef section would not be eligible for compensation.

Sir Ross McLarty: I think you had better have another look at it.

Mr. NALDER: I reiterate that the Farmers' Union is quite happy about the measure; and provided we are satisfied the provisions in the Bill are sound—and I have been assured of that—I can see no reason why we should not pass the measure. I can assure the Committee that there is no catch in it; because, if there were, the dairy farmers' section of the Farmers' Union would definitely be aware of it. I trust, therefore, that the Committee will agree to the clause.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I think there is a point here that needs investigation. I represent a district which carries a limited number of dairy cattle, but there is a large number of beef cattle or animals crossbred from dairy cattle. It appears to me that the contributions to the fund would be made by those who are raising dairy cattle for butter production. Those are the men who will be entitled to reap the benefit of compensation.

For instance, a farmer who sends butterfat to the butter factory would be a contributor to the fund, and he would be entitled to compensation on any steers which he possessed, because he is a contributor. To me, that would appear to place a very heavy draw on the fund, which would be built up in the main from contributions from butterfat producers.

Sir Ross McLarty: And the farmer you have instanced who has steers might be contributing to the fund for only a portion of the year.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is quite so; and therefore he would be eligible to compensation for any steers that were condemned. I am not objecting to the provision from that point of view, because those farmers would be at an advantage; but the fact is that the fund would not be able to stand it. Although most steers raised in my district are a crossbreed between beef cattle and dairy cattle, they are still steers raised for the beef market. So it appears to me that there is a weakness in the clause in that the people who should derive benefit from the measure would be contributing to the fund for the benefit of those who are not really entitled to compensation.

Mr. NALDER: To my way of thinking, the point raised by the member for Narrogin does not enter into the matter. The point at issue is that people who are dairying, and who are contributing to this fund by an amount deducted from the returns they receive from the butter factories, would not receive the benefit if the words in question were taken out. Anybody can breed dairy cattle until further orders; he could cross them as he liked so far as the production of calves is concerned, but he would not derive any benefit from his contribution to the fund if an inspector came to the property and found the cattle were suffering from T.B.

Sir Ross McLarty: As long as they are contributing, they are all dealers.

Mr. NALDER: That type of person would not come under this legislation.

Sir Ross McLarty: But he is contributing to the fund.

Mr. NALDER: That is perfectly all right.

Sir Ross McLarty: But he could be a dealer as well.

Mr. Tonkin: What makes a steer dairy cattle?

Mr. NALDER: If the member for Melville had been listening, he would have understood the position I am trying to explain.

Mr. Tonkin: I have been listening, and I think the member for Murray has a point.

Mr. NALDER: It was the member for Narrogin who made the point.

Mr. Tonkin: I do not care who else made it.

Mr. NALDER: A dairyman could have an ox or steer in the herd that had not been sold for beef; it could have been out

of condition. When the inspector inspects the dairy cattle he also inspects the steers that are there.

Mr. Tonkin: Could he have 10 of them?

Mr. NALDER: Yes; and one of the steers could be suffering from T.B. If the words it is proposed to take out are deleted, it will mean the dairyman will not receive compensation. If those words are left in, he could claim compensation as a contributor. He is a dairyman in the true sense of the word, because his main income is from that source.

Mr. Nulsen: Would oxen mean all cattle?

Mr. NALDER: An ox is an older steer.

Mr. Tonkin: What good would it be for dairy purposes?

Mr. NALDER: As I explained, it happens to be still in the herd. It has not been kept for milk, of course, but the dairyman has not been able to dispose of it because of its condition; it might not have been able to put on sufficient meat to warrant its disposal at value. So it will continue to remain in the herd.

Mr. Tonkin: It will be there a long time.

Mr. NALDER: That is so; and I have seen it happen. It could be a bull that has been castrated and kept there for dairy purposes.

Mr. Lewis: Suppose those steers comprise 90 per cent. of his herd?

Mr. NALDER: He would then be in the meat industry.

Mr. Brand: He would be a poor old dairyman with 90 per cent. of steers.

Mr. TONKIN: I had no intention of buying into this argument, but the Minister seems to resent my having asked a question in regard to steers. What should be clarified is the meaning of "dairy purposes." Without some further information being made available I cannot see what a steer is doing in a dairy herd for dairy purposes, and being kept there for a long time. The Minister said it might be there for a number of years. How can a steer be on a dairy farm for dairy purposes for a number of years? "Dairy cattle" means any bull, cow, ox, steer, heifer, or calf kept for dairying purposes.

Mr. Watts: In the rare event of this difficulty arising, clause 23 would apply. Have you had a look at that?

Mr. TONKIN: I have not gone that far.

Mr. Watts: Clause 23 would settle the matter if that rare event occurred.

Mr. TONKIN: If that is so, I am quite happy about the matter. As the definition appears, it would seem to be extremely difficult to differentiate in the matter of compensation.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I appreciate the point raised by the Minister. The whole-milk producer is not concerned about having a few steers in his dairy herd; his main aim is to produce as much milk as possible. With reference to butterfat, however, it will be found that there are perhaps half a dozen calves raised and kept until they are steers. They run with the dairy herd until they are ready for the market. It would be wise to have them T.B. tested if they were to run with the herd for some time. But when there are a large number of steers on a dairy property, they should not come within the ambit of the Act.

Mr. NALDER: As the Attorney-General explained in his interjection, clause 23 covers the position raised.

Sir Ross McLarty: That puts a different complexion on it.

Mr. NALDER: That being so, I think we will leave the matter as it is.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9—Diseased cattle or suspected cattle to be marked:

Mr. ROWBERRY: I draw attention to subclause (3) which states that the chief inspector or inspector may order dairy cattle suspected to be suffering from disease to be destroyed. I maintain that if cattle are suffering from a disease, the condition could be easily ascertained. This clause leaves the whole decision to the inspector.

There is already provision enabling the inspector to make a report to the chief inspector in respect of cattle suspected of being diseased; and enabling the chief inspector to inspect the property concerned. Yet, under this clause power is to be given to the inspector to order the destruction of cattle on a mere suspicion that they are diseased. That does not seem to me to be equitable. If cattle are suspected of being diseased and the symptoms are not readily recognised, they should not be slaughtered on a mere suspicion that they are diseased. I maintain that cattle are entitled to the same treatment in this respect as human beings. We do not slaughter or condemn people on mere suspicion. In my view the word "suspected" is not required in subclause (3).

Mr. HALL: I am also opposed to the inclusion of the word "suspected" in subclause (3). Subclause (1) states that

cattle suspected to be suffering from a disease shall be marked for the purposes of identification. Then subclause (2) states that the results of the test shall be forwarded to the chief inspector. However, subclause (3) states that the chief inspector or inspector may order any dairy cattle suspected to be suffering from disease to be destroyed.

How can such an animal be suspected of suffering from a disease in view of the initial test which has to be made? After action has been taken under subclauses (1) and (2) the chief inspector or inspector cannot still suspect dairy cattle to be suffering from a disease. The assumption in subclause (3) is that the chief inspector is not able to make up his mind whether disease is present. On a suspicion that disease is present he can order the destruction of an animal. I propose that the word "suspected" be removed from subclause (3).

Mr. NALDER: The provision in clause 12 of the Bill should allay the fears of the members who have just spoken. Similar provisions appear in other Acts, such as the Milk Act, but no complaints have been received that dairy farmers in the whole-milk section have been treated unfairly by the inspectors. This was illustrated by the figures I gave during the second reading. Of the 18,000 cattle tested last year, only 118 reactors were found. That is a very small percentage of the number tested.

No complaints have been received against the determinations made by inspectors under the Milk Act; therefore the industry must be satisfied with its provisions.

Progress reported, and leave granted to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.4 p.m.

INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE RECOVERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 4th October.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [4.7]: This is a small amendment which was clearly explained by the Attorney-General. The Bill amends a provision which was before the House about two years ago in regard to maintenance recovery and reciprocity between Western Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth, and New Zealand. Apparently something happened which necessitated the introduction of this Bill as it provides only for the correction of an error. It appears we were superseding a Commonwealth law; and the Bill will correct the position. Summonses will be able to be delivered in cases where necessary.

There have been many cases in this State which warrant the provision in the Bill. A few jockeys have been able to leave the State to go to other parts of the world, within the Commonwealth; and although they have made plenty of money, they have not maintained their wives and children. That was the principal reason for the original Bill. I support the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport) [4.11]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure is one which was considered in another place; and I think that if members read the debates which took place there, they will find that there was very little difference of opinion in regard to it.

The position is that for some considerable time the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust has been concerned at the withdrawal of participants, particularly withdrawals necessitated by the take-over of participant companies by other companies. It is considered that some past withdrawals might have been prevented if the Act had been amended to allow a company to dispose of either its entire interest in the trust or part thereof.

As it is, as participants withdraw, other small companies' interests are increased proportionately, thus giving the latter companies some concern. The Commercial Union Assurance Company Ltd. has sold its Australian interests to a new company, the Commercial Union Assurance Company of Australia Ltd., which was to be formed on the 1st July this year. To all intents and purposes the business will remain the same, and will be carried on at the same premises as those occupied by the old company, and by the same staff as that employed by the old company.

Legal advice which the trust has received in the past is to the effect that when a participating company disposes of its interests to a new company, the new company cannot become a participant of the trust. I understand that the Commercial Union Assurance Company of

Australia Ltd.—that is, the new company —is anxious to take over the old company's interests in the trust and thus remain a participant. This I consider is most desirable.

I think the Bill speaks for itself. The trust is anxious not to lose any more of its members, as a considerable number have been lost since the trust was formed; and it is important to retain those members it has.

On motion by Mr. Evans, debate adjourned.

DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 4th October.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [4.15]: I have studied this Bill and compared it with the original Act. I have also perused the Minister's second reading speech. It is true, of course, that in another place this measure proved to be quite controversial. It could well be that the same will be the situation here; and in an endeavour to save time, I have gone through the sections fairly closely.

In the main, I feel that the House could subscribe to five or six of the clauses; but there are two or three which I will oppose. Clause 6(a) adds words which will give the local governing authorities the right to refuse registration of or a license for an animal which is suffering from an infectious disease. That is a provision which we can all support.

Another clause will make it more or less uniform that the registrations will operate from July to June each year. Yet another portion of the Bill provides power to seize stray dogs. That is the particular point which caused controversy in another place, some objection being taken to members of the Police Force having to act as dog catchers in some of the local governing authority areas.

However, it was argued that the police have had the right to pick up dogs for many years, but in the past they have been more or less left with the dogs on their hands, as it were, because they had no power to destroy them. This Bill will give that power if the dogs are not claimed within 48 hours.

Therefore, the local authorities will either have to appoint an officer to enforce this portion of the Bill, or the police will ultimately destroy the dogs if they are not claimed within 48 hours. This, of course, refers to dogs which are not licensed.

Another matter dealt with in the Bill is that relating to owners who may allow their dogs to wander into a shop or on to a local beach. In such cases, owners can be fined £5 for the first offence, if found guilty; and £10 for the second offence.

That is a most difficult provision for this side of the House to agree to, because there could be a hundred and one instances where owners exercise the greatest amount of care to control the actions of their dogs; but where, nevertheless, the animals will be out of sight within a few moments. The owners will be liable to a penalty of £5 if that occurs and the dogs enter the local butcher's shop, ice-cream shop, or some such establishment.

It is particularly difficult to control dogs on beaches. I know most owners try to prevent their animals running around by keeping them in their cars; but it is not always easy. I cannot support this proposition. I will read the portion about which I am speaking, as members will be interested to hear it.

> The owner—
>
> (a) of any dog which is found in any shop within any city, town or townsite, not being a shop where dogs are sold or treated for illness; or
>
> (b) of any dog, not being a dog that is used in the droving of stock, which is found in the district of any local authority on any bathing beach specified for the purposes of this section by order of the local authority published once in the *Gazette* and once in some newspaper circulating in the district,
>
> and which is not under the effective control of some person by means of a chain, cord or leash, commits an offence.
>
> Penalty: For a first offence, five pounds, and for a second or any subsequent offence, ten pounds.

I cannot support that enthusiastically, particularly as the section precludes a dog used for the droving of stock. It appears that such dogs could go into towns in any part of Western Australia, and their owners would not be liable to a penalty. But if a child's dog happened to wander into a shop, the child's parents would be liable to a fine of £5. I am not altogether happy about that particular provision.

Another clause of the Bill removes a portion of the effectiveness of a provision which, at the moment, gives the right to natives in Western Australia to have one dog without payment of a license fee. Natives may go to a road board and obtain a license, a disc, and a collar, and no fee is charged. The Government now

wishes to remove that provision, where it applies to the South-West Land Division as defined in secton 28 of the Land Act.

I am not sure exactly what area that section covers, but I think the South-West Land Division reaches to the other side of Northampton—to the Murchison River—and runs down as far as Albany and Esperance. I can imagine a number of natives in that area finding a dog a necessity for the purpose of obtaining food.

The Minister, when introducing this Bill, mentioned that natives now have satisfactory employment. I do not know what the Minister calls "satisfactory employment." I understand there are hundreds of natives out of work in the South-West Land Division, to say nothing of white people. But I do not want to get on to a discussion of unemployment. I merely wish to point out that natives, particularly when they are out of work, require a dog, more so than when they are in employment. Even if every native in Western Australia were in full employment, I think it would be a nice gesture for the white man to give him a free license for his dog.

Mr. W. Hegney: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRADY: I was hoping the member for Narrogin and the member for South Perth would support me on this, since they are interested in native problems. To suggest that natives in the South-West Land Division must now pay a license fee for their dogs, even though they cannot get citizenship rights, is going too far. Here I think I can count on the support of the member for South Perth and the member for Narrogin.

I think it is true to say that in the main natives in the South-West do not keep dogs today to the same extent as their brothers and sisters in the North-West.

Sir Ross McLarty: They have more dogs than they can feed and look after.

Mr. BRADY: If they have more than they can feed and look after, the police have the right to destroy them. The member for Murray knows that as well as I do. The police adopt that practice, despite appeals from natives not to destroy the dogs. It is an everyday occurrence. If a native has more than one dog, the police have the right to destroy the others.

I am not anxious to see this portion of the Bill passed. As I said before, even if every native were fully employed—and I doubt whether any native in the South-West Land Division is employed more than 70 per cent. full time—it would be a nice gesture if each one could have his dog licensed without payment of a fee. I think the majority of natives in the South-West Land Division are not worrying about dogs these days. There would not be many in that division of the State; and not many local governing bodies would lose revenue.

Another part of the Act provides for guide dogs to be licensed without payment of a fee. This is rather ironical. We all appreciate the affliction suffered by a blind man in not having his sight, and we applaud the idea of his having a dog without payment of a license fee. But I think it is just as necessary for a native in the outback of Western Australia to have a dog in order to obtain food, particularly if the native is out of employment and unable to secure food from either the metropolitan area or from farming areas. The Bill provides that training centres for guide dogs shall be permitted a license without payment of a license fee. I think we would all support that, and I am quite prepared to do so.

The third schedule of the Act is going to be amended to increase license fees for dogs from 7s. 6d. to 10s. The registration for a bitch is to be increased from 10s. to £1 1s. There is another important section; namely, that which provides that where a dog or a bitch is sterilised, the fee shall be only 5s. I think the reason is obvious to everybody. This provision will probably have the ultimate effect of reducing the number of stray dogs roaming our cities, and even our country towns. I am not going to object strenuously to the third schedule, except to say it is unfortunate that the Government is continuing this theme of continually seeking increased taxes—as this has been referred to in another place.

The Government would have done better to proceed with the main amendments without taking the opportunity of increasing the fees, because 2s. 6d. is not going to make or break a local governing body in any area. The fact that sterilised animals can now be licensed for a reduced fee would indicate that to some extent the Government is not in earnest in seeking to amend the rates from 7s. 6d. to 10s. for a dog, and from 10s. to £1 1s. for a bitch.

With those remarks, I support the Bill, but reserve the right to oppose the introduction of the provision which imposes a penalty of £5 should an owner's dog stray into a shop or on to a beach; and to oppose the clause which precludes natives in the South-West Land Division from having a dog licensed without payment of a fee.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [4.29]: I am certainly not going to allow this opportunity to pass without expressing my protest and disgust at the attitude of the Government in incorporating in this Bill a measure to further restrict the native community. I would preface my remarks;

by saying that as far as the other amendments are concerned they are, to my mind, very reasonable and just. There is the question whether the penalities are too severe or not. But I have personally been approached by a number of people on the subject of whether anything of a reasonable and yet successful nature could be done with regard to stray dogs in the metropolis; and probably quite a number of members representing other metropolitan constituencies have been so approached.

As a dog lover, I think the average person likes to look after his or her dog and treat it correctly. But to have dogs running around the streets, in these days of dense traffic is, I suggest, a definite danger not only to motorists but also to pedestrians. Yet we see it nearly every day of the week.

Therefore I think that definite steps should be taken to prevent dogs being allowed on beaches and in shops, and on the streets generally, without being on chains or leashes. The provisions of the Bill seek to strengthen somewhat the authorities—the police and the local authorities—in their desire to keep the streets clear of such dogs.

Reverting now to the proposal to amend section 29, referred to by the member for Guildford-Midland, I am disgusted—in fact, I am amazed—at a Government which declines to give to a section of this community the same rights and privileges which every one of us has—consistently refuses to grant them—and yet when the Dog Act is to be amended, the Government wants to amend a provision which has been in the Act for 57 years, and thus take away a very small privilege which has been extended to natives for the period I have mentioned.

It is most amazing, and I hope the private members of the Government will not stand for it. I hope they will leave this provision in the Act until such time as that section of the community to which I have referred enjoys at least some of the rights and privileges which we enjoy. Let us have a look at the provision which has been in the Act for such a long time. It reads—

> Any adult male aboriginal native may register one male dog free of charge, the collar and disc for which shall be supplied free of charge by the registering authority, but such dog shall be kept free from mange or other contagious disease.

That is the relative part of the section, and the provision applies to all adult male aboriginal natives in Western Australia.

But what does the Minister, on behalf of the Government, seek to do? He seeks to put a restriction in the Act so that that provision shall not apply within an area covered by the South-West Land Division. How ridiculous can a Government get! I suggest it would have been more honest to repeal that section in the Act altogether. What harm has it done up to date? It has been there for 57 years, but it has been suggested that because the people to whom it refers are now in full-time employment the necessity for it does not exist. Actually there is no absolute necessity for people in the metropolitan area to own dogs, except those who are dealing in cattle or sheep, and those who are blind or partially blind. But all are allowed to have dogs, and rightly so.

Let us have a further look at the provision. The South-West Land Division takes in an area from the Murchison River, which is approximately 40 miles north of Northampton—

Mr. Norton: Eighty miles.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Yes, eighty miles north of Northampton, and extends to the other side of Merredin—between Merredin and Southern Cross—and out to Burracoppin. It also takes in quite a large area of country east of Albany and the territory represented by the Minister who introduced the Bill. In other words, it is a substantial area.

What does the provision in the Bill mean? It simply means, in effect, that a restriction will be put on all adult male aboriginal natives in the South-West Land Division inasmuch as those people will be forced to pay a registration fee. I think that is the limit so far as dealing out a reasonable measure of justice is concerned.

I would not raise my voice in protest but in approbation of this provision if the male aboriginal natives within the area had the same rights and privileges as I have. However, while they have not got those rights, I think it is abhorent for any Government to introduce a measure which will further restrict the few privileges which they enjoy.

Mr. Lewis: Suppose these dogs were sterilised?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: We are not dealing with sterilisation. There are a number of others whom I could mention who could or should be sterilised; but I am dealing with a provision in the Bill which seeks to impose further restriction on natives. I appeal to, in fact I implore, the private members of the Government—because I suggest they are not bound by the provisions of this Bill—to realise what it means, and to realise how mean a Ministry can get when it introduces a provision of this nature, which will have such an effect on an under-privileged section of the community.

I hope that in due course the Minister will either withdraw this provision, or allow it to be taken out in Committee,

because I shall certainly test the feeling of the Committee when we reach that stage. I do not intend to oppose the second reading, but in Committee I shall certainly oppose the provision to which I have referred.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport—in reply) [4.38]: It seems that there are certain clauses in the Bill to which some members take exception; but judging by the tenor of the speeches so far, most of the Bill is acceptable to the House. I do not propose to deal with these particular clauses in detail at this stage. This Bill is one prepared by a department that is not under my control, and on some aspects I may need to get further advice from the Minister in charge of the department. I do not think at this stage I need to reply in detail, because it is evident that the House will agree to the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Perkins (Minister for Transport) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5—Section 21A added:

Mr. BRADY: As I pointed out during the second reading, this clause seeks to provide a penalty to be imposed against the owner of any dog that is found in a city or townsite. The penalty for a first offence is to be £5; and, for a second offence, £10. However, the owner of a dog used for droving stock will not be prosecuted. Could the Minister tell us more about the reason for this clause?

Mr. PERKINS: I would like to have some indication from the honourable member as to what he takes exception to, because he has not made it clear so far. Many of us own dogs for which we have great affection, but I think we all agree that they should be kept under reasonable control. There is a greater likelihood of pet dogs being kept in confined spaces; and it seems to me that most of the complaints about dogs making a nuisance of themselves come from beaches, holiday resorts, and closely-settled areas. Dogs used for droving are not likely to create such a nuisance.

Mr. Bickerton: Why are they exempt?

Mr. PERKINS: Obviously, if they were going to be policed to any degree it could cause difficulty, and for that reason it would appear that a distinction has been made. I am not clear whether the member for Guildford-Midland desires to release, to a degree, the control over all dogs, or whether he wishes to place greater control over dogs used for certain utilitarian purposes.

Mr. LEWIS: The clause may be clarified by the insertion of the word "being" before the word "used" at the beginning of line 35 on page 3. The clause would then read that only "a dog being used . . ." would be exempt from the penalty provided.

For instance, at a place like Coogee Beach, where cattle could escape from Robb Jetty and dogs could be used to round them up, the dogs could eventually stray on to the beach and their owners would be subject to a penalty.

On the other hand, under the clause as printed, farmers on holiday could bring their dogs down to Cottesloe and the dogs could stray on to the beach; but because they are used for droving stock, the farmers would be exempt from a penalty. The Bill should stipulate that they are being used for the droving of stock.

Mr. O'NEIL: Before the member for Moore moves the amendment he has suggested, I wish to move a small amendment which would precede his.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Roberts): Very well, will the honourable member move the amendment please?

Mr. O'NEIL: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 33—Insert after the word "or" the words, "in any school ground within any city, town or townsite; or"

Mr. PERKINS: This may be a perfectly good amendment, but I could not be sure.

Mr. Hawke: Well!

Mr. PERKINS: What I was going to suggest is that, obviously, there are several points in the drafting of legislation on which there is some difference of opinion on whether amendments are required; and therefore, in regard to this amendment, as well as others, it would be advisable if they could be placed on the notice paper to give me an opportunity to have them examined by the Minister in charge of the Dog Act so that he can advise me whether it is considered such amendments are well worded and are generally desirable for incorporation in the Bill.

If that is acceptable to the Committee, I suggest that some honourable member might move that progress be reported and that leave be granted to sit again; and, if that is agreed to, I can assure the Committee that the amendments will be carefully considered.

Progress reported, and leave granted to sit again.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1960-61

In Committee of Supply

Resumed from the 4th October, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair.

Vote—Miscellaneous Services, £4,662,177 (partly considered):

Item No. 3—Tourist Development Authority—Salaries and Incidentals, £75,000 (partly considered):

Mr. BRADY: When progress was reported on this item I was asking the Treasurer whether he could explain the estimate of £75,000. I know the Treasurer could say that on page 43 there is an allocation to the Tourist Bureau which amounts to £59,000. What is the reason for the difference between £59,000 and £75,000?

Mr. BRAND: It is true a change has been brought about as a result of the Tourist Act that was proclaimed to come into operation on the 31st December, 1959. Only a small amount of incidental expenditure was incurred in 1959-60 for the new authority; but it is intended to extend its activities during this financial year. The figure also includes the amount for conducting the Tourist Bureau which was previously provided as a separate division in the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates, but which now comes under the control of the Tourist Development Authority.

This vote will be expended on the Tourist Development Authority salaries—those of the director, secretary, clerks, and typists will total £7,420. The salary estimate of the Government Tourist Bureau, including the manager, clerks, typists, and temporary assistants will total £33,280; contingencies and incidentals, £6,050; publicity, £20,500; and the tourist association, £7,750, making a total of £75,000.

In addition to these funds there will be a grant from the loan fund to assist local authorities in the country to improve their tourist facilities and the general tourist attractions and resorts which come under their jurisdiction.

Item No. 13—Kindergarten Union, £41,000:

Mr. TONKIN: Does the new policy of the Government with regard to kindergartens apply to all electorates, or only to some? I merely want to know the reason for the altered policy. It was the practice of the Hawke Government to make a grant of £500 for the establishment of kindergartens in various districts; and some parts of my electorate were advantaged by that provision. Kindergartens were established there. More recently I made application to the Treasurer for the usual assistance for the establishment of a kindergarten; and, in due course, I had a reply from the Minister for Education telling me there was a new policy.

This policy is to make money available to the Kindergarten Union. The Kindergarten Union does not assist local committees to acquire buildings; it helps them only with regard to the running of their kindergartens by providing trained staff for the kindergartens, and by providing portion of the salaries. I regard the Government's policy as most unfair, inasmuch as a number of the older-established districts have had the advantage of Treasury assistance to provide for their kindergartens; but in the newer districts, where parents have endeavoured to establish kindergartens themselves and have raised substantial sums of money by their own efforts, they cannot expect any finance from the Government with regard to their buildings.

It is no good telling them that when they get the building and start the kindergarten they will receive assistance from the Kindergarten Union, providing it is happy with the set-up. Their difficulty is to get started; they want to get the buildings constructed. There is a case in my own district where people have raised several thousands of pounds; and they applied through me for the usual Treasury grant which other districts have had in past years. I had to forward to them a letter I received from the Minister for Education detailing this altered policy by which the Government no longer gives assistance for the establishment of buildings, but by which it has increased the grant to the Kindergarten Union.

I protest against this policy most vigorously. I think it is short-sighted and unfair. When we consider the advantage gained by the older districts, it is most unfair to say to people in the other districts—which in the main consist of working people—that no further grant will be made for the establishment of kindergartens, but that when they get going they can apply to the Kindergarten Union.

I would like to know, firstly, whether this policy has general application; and, secondly, the reasons in support of the altered policy. It means that the establishment of kindergartens will now be retarded—perhaps that is the Government's purpose so that there will not be a great call on the Treasury. Kindergartens should be assisted; their establishment should not be retarded. The purpose of the grant given by the Hawke Government was to encourage people who had raised substantial sums of money themselves. They were not given £500 to do with as they pleased; they had to demonstrate that they, as a result of their activities, raised substantial funds, after which they applied for additional help to get the building established.

The only result of the present policy will be to retard the establishment of kindergartens. It will not prevent them from being established, but it will take the people concerned longer to raise the necessary finance. So some children will lose the opportunity to attend kindergartens. What satisfaction is it to tell the parents of those children that when a kindergarten has been established in the district, they can apply to the Kindergarten Union for assistance to run it?

The first requirement is to assist people to establish their kindergarten as quickly as possible. Having done that, an appeal can be made to the people in the locality to support the kindergarten and to provide funds to run it. That was the procedure followed over many years in many districts.

For years I was associated with the kindergarten in North Fremantle, when that was in my electorate. I was a member of the committee which provided the building, free of charge, for the kindergarten. The committee was able to impose a levy for the purpose of acquiring the necessary finance to run the kindergarten. If the committee had not had the building, I doubt very much whether a kindergarten would have been established there until many years later. I reiterate that the new method is retrograde and is unfair to some sections of the people.

Mr. BRAND: In the first place, the new policy is general; it does not apply only to the district referred to by the honourable member. This change was made after investigations had been made into the position, and into the many claims for assistance which were received in regard to the capital, as well as the maintenance and operational point of view.

Evidently it became apparent to our advisers—mainly the Education Department—that there was a need to give further financial assistance to the operational side in order to improve the standard of education of the very young children. My notes indicate that the Royal Commission in 1952 recommended increased financial assistance to the Kindergarten Union. The basis then approved was recently revised to increase the total assistance made available for this purpose.

The grant covers student-teacher training, living allowance for approved teachers, contributions to administrative costs, and the *per capita* subsidy on children attending kindergartens. In addition, an amount of £3,000 is included for making special grants to needy kindergartens which are experiencing financial difficulties following their establishment. This increased provision for needy kindergartens replaces the previous policy of specific grants for building purposes. The increased proportion is due to the revised basis of assistance and larger enrolments at kindergartens.

The new policy was adopted on the advice of our advisers that the money would be more profitably spent in a grant to cope with the operational side, than spent in a straight-out subsidy, in respect of assistance for construction, to an individual kindergarten.

Mr. TONKIN: With respect to the financial advisers, I say this is a very unfair way to render assistance to kindergartens. In effect, under the new proposal, kindergarten committees which have already obtained the advantage of a £500 grant are to be further assisted because they are needy; whereas kindergartens which have not yet been established will be denied assistance. This is done in order that those already established may get more. I consider this to be an unfair policy.

The provision of additional teachers, better training facilities, and so on are all in the interests of kindergartens which have been established. They have already received the grant of £500, and they are to be assisted two or three times over under the new proposals. However, in the newer districts where people are endeavouring to establish kindergartens, the assistance which was previously forthcoming has been cut out. I hope the Government will re-examine the new proposals, because I consider them to be unfair.

I do not object to more money being allocated to the Kindergarten Union for the purpose of increasing the number of teachers and providing more facilities on the operational side; but it is much fairer to assist kindergartens which have not been established, because they have no hope of getting any advantage from the increased vote for the operational side unless they can become established.

The Government should first help communities to establish kindergartens. It should not help those which have already been established and which possibly have received a grant of £500, by increasing the assistance on the operational side if they happen to be needy kindergartens. That is merely giving assistance upon assistance to one section of the people, and denying assistance to others.

I can understand people living in areas where kindergartens are established, and where there is no likelihood of a demand for more kindergartens, being 100 per cent. in favour of the new scheme. We should take into consideration the newer-developed districts where kindergartens have

not yet been established. Surely those people have a greater right to assistance in the initial stage than have established kindergartens. I hope the Government will take a further look into this matter, and in due course restore those grants which I regard as of the utmost importance. They have been of great assistance to establishing kindergartens in newly developed districts, where generally the people have to meet great expenses in setting up new homes.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It is obvious that the increased vote is largely caused by the greater amount required for the training of kindergarten teachers. I understand the course of training extends over three years; whereas the training course of some primary-school teachers extends over only two years.

I wonder whether the Treasurer has inquired into the necessity for a three-year training course for kindergarten teachers; and I wonder whether it could be condensed. Not only does the three-year training period increase the costs of running kindergartens—as is indicated in the increased vote—but it also tends to discourage prospective teachers from entering the kindergarten service. There is a shortage of trained kindergarten teachers in this State; that is because a longer period of training is required. If this course of training could be shortened, I feel the vote would be reduced considerably. Furthermore, prospective teachers will be encouraged to join the profession. If the period could be shortened without in any way handicapping the work of kindergartens, that should be done. It seems to me to be entirely out of place to have a kindergarten teacher trained for a longer period than a primary-school teacher.

Mr. NULSEN: In speaking to this item, I want to say something about the Mentally Incurable Children's Association.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Roberts): The honourable member cannot discuss that item, because there is no vote.

Mr. NULSEN: I feel something should be done to assist that association.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Roberts): Order!

Mr. HEAL: This new method of financing kindergartens which is to come into operation will not only be unfair to those desiring to establish new kindergartens but it will also be unfair to kindergartens in what is termed the "needy" kindergarten category. There is only one kindergarten in operation in my electorate and it is in Lake Street. It has been in operation for many years. As time has passed, Australian families have shifted away from the area and this kindergarten now caters to its fullest extent for new Australian children.

The kindergarten has to raise £600 a year in order to operate; and that money has to be found by outside means. The new Australian families in that area are not in the same financial position as families situated in Floreat Park, or maybe Nedlands and Claremont. They are mainly working people on a low income. Therefore the committee finds it hard to raise this £600.

I believe that in years gone by this kindergarten has made application to the Kindergarten Union for a small grant from the "needy" grant which the Treasurer has made available to the Kindergarten Union. Amounts of approximately £500 have previously been granted automatically by the Government, but now these sums will have to come out of this extra grant.

That is going to affect the kindergarten in my area; because at a meeting which I attended recently, I was informed that it was unable to raise the £600 required to keep the kindergarten going, and that it would be necessary to approach the Kindergarten Union for some money out of the grant especially for this purpose. I hope the Treasurer will have another look at this matter, because it would be to the advantage of the Kindergarten Union and the people of Western Australia if the Government reverted to the old system.

Item No. 15—Rescue and Prison Gate Work, £300:

Mr. MAY: The estimate under this heading for last year was £300, and that amount was spent. I do not know what the expenditure is for. On occasions I have met prisoners coming out of the Fremantle Gaol; and, when they have been up against it, I have helped them. I am wondering whether that sort of help would come under this item in the Estimates.

Mr. BRAND: The grant is to help societies meeting and assisting discharged prisoners. The societies concerned are the Salvation Army and the Home of the Good Shepherd. Those societies share equally in the grant.

Mr. May: That would not include private individuals waiting to meet prisoners?

Mr. BRAND: No. It is to assist organisations that have taken on the responsibility of meeting these people and caring for them.

Mr. May: I will send for the Salvation Army next time.

Item No. 18—Sailors' Rest, £50:

Mr. HALL: I would refer the Treasurer to the following question which I asked on the 30th August:—

> In view of the fact that the Port of Albany with its increased shipping has no seamen's mission would he, when

considering the Estimates, make provision for finance to be made available for the commencement of a seamen's mission in Albany?

The Treasurer replied—

The establishment of a seamen's mission is considered to be a matter for private charitable organisations.

I fail to see any difference between a seamen's mission and a sailors' rest. The Port of Albany has grown, and an encumbrance has been placed upon the community because of the lack of these facilities. When the crews come off the boats there is no entertainment for them other than their visiting the local hotels.

No doubt the Treasurer will recall a murder which took place in Albany outside a restaurant. That caused so much concern to the clergy of Albany that they have now joined together and formed a mission with the object of catering for crews when they leave their ships.

Recently in Albany there was a dispute on two of the ships and the crews walked off. I would draw the attention of the Treasurer to the fact that some 25 men were forced to look for lodgings in Albany, and the police were about a yard behind them and charged them with vagrancy. It is obvious that in a situation like that the people of the town would have to suffer the consequences of any disturbance that took place. It would assist the local clergy if the Government would provide some finance for the purpose of establishing a seamen's mission at Albany. By so doing it would be facing up to its responsibility.

Mr. BRAND: The point raised by the member for Albany is one which we recognise as being of importance. There is a need to look after these people; but the fact is that in other ports the local folk have got together and provided whatever accommodaton is available. They have done that without Government assistance. The £50 is given towards meeting out-of-pocket expenses which may be incurred by the existing sailors' rests. The notes which I have state that the objectives of the society are to advance the literary, moral, and social welfare of seamen; to provide board and lodging for seamen; to communicate with lonely lighthouse-keepers; and to perform other charitable work.

Item No. 20—Slow Learning Children's Group, £4,000:

Mr. NULSEN: Other organisations have had an increase given to them of over 100 per cent. I do not begrudge them that increase, but note that no increase has been given to the slow-learning group, the work of which is very important to this State.

However, if they have not sufficient finance, these slow learners will still learn slowly. I know quite a number of very fine people who are making big contributions, not only financially but also by way of labour. I am wondering why these other organisations—I will not mention any names—are receiving an increase of over 100 per cent. while the slow learning group is not. I believe the other organisations are justly entitled to an increase, but I feel that the group to which I have referred should also receive more assistance. I know two or three groups in my area are trying to obtain accommodation, but are unable to do so because of lack of finance.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I would like to support the member for Eyre in his remarks about the Slow Learning Children's Group. I think that if there is any section of the community which should have special consideration it is this group, the members of which are mentally and physically underprivileged. I really cannot understand why it is that ordinary, healthy children are a complete charge upon the State as far as education is concerned, while the mentally and physically under-privileged children are dependent upon charitable organisations. That is surely a blot on our community.

I really think it is time the Government made a new approach to this matter. I do not want the Premier to tell me in a few moments that this Government is only following in the steps of the Labor Government, because I do think the education of all children, no matter what their mental or physical capacity is should be a complete charge upon the State.

Mr. BRAND: I have noted what the member for Eyre has said. Financial assistance to the Slow Learning Children's Group consists of an annual grant of £4,000 already referred to, which is for administration costs of the group, and capital assistance towards approved projects in the metropolitan area and country centres. This assistance is on the basis of a pound for each pound of funds raised and expended by the group. In addition, the Lotteries Commission has made grants to this organisation. Government grants made on the basis to which I referred amounted to £3,575 in 1959-60. The annual grant of £4,000 is chargeable to revenue, and the capital grant is, of course, made from general Loan funds.

Item No. 21—Social Centres for Aged—Maintenance Grants, £2,000:

Mr. CURRAN: I notice that this item has been increased by £673. Everyone will agree that these centres serve a great need for aged pensioners in the community. I would like to refer to the South Fremantle

centre, because I made an inspection of it and found that certain parts of the interior of the building were not completed. I understand that the member for Fremantle raised this question some time last year. An application has been made by the centre; but, as yet, it has received no satisfaction. The further amenities still required to be completed are the bathrooms, toilets, etc. I also understand there are no doors in the kitchen; and the cupboards have no tops.

I am raising this matter because those concerned have applied for assistance for the completion of the building, which is very substantial from the outside, but does not contain sufficient amenities inside. I would like the Treasurer to give some assurance that some of this money will be set aside for the South Fremantle centre.

Mr. BRAND: I cannot give an assurance that money will be set aside for any particular centre. The finance is made available, of course, in two ways: (a) Assistance for construction or alteration to buildings on land vested in the local authorities or approved organisations, to the extent of one-third of the total cost and up to a maximum cost of £3,000 for any one centre; and (b) Half the operating net costs of the centres up to £500 per annum for any one centre. Capital grants come from the General Loan Fund, an amount of £3,000 having been paid in 1959-60. This item covers provision for grants towards operating expenses.

Item No. 25—Travellers' Aid Society, £150:

Mr. FLETCHER: I have written to the Minister for Transport, and he has been good enough to reply informing me that consideration is being given to my overtures on behalf of this organisation, which is a very worth-while one. My request on its behalf was for free passes on M.T.T. buses for two members of the executive. They used to enjoy this privilege on the Metro buses, but the privilege has since been withdrawn. I am glad the Minister is giving consideration to this matter.

For those who do not know of the work of this society, I would like, in support of its case, to inform members that the organisation meets strangers from overseas, our own travelling public within the State, and country visitors. In case, Mr. Chairman, you feel that as I mentioned the Minister for Transport, I should not be discussing this matter, I hasten to state that it should come under the portfolio of the Minister for Tourists. I mention it in order that the Minister for Tourists and the Minister for Transport might make a combined effort on behalf of the society, and give it kindly and sympathetic consideration.

I would also like to ask whether or not any allocation of space in the proposed new overseas terminal at Fremantle has been made to this splendid organisation to assist it in its work.

Mr. TONKIN: I understand that a new building is being erected in Fremantle to provide facilities for people who aid travellers and tourists. I am wondering whether provision is being made in this building for the Travellers' Aid Society so that it will have facilities similar to those enjoyed by the Good Neighbour Council. It is the practice in ports in various parts of the world to ensure that buildings are available for good neighbour councils and travellers' aid societies. I am not in a position to know whether such facilities will be provided at Fremantle. That branch of the Travellers' Aid Society has endeavoured to find out, but can obtain no definite information.

I am wondering whether the Premier can advise me whether it is intended that facilities will be provided; and if it is not, whether steps can still be taken to ensure that accommodation is provided for this society, which does a very worth-while work. The people concerned do not receive payment for their services; they work out of the goodness of their hearts in order to assist travellers. I do not know what some people would do without the help they receive from this source. I do hope it is intended to provide facilities at Fremantle; or, if not, that steps will be taken to see whether provision can be made.

Mr. BRAND: I will certainly make some inquiries. I think it is quite a worthy cause, and could be of great benefit to travellers. However, I move—

> That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Mr. HAWKE: I have no desire to speak against the motion, but the Premier was speaking on an item in the Estimates. This seems to me to be a motion for adjournment. Can any member of the House, at the same time as he is making a speech on a particular subject, also move a motion which has no relation to the item?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Roberts): It is out of order.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I move—

> That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Progress reported, and leave granted to sit again.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING BILL

Second Reading

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police) [5.34]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As is common knowledge, the Royal Commissioner on Betting (Sir George Ligertwood) recommended the abolition of betting shops and the establishment of an off-course totalisator scheme similar to that which has been in operation in New Zealand for some years past and similar to that which is now envisaged in Victoria.

On studying the position, the Government has had to take cognisance of two important factors which apply here but which did not apply in New Zealand at the time the tote system was introduced into that country. They are, firstly, that the introduction of a tote system in this State must of necessity be brought in against a background of already legalised off-course betting per medium of licensed-premises bookmakers; and secondly, that a large amount of the volume of off-course betting in this State arises out of racing conducted outside the State.

As yet, no altogether satisfactory scheme has been developed to cater for betting on Eastern States racing through a full totalisator scheme. After six months' experience, the board proposed to be constituted under this Bill will have much greater knowledge of the spread and level of betting on interstate racing, and it should be possible to frame rules for the successful conduct of an off-course totalisator pool if the board so decides.

In the meantime, the Bill proposes to authorise the Totalisator Agency Board to hold all moneys invested on Eastern States racing and to pay dividends, both win and place, in accordance with the dividends declared by the totalisators on the respective racecourses in the Eastern States covering the races on which the bets are made.

In connection with betting on local races and trots, the Bill proposes that as far as practicable all the earlier off-course bets—that is, bets made up to 45 to 60 minutes prior to the scheduled starting time—will be collated and transmitted to the on-course totalisator and form part of the moneys on which the dividends are struck. Bets made after the closing down of the earlier betting may be held by the board; and winning bets, both win and place, paid in accordance with the dividends declared by the on-course totalisator.

Whilst there will probably be some restriction on the amount of a bet that can be made after the earlier betting is closed off, it is envisaged that the small bettor will be able to place his bet up to a few minutes before the scheduled starting time. The approach has been one to ensure—

(a) that the off-course punter is given facilities fairly consistent with what he enjoys now, including pay-out on the day of the race and race broadcasts;

(b) that the revenue from off-course betting is maintained at its present level; and

(c) that after meeting all outgoings of the board the surplus remaining is fairly distributed between the racing and trotting authorities for the purpose of assisting the racing industry both in the metropolitan area and country districts.

How the system will be gradually introduced and operated will become apparent as I explain the main provisions of the Bill. When the board—to be known as the Totalisator Agency Board—is established, it will take over from the Betting Control Board, which will cease to exist.

It is intended to gradually introduce the totalisator scheme in the metropolitan area, and then extend it to the main country areas. As a region is declared by proclamation to be a totalisator region, the present Betting Control Act will cease to apply to that region. The present Betting Control Act will, however, continue to apply to areas other than regions covered by the totalisator scheme.

It is envisaged that some areas within the State, particularly the somewhat remote areas, will always be covered by licensed-premises bookmakers under the Betting Control Act. With this in mind, it is proposed to extend the Betting Control Act, 1954-59, as a permanent Act after amending it to dovetail in with the Bill to cover the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960.

The Bill provides that the board shall be a body corporate under the name of the Totalisator Agency Board, and that it shall be constituted as a public authority; and there is another provision that the board shall consist of seven members, comprising a chairman appointed on the nomination of the Minister, three nominees of the Western Australian Turf Club, and three nominees of the Western Australian Trotting Association, with power to appoint deputees. The term of office of a member is to be three years.

Another provision deals with the establishment of tote offices and agencies, and further provides for all expenses in connection therewith, together with any other

expenses of the board to be met out of loans raised by the board pending the board being in a position to meet such expenses in full from its own funds. The W.A.T.C. and the W.A.T.A. are each to make an immediate loan of £25,000 to the board, such loans to be unsecured and free of interest. The board is authorised, with the approval of the Treasurer, to borrow moneys, and the Treasurer to guarantee such borrowings. It has been estimated that in time the total loans required in connection with capital and establishment charges could reach £300,000.

Other provisions deal with the making of bets with and through the board and the payment of dividends, all of which are to be at the respective totalisator odds. Where the bets made on local gallops and trots are transmitted to the on-course totalisator, such bets will form part of the pool moneys on which the dividends are declared. Where not so transmitted, the bets will simply be held by the board and paid at totalisator odds.

Until such time as a totalisator pool is established in connection with Eastern States racing, all bets on such racing will be held by the board and paid at odds as declared by the respective Eastern States totalisators.

Winning dividends will be payable on the day of the race. A provision in the Bill requires that 15 per cent. be deducted, by way of commission, from bets received by the board and transmitted to an on-course totalisator. An amendment to the Totalisator Duty Act, 1905-58, is being sought to increase the statutory deduction for money invested direct on the on-course totalisator from 13½ to 15 per cent. This additional 1½ per cent. from the on-course investment is to be paid to the board.

The board will be required to pay a turnover tax of 5 per cent. to the Treasurer under a new Bill to be introduced in connection with the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax Act, 1960. The board is required to set aside 1½ per cent. of its turnover for the purpose of repaying any moneys borrowed in accordance with the Act. The board is also required, after meeting all outgoings, including turnover tax, and appropriating 1½ per cent., to pay the balance then remaining to the W.A.T.C. and the W.A.T.A. in accordance with an agreement submitted through the board and approved by the Minister.

The further distribution by the W.A.T.C. and the W.A.T.A. to their registered clubs will be proportionately similar to that which now applies in connection with off-course turnover tax and investment tax.

The board will have the first right to take over premises registered under the Betting Control Act. The board is required to exercise its right within 42 days of the area being declared a totalisator region, and the Minister has power to exempt any person from the provisions of this section where thought justified.

There is a provision in the Bill which will have the effect of cancelling registered premises and licenses to carry on business as a bookmaker under the Betting Control Act once an area is proclaimed a totalisator region. The unexpired portion of the annual license fee will be refunded to licensed-premises bookmakers.

There are other provisions relating to bets through the board which can be made—

(a) in cash;

(b) by letter or telegram accompanied with the cash or against a credit already established; and

(c) by telephone against a cash deposit previously made.

In regard to credit betting against a deposit, winning bets made will be credited on the day of the race in support of the deposit account. The minimum bet is to be not less than 2s. 6d., but, by regulation, will most likely be fixed at 5s. in order to fit in with the standard totalisator unit both here and in the Eastern States.

Other clauses deal with offences in relation to—

(a) the conduct of totalisator agencies;

(b) unauthorised persons acting as totalisator agents; and

(c) agents or servants of racing clubs accepting off-course totalisator investments.

Under another clause betting with minors and intoxicated persons is prohibited.

In a totalisator region it will be an offence to act as a bookmaker, or for a person to bet with a bookmaker at any time or at any place other than with an on-course bookmaker registered under the Betting Control Act, 1954.

Loitering and "nit-keeping" also constitute offences. In the main the penalties are severe, and it is intended fully to enforce the legislation.

The board is authorised, with the approval of the Governor, to make regulations for the operation of the Act in regard to—

(a) the admission of persons to totalisator agencies;

(b) any additional powers required by the board;

(c) the establishment, maintenance, conduct, and operation of the totalisator agencies, including the lodging and receipt of bets and the transmission and holding of such bets; and

(d) the payment of dividends.

Racing authorities will not participate in the revenue derived from off-course licensed premises once the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill becomes law and is proclaimed.

Estimates taken out after careful analysis indicate that the off-course betting turnover under the system proposed will approximate £6,500,000 in the metropolitan area, and will increase to about £11,500,000 when the whole of the State is covered.

The system of transmitting the earlier betting to the on-course totalisator, and paying out on all bets, whether so transmitted or simply held by the board, on the totalisator dividends for win and place, is known as *pari-mutuel* betting, and appears to have been most successful in the United States, France, and Italy. *Pari-mutuel* was the name first given to the totalisator which ensures that the winners share the money staked on the horses after the cost of management, taxes, etc. have been deducted.

Briefly it is expected that the respective interests of the parties mainly concerned will be as follows:—

(a) The State will not suffer any loss of revenue.

(b) The racing authorities, who will have a big say in the management of the board, on the figures available should receive a better return from off-course betting than they have at present.

(c) The Totalisator Agency Board will be a fairly big employer of clerical and other labour, similar to the combined licensed-premises bookmakers.

(d) Licensed-premises bookmakers will all receive at least an extension beyond that fixed by the law at the present time, and the Betting Control Act will be extended on a permanent basis to permit licensed-premises bookmakers to operate in some areas until such areas are included in a totalisator region.

(e) The average off-course punter will have similar scope for betting as at present, and will enjoy substantially the same facilities, and in the main will receive a slightly higher return for his money.

(f) The community, as a whole, will benefit by a reduction in the total volume of off-course betting, and many of the evils associated with huge credit betting will disappear.

The betting investment tax paid by the off-course punter in the totalisator area will be the same as now applies to betting with licensed-premises bookmakers.

I think it can fairly be claimed that this legislation, if it is accepted by Parliament, will bring about a measure of social reform in that the existing incentive to promote off-course betting under the present law will largely disappear; and the substitution of betting against deposits held by the T.A.B. for credit betting at present made possible by legislation of this Parliament in off-course betting shops sited to tempt wage earners within their doors will, I hope, result in money required for providing essential family needs being spent for such purpose and not for payment of losing credit bets.

A substantial drop in turnover through the off-course totalisator as compared with off-course betting shops has been allowed for, because credit betting off course in totalisator regions will no longer be legal, and bets will be possible only in cash or against cash deposits or winnings held by the T.A.B.

This Government desires to foster racing, both gallops and trots, in Western Australia, and is convinced that replacement of off-course bookmakers by an off-course totalisator covering the bulk of the State will be a big forward stride in keeping racing clean and healthy, and in maintaining public interest and confidence in the sport.

On motion by Mr. Hawke, debate adjourned for one week.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police) [5.50]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is complementary to the previous measure. The life of the Betting Control Act, 1954-59, as it now stands, is limited to the 31st December, 1960. This Bill proposes to extend the Act as a permanent one, on the passing of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill, and to amend it to fit in with the latter legislation. It is necessary to amend the long title to the Act by including after the word "Bookmakers" in line 5, the words "or the Totalisator Agency Board", so that the betting investment tax paid by the off-course punter in totalisator regions is allocated along with the betting investment tax collected by licensed-premises bookmakers.

The Bill seeks to amend section 4 of the principal Act by substituting the totalisator agency board for the Betting Control Board. As previously mentioned, on the passing of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill, the totalisator agency board will take over from the Betting Control Board. The amendment to section 5 is for the purpose of requiring licensed-premises bookmakers to pay winning bets—both win and place—at totalisator odds, the same as will be done by the totalisator agency board. At present, licensed-premises bookmakers pay winning bets for a win at the declared starting price obtained by averaging the last price laid by the on-course bookmakers and winning place bets only at totalisator odds.

This means that off-course punters, whether within a totalisator region, or a licensed-premises area, will be paid on the same basis. It is sought to repeal section 6 dealing with the constitution of the Betting Control Board. An amendment to section 7 is sought by substituting for the word "The" in line 1, the words "For the purposes of this Act, the." The intention here is to make it clear that the appointment of officers under the Public Service Act, 1904, is to apply to purposes under the Betting Control Act only. The repeal of section 8 is sought as it is no longer required.

The Bill seeks to amend section 16 so that the full amount of the bookmakers' betting tax—turnover tax—on the passing of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill will be received in full by the Treasurer for the use of Her Majesty. There will be no division with the racing authorities as they will be receiving the surplus from the operations of the totalisator agency board. The amendments to section 16A are sought so that the totalisator agency board will be required to collect the same rates of betting investment tax as are licensed-premises bookmakers, and pay the full amounts received to the Commissioner of Stamps without any distribution to the racing authority. This requires the repeal of sections 16B and 16C.

The amendment sought to subsection (1) of section 23 is for the purpose of making lawful bets made under the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill when proclaimed an Act. The Bill proposes to amend section 27 so that premises can be used for betting only when such betting takes place with licensed-premises bookmakers under the Betting Control Act or with the totalisator agency board. In regard to section 35 of the Betting Control Act, the proposals in the Bill are—

(1) The repeal of the section which at present limits the life of the Act to the 31st December, 1960.

(2) The re-enacting of section 35, so that, apart from—

(a) Section 14, in relation to on-course bookmakers' turnover,

(b) Section 15, in relation to the returns to be furnished by on-course bookmakers,

(c) Section 16A, in regard to the collection from punters of the off-course betting investment tax by the totalisator agency board, and

(d) Section 35 itself,

the provisions of the Betting Control Act, 1954-59, shall not apply to any part of the State when it is proclaimed as a totalisator region other than to a licensed on-course bookmaker, whether the racecourse on which such person operates is inside or outside a proclaimed totalisator region.

On motion by Mr. Hawke, debate adjourned for one week.

MESSAGES (3)—APPROPRIATION

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

1. Traffic Act Amendment Bill.
2. Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill.
3. Betting Control Act Amendment Bill.

House adjourned at 5.57 p.m.