

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 28th September, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Infantile paralysis—(a) as to investigation of cases	1345
(b) as to hospital treatment	1345
Fish culture, as to fertilising country dams, lakes, etc.	1346
Closer settlement, as to exercise of power of resumption	1346
Education—(a) as to age for entry to high schools	1347
(b) as to grants for school bus services	1347
(c) as to number of school bus services	1347
Superannuation, insurance, etc., as to schemes submitted by local authorities	1347
Legislative Council, as to legislation to restrict powers	1348
North-West, as to report of Commissioner of Public Health	1348
Hospitals, as to regional building at Geraldton	1348
Bills : The West Australian Club (Private) Petition, 1r., referred to Select Committee	1345
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1), 3r.	1348
Industries Assistance Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r.	1348
Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r., passed	1348
Interpretation Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1348
Builders' Registration Act Amendment, report	1348
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 2r.	1349
Fisheries Act Amendment (Continuance), 2r., Com., report	1351
Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment (Continuance), returned	1352
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment, 1r.	1352
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 1r.	1352
Health Act Amendment, Com.	1352
Western Australian Marine, 2r., Com.	1352

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

PETITION—THE WEST AUSTRALIAN CLUB.

Mr. NEEDHAM presented a petition from the agents for The West Australian Club, praying for leave to bring in a private Bill for "An Act to resolve certain difficulties concerning the legal position of The West Australian Club, a Company duly registered under the Companies Act, 1893, and to vest the assets of the Company in an

Association to be formed and registered under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1895-1947, and for other purposes arising out of such difficulties and incidental to such vesting."

Petition received and the prayer of the petitioner granted.

BILL—THE WEST AUSTRALIAN CLUB (PRIVATE).

Introduced by Mr. Needham and read a first time.

Referred to Select Committee.

On motion by Mr. Needham, Bill referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Hoar, Wild, Kelly, Perkins and the mover, with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned and to report on Thursday, the 30th September.

QUESTIONS.

INFANTILE PARALYSIS.

(a) *As to Investigation of Cases.*

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What is the procedure of investigation followed when a case of infantile paralysis has occurred?

(2) Is the procedure followed in every case?

(3) If the answer to question No. (2) is "No," will he have a thorough investigation made in every case where infantile paralysis has occurred?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) All local authorities have been instructed to inquire as to the migration and contacts of all poliomyelitis patients.

The information obtained is checked by the Department of Public Health, and, if considered necessary, a further check of the information is made by the Department.

(2) Yes.

(3) See Nos. (1) and (2).

(b) *As to Hospital Treatment.*

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is he aware that infantile paralysis patients at the Royal Perth Hospital complain that in some cases the intervals be-

tween therapy treatment is four days, and that they strongly feel that their recovery would be expedited with daily treatment?

(2) Will he ascertain if these complaints are justified, and if so, arrange for at least daily treatment?

(3) Is he aware that ex-Servicemen paralysis patients are anxious to be admitted to Hollywood Hospital?

(4) In view of the fact that the course proposed in question No. (3) would relieve the position in the Royal Perth Hospital, and in order to meet the expressed wishes of ex-Servicemen patients, will he arrange for them to be transferred to Hollywood Hospital?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) The treatment for poliomyelitis cases at the Royal Perth Hospital is in accordance with the directions of the senior honorary orthopaedic physician.

(3) No.

(4) The Government has no authority to admit poliomyelitis patients to Hollywood Hospital.

FISH CULTURE.

As to Fertilising Country Dams, Lakes, etc.

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware that the cultivation of fish in country dams, lakes, etc., which is known as "fish farming," is practised throughout America and in other overseas countries?

(2) Is he aware that experiments have proved that nitrate of sodium and superphosphate scattered over the surface of the selected waters encourage to an amazing extent the growth of plankton, which is the commencement of the complex food chain on which the growth and numbers of fish depend?

(3) Is he aware that in fertilised waters fish are found to increase twice as much in length and 25 times as much in weight as similar fish in normal waters?

(4) Is he aware that there are thousands of creeks and farm dams, etc., in this State ideally situated for such fish cultivation?

(5) Will he give consideration to having fish farming sponsored by the Fisheries Department and the Agricultural Department in order that farmers generally may bene-

fit by this recent development in overseas countries?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Fertilisers undoubtedly stimulate the growth of vegetable organisms in the water.

(3) It was found in Scotland during the recent war that the growth rate of fish increased very markedly in waters in which nutrient chemicals had been added.

(4) Some local streams and dams are undoubtedly suitable for fish cultivation.

(5) Three or four years ago an expert attached to the Biology Department of the University discussed with the Chief Inspector of Fisheries the possibility of conducting experiments of this nature, largely for the purpose of ascertaining whether the supply of fish, which was then at a low ebb through war-caused circumstances, could be increased. The war finished before arrangements for the setting aside of certain waters for the investigation were completed, and the University expert concerned transferred to the Eastern States. Further discussions have recently taken place between the Chief Inspector and officers of the Fisheries Division of the C.S.I.R. It would be most unwise to arrive at any arbitrary conclusion based on results achieved in Scotland and elsewhere, because of the vastly different climatic conditions in Western Australia, of the somewhat intractable nature of the country in which many of our dams and water-courses are situated, of the considerable variations in salinity in certain waters, and of the high evaporation rate in inland districts. The problem is really a very complex one, but it is hoped that some work will be possible as soon as trained personnel become available.

CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

As to Exercise of Power of Resumption.

Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) As the provisions of the Closer Settlement Act, 1927-1945 and Part VIII of the Land Act, 1933, permit the Government to acquire land, has this power been exercised in the case of suitable properties which are offered for private sale—

(a) Where the property has been, is on offer to the Government and later withdrawn?

(b) Where the property has not previously been offered to the Government?

(2) If not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) No.

(b) No.

Action has been taken in respect of both Nos. (1) (a) and (1) (b) under the National Security (Economic Organisation) Regulations, and also under Section 11 of the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act and Public Works Resumption Act.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

EDUCATION.

(a) *As to Age for Entry to High Schools.*

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is a child prevented from entering a high school if he or she has not reached a certain age?

(2) If so, what is that age?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) As a general rule, children transfer from the primary school, to the high school at the age of 12 plus, i.e., in their twelfth year. There is no regulation preventing a child from entering a high school at any age, and some of them actually do enter the high school before they are 12, some of them, of course, not getting there until they are 13 or more. It depends upon the progress of the child through the primary school and really coincides with its completion of a satisfactory standard VI. education.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(b) *As to Grants for School Bus Services.*

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has a special grant of money been made available by the Government to each road board in whose district one or more school buses are operating?

(2) If so, has the same amount of grant been paid to each road board concerned?

(3) If not, what are the variations as between the minimum and maximum amounts paid?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) No allocation has been made to road boards specifically for school bus routes. During the past two years a general allocation has been made to road boards in country areas for works on developmental roads, and they have been advised that school bus routes must receive first priority. This allocation has generally only been portion of funds made available for developmental roads in each road board district.

(2) No.

(3) The general allocation for developmental roads has varied from a minimum of £500 to a maximum of £2,000.

(c) *As to Number of School Bus Services.*

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Minister for Education:

What is the number of school bus services operating in each road board district?

The MINISTER replied:

It has been a difficult matter accurately to dissect the bus services into road board districts, as some traverse portions of more than one road board's area. The list which I now lay on the Table of the House, however, is substantially correct.

SUPERANNUATION, INSURANCE, ETC.

As to Schemes Submitted by Local Authorities.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Local Government:

(1) How many local authorities have now submitted superannuation or insurance schemes for the approval of the Governor, in accordance with the provisions of the Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance, Guarantee and Endowment (Local Government Bodies' Employees) Funds Act, 1947?

(2) Has the Governor approved of any of the schemes submitted?

(3) Is he aware that the very considerable delay in obtaining approval for the schemes submitted is causing inconvenience and concern to certain municipalities, notably North Fremantle and Fremantle?

(4) Will he take immediate steps to have decisions made on the schemes which have been submitted?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Four local authorities have submitted endowment assurance schemes. Two others have suggested contributions to Savings Bank accounts as an alternative.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) The subject is receiving attention. Draft regulations have been prepared and are under review. Before finality is reached it is desirable in the interests of the employees and the local authorities to remove difficulties that would be created by varying conditions in the several trust deeds already submitted, some of which are not considered suitable. It is the intention to provide for a uniform policy which would not be affected by transfers between local authorities and to prescribe a uniform deed in the regulations, which will provide for continuity of the scheme once it is entered into, in relation to local governing bodies and the employees who become subscribers. The matter will be dealt with as soon as possible.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

As to Legislation to Restrict Powers.

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

In view of the attitude of the Legislative Council towards vital Government legislation, will the Government introduce legislation this session to restrict the powers of that Chamber, and to overcome differences, so that any Government might in future be able to govern without hindrance?

The PREMIER replied:

The progressive legislation of this State has been passed by both Houses of Parliament, and no Bill has been rejected by the Legislative Council this session.

NORTH-WEST.

As to Report of Commissioner of Public Health.

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it a fact that extracts from the report of the Commissioner of Health, which were referred to by the Member for Roebourne when speaking on the State Housing Act Amendment Bill, are borne out by the report of an officer of the Health Department who investigated conditions in

the North-West recently and that in view of this report the Commissioner would have been failing in his duty had he not referred to the conditions in the North-West in strong terms?

(2) In view of the statements made recently that the Commissioner of Health should be censured for his criticism of health conditions in the North-West, will he have all papers relative to the matter laid on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) The annual report of the Commissioner of Public Health was compiled on information gained by the Commissioner in the course of his duties as such. The report has already been tabled.

HOSPITALS.

As to Regional Building at Geraldton.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL (without notice) asked the Minister for Health:

Has the Government given any consideration to the erection of a regional hospital at Geraldton?

The MINISTER replied:

The Government has given some consideration to the erection of a regional hospital at Geraldton in conjunction with the erection of regional hospitals at Bunbury and Albany. No final decision has been made as to when work can be commenced on regional hospitals, but it will not be until the materials situation is such as to enable the work to proceed without detriment to other work of an urgent nature, such as hospitals, schools and housing.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1).
- 2, Industries Assistance Act Amendment (Continuance),
Transmitted to the Council.
- 3, Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance).
- 4, Interpretation Act Amendment.

Passed.

BILL—BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 23rd September.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.48]: This is apparently a simple measure introduced into both Houses of Parliament with the most meagre information. I consider it is unfair of Ministers to introduce such Bills by speeches which contain a number of inaccurate statements. The Bill should not be introduced loosely or carelessly, and the statements made about what it is supposed to do should be accurate. However, the Minister's statements were not accurate, nor did his counterpart in another place make accurate statements when the Bill was introduced there.

For example, three amendments are proposed to Section 5 of the principal Act. The Minister in another place said that the Bill had been asked for by the manufacturers as well as the producers. I venture to say that in its present form it was not asked for by the producers at all. They might have requested one of the amendments but, whilst I do not know definitely, I am almost certain they did not request the other two. The Minister in this House said the first amendment was requested by the manufacturers and that it would comply with the wishes of the producers. How does he know? I am referring now to the amendment regarding the provision for an alteration to be made to the registration rather than to require an entirely fresh registration to be taken out. How does the Minister know that that would comply with the wishes of the producers? I could understand that it would be done at the request of the manufacturers, because it would save them some trouble. I have no objection to the proposal but it is careless talk for the Minister to say that it would comply with the wishes of the producers, when I cannot understand how he could ascertain that fact. It was definitely wrong to make the statement that the Bill had been asked for by the manufacturers as well as by the producers, as I think I shall be able to prove a little later on.

The Minister in this House said that the second amendment embodied in the Bill was also the result of a request made by the growers, supported by the manufacturers. How could the Minister say that, because the first amendment was not requested by the growers but by the manufacturers, which amendment the Minister said complied with the wishes of the producers. Then he went on to say that the second amendment was also the result of a request proffered by the growers. I say that was careless talk. It was misleading, because it is not true. It may be that this second amendment was introduced at the request of the growers—I could believe that—but they would not be interested in the first amendment and they would be against the third one, if they were aware of what was happening. The first simply enables the producers to submit proposals for the alteration of the original registration, and I have no objection to that because there is also provision made that if any fee is involved it shall be paid to the Director of Agriculture—I was not aware that any change in the title of that officer had been made, but the Bill refers to him as such, for I always understood the officer concerned to be the Under Secretary for Agriculture—who may agree to the alteration in the registration. I take no exception to that.

The second amendment is quite simple and I can well see that it would be introduced at the request of the producers, because it provides that on manufactured food sold there shall be a label which shall indicate, among other things, the chemical analysis of the commodity. As the Act stands at present, it requires a label to be attached to each package of manufactured foods in excess of 28 lb. in weight, but it does not provide that there shall be a great deal of information on the label. The first subsections of Section 5C read:—

(1) Every person who sells any manufactured food for stock or any by-product shall securely and conspicuously affix a label or brand in accordance with this section to every package containing such food for stock or by-product.

(2) On every such label there shall be set out—

(a) the name and place of business of the manufacturer or importer;

(b) the distinguishing name of the stock food or by-product.

(3) The provisions of this section shall not extend or apply to any package when the net weight of the contents does not exceed twenty-eight pounds.

That is all that has to be shown on the label. The Minister provides by his amendment in the Bill that in addition there shall now appear on the label the chemical analysis referred to in Section 5, Subsection (1), paragraph (c) of the principal Act. So, in addition to the two items mentioned, in future the labels are to show the chemical analysis. The reason for that is easy to see, because the producers have complained bitterly about the contents of some of the stock foods they have been purchasing. In fact, I understand the department contemplated taking action against certain manufacturers because they sold stock foods that were not up to standard or in accordance with the analyses.

The Minister for Lands: Do you not think that is essential?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is. I have no objection to that provision at all because I regard it as necessary. The growers should know that what they were buying was in accordance with the chemical analysis. In my opinion, the Minister misled the House in connection with the third amendment because of his careless method of stating what it proposed to do. It seeks to relieve the manufacturers or storekeepers of the obligation already imposed upon them under the Act whereby if they sell manufactured stock foods they shall within seven days supply an invoice giving details of the food they have sold. That invoice is an implied warranty and is therefore worth a considerable amount to the person making the purchase. It is the document upon which he can take action if the stock food is not up to standard. The amendment the Minister proposes is that that implied warranty shall not be given if the quantity sold is less than 28 lb. and he gave as a reason for doing so that it would remove an anomaly. All the principal Act provides for regarding the labels is that no labels need be affixed if the package is under 28 lb. in weight. That is quite correct, but then the Minister went on to say—

A storekeeper would probably buy a supply of stock food in bags containing 120 lb. and the analysis and everything else required by law would appear on the bag. The storekeeper would break down the bulk into 5 lb. or 7 lb.

packages to meet the requirements of purchasers. The law would have been observed in so far as the delivery of the stock food to the storekeeper was concerned, but if he broke the bag down into small packages, it would be necessary under the existing law to have the analysis shown on the package.

It would not be any such thing. The existing law specifically exempts the manufacturer or storekeeper from the necessity to put labels on packages of less than 28 lb. in weight, and the amendment proposed by the Bill provides that on all labels to be fixed to packages in future the chemical analysis will be shown. As the law stands now, it is not shown on any sized package. Thus the Minister's statement is definitely wrong, and during the course of his speech he also said—

That is quite unnecessary and so we are providing that he may carry on his business without being required to have the analysis on every package.

That is not what the Minister is providing for at all. The third amendment included in the Bill is to say to the storekeeper that if the package of stock food weighs less than 28 lb., he shall not have to give an invoice. That is what the amendment says, but the Minister makes no reference to it in his speech. He therefore gives the House an entirely wrong impression of what he proposes to do. I shall not agree to this amendment, by which the storekeeper would be relieved of the necessity for providing an invoice, as the invoice is the implied warranty to the purchaser. What does the parent Act say? Section 5D. provides—

(1) Every person who sells any food for stock (whether paid for at the time of sale or not) shall, at the time of sale, or within seven days after delivery of the food for stock, or any part thereof, give to the purchaser an invoice certificate stating the name under which such food for stock is sold, and the prescribed particulars (if any) of the nature, substance, and quality of the food for stock and the percentages of nutritive or other ingredients contained therein.

(2) An invoice certificate given by the seller of any such food for stock as aforesaid shall, notwithstanding any contract or notice to the contrary, have effect as a written warranty by the seller that the particulars contained therein are correct.

I submit it is all-important that that protection shall remain. Why should it be removed for the small packages and re-

tained on the larger ones? It is just as important that the purchaser of the small lots—the 7 lb. or the 14 lb. lots—should be able to rely upon getting what he wants as it is for the man who buys the bigger lots. This amendment is not designed to remove an anomaly. I venture the opinion that it was not introduced at the request of the producers, as the Minister in the other House and the Minister for Lands has told us. It would be folly on the part of the producers to make such a request, because they would thereby be losing their protection. This is what they have been complaining about all along, that in purchasing these stock foods they have been unable to get what they asked for, and that the foods were not up to standard. That is why they asked for a chemical analysis and for that analysis to be shown on the label.

Then the Minister wants this House to agree that there shall be no implied warranty, no invoice given with lots of less than 28 lbs. I am certain we should find very few purchasers indeed who would be anxious to have this amendment, or anxious to throw away that protection. If a man buys stock foods in small lots, he probably does so because he cannot afford to buy larger lots; and he is undoubtedly entitled to the same protection as the man who buys the larger lots. I hope the House will give short shrift to amendment No. 3. As regards amendments Nos. 1 and 2, I have, as I have already said, no objection to them.

On motion by Mr. Wild, debate adjourned.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

MR. KELLY (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [5.4]: This is a small continuance measure extending the control over fishing nets and material for the mending of nets for another 12 months. I have no violent objection to the passage of the Bill, but I feel that in existing circumstances it is rather unnecessary. At present there appears but little reason for the continuance of this control. We were told 12 months ago, when the re-enactment measure was before the

House, that stocks were extremely limited, in fact, almost unprocurable, and that the stock then available should be kept for the professional fishermen. Since then quite a reasonable quantity of stock has been received into the State. Indeed, the consensus of opinion amongst traders at present is that while they have no objection to the measure, they do not see there is any real necessity for its continuance. On most shelves there is at present a quantity of the required type of net. It would appear that most of the trouble in disposing of the nets is not the fact of control, but rather the expense from the fishermen's point of view.

One trader asserts that the merchants have sufficient quantities of net on hand to see them through for a considerable period, even if no further stocks are received. These traders repeated the statement expressed by other traders that it was not the quantity coming forward that was limiting their sales, but rather the inability of the fishermen to buy the nets. I draw the attention of the House to this aspect, because later on, when it is dealing with a motion on the subject of fisheries, that statement will be more or less contradicted. I refer to the inability of the fishermen to purchase nets because of their financial position. The traders qualify their statement insofar as present supplies are concerned by saying that, although supplies have come forward fairly regularly in latter months, they have no guarantee that stocks will be available in the required quantities in the coming period, and that therefore, under those conditions, it might become necessary for the control to be extended for an additional year. In any case, I do not think it would make much difference if the control were not continued, as the demand for nets at present is not great. On the surface, it would appear that controls could easily be relinquished without further worry on the part of the suppliers, the professional fishermen or others.

It is interesting to note that when the parent Act was before the House, the present Minister for Fisheries did not seem very much concerned about it, nor was he inclined to agree with the then Minister that the fishermen's angle should be considered. On that occasion he said that it was wrong that the Minister should be

guided by professional fishermen on practically everything appertaining to fishermen. That is the very reason the Minister gave us the other evening in support of this Bill.

The Minister for Fisheries: I was not Minister for Fisheries then.

Mr. KELLY: It is a matter of the same buggy, but a different horse. Apparently, it makes a lot of difference whether a member is on one side of the House or the other as to what he says in regard to measures such as this. I have no desire to hold the Bill up because of what will be its rather useless performance, so I shall support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

**BILL—BUILDING OPERATIONS AND
BUILDING MATERIALS CONTROL
ACT AMENDMENT
(CONTINUANCE).**

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment.

2, Factories and Shops Act Amendment.

Received from the Council.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 23rd September. Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 3, to which the member for Fremantle had moved an amendment to strike out the words "and other insect pests" in line 4.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I cannot support the amendment as I prefer the proposed amendment on the notice paper

appearing under the name of the member for Leederville. As printed, the Bill would enable bylaws to be made relating to insect pests other than those mentioned in the Act and in the Bill. I would also point out that all bylaws must be laid on the Table of the House within 30 days of the making thereof, if Parliament is in session; and, if Parliament is not in session, within 30 days of its next meeting. The section we are dealing with merely gives authority for bylaws to be made by local authorities. Such bylaws have to be made before any action can be taken by any local authority and, as they have to be tabled, I submit that Parliament will be able to keep the matter under its control if the Bill is passed in its present form; though, as I have said, I am in favour of the suggestion of the member for Leederville.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister implied that as bylaws had to be tabled within 30 days of Parliament meeting we would have sufficient protection. Had the Minister left it there, I might have been inclined to give favourable consideration to his submission; but he said that there is a proposal on the notice paper for the right to make a proclamation. What does the Minister propose to do? If he has power to make bylaws, he does not need to proclaim anything; because bylaws must be published in the "Government Gazette" immediately, and that amounts to a proclamation. Why does the Minister want the right to make a proclamation?

Hon. A. H. Panton: He does not want it; it is my amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: He proposes to agree to it.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I have not moved it yet.

Mr. MARSHALL: Because a bylaw has to be gazetted, it is equivalent to a proclamation; and I want to know what the Minister meant by saying he agreed to the proposed amendment, having regard for the fact that he gave us to understand this provision was only to provide power to make bylaws. We all know the procedure to which bylaws have to be subjected, which gives us an opportunity to discuss them and to determine what shall be added to an Act in this way without any right on the part of the Government to make proclamations in addition.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I would like to be able to answer the hon. member and I will do so if the Chairman does not prevent me. Bylaws may be made on the motion of any local authority. For instance, if any local authority desired to make bylaws in connection with cockroaches, it could do so without Ministerial consent. Admittedly Parliament could subsequently disallow such bylaws, but the fact remains that the local authority could initiate them. If the amendment on the notice paper is carried, the local authority could not initiate bylaws in connection with cockroaches without obtaining Government consent in the first place, because there would have to be a proclamation. That is the distinction.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Minister says he favours the amendment of the member for Leederville. It seems to me that he favours a proclamation as against the making of bylaws or regulations by local authorities. If there is a proclamation, the Minister has some say but Parliament has none. A proclamation is made and that is the end of it, and any insect pest can be included.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The point is whether we propose to trust the Government, or a local governing body. My reading of the Bill suggests that, if it is carried, local governing bodies can make bylaws relating to any insect. Ladybirds and other valuable insects in a garden could be included. If the amendment I have on the notice paper is carried that cannot be done unless there is a proclamation by the Government. I am in favour of trusting any Government rather than half-a-dozen local governing bodies, which might make up their minds to introduce a regulation to deal with some particular insect.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: As the Bill stands, bylaws could be passed on the motion of any local authority in connection with any insect the local authority liked to name. The proposed amendment regulates the type of insect that may be dealt with, because it has to be proclaimed. But it is only the name of the insect to be dealt with that can be proclaimed. The bylaws concerning it still have to be tabled.

Mr. MARSHALL: I want a further point cleared up. The Minister proposes

and I propose to support the amendment on the notice paper. The provision in the Bill is to add to the relevant subsection of Section 185 the words, "and Argentine ants and other insect pests." If the member for Leederville's amendment is carried, the words "as may be proclaimed from time to time" will be added. Does the proposed amendment deal solely with Argentine ants and other insect pests or will all bylaws made by any local authority be dealt with?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: It will deal only with the provision we are now considering. In the Act power is given to local authorities to deal with mosquitoes. It is now proposed to add Argentine ants and other insect pests and if the member for Leederville's amendment is agreed to that will relate to such pests as may be proclaimed. The proclamation will deal only with that particular subsection.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I wish to move an amendment—

That in line 4 after the word "and" the word "such" be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: It is too late to move that amendment, which is out of order.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I move an amendment—

That at the end of the clause the following words be added "as may be proclaimed from time to time."

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Minister has already said that bylaws must receive the sanction of the House. In that case, what is the need for a proclamation?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The proclamation will ensure that the local authority will not make bylaws relating to insect pests without the consent of the Government. If such bylaws were made the House could disallow them, but it might be necessary to wait until Parliament met before adopting that course.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed, from the 16th September.

HON. A. A. M. COVERLEY (Kimberley) [5.35]: I raise no serious objection to the measure which, though it is formidable in appearance, is really one for Committee. It has been stated that the Bill was agreed to by the previous Government, and so that there may be no misunderstanding I wish to add that, as Minister controlling the Harbour and Light Department in 1946, I did authorise the then general manager of that department to have a Bill drafted for the consideration of Cabinet. I understand that that is the Bill now presented for the consideration of the House, but it was never examined, as printed, by the previous Cabinet. It is a Bill to consolidate the Marine Act and to include amendments taken from Acts throughout the other States of Australia. They are amendments which, in the opinion of those controlling the Harbour and Light Department, will be of service and benefit to that body. This is the first opportunity I have had of reading the Bill, and I think it will be necessary to move certain amendments when the measure is in the Committee stage. I hope those amendments will be agreed to by the Government. I support the second reading.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.37]: I am pleased to hear that the member for Kimberley did not authorise this particular measure, as it was stated by the Minister when introducing the Bill that the previous Government had authorised it. Authorising the bringing down of a Bill and authorising this particular Bill are two different things. While most of the measure may be all right, that portion dealing with the engagement, discharge and conditions of employment of seamen conflicts with the Seamen's Award. I cannot understand the Minister bringing down a Bill that will conflict with an award of the Arbitration Court.

The Attorney General: I do not think it will do so.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: One provision of the Bill calls for seamen to serve three years before the mast before being entitled

to an A.B.'s rating. I understand that the present provision is for two years, plus an examination after that period to be held by a responsible person in each of the capital ports. Another provision of the Bill makes it necessary for an ordinary seaman to be 17 years of age after one year of service. The Seamen's Union admits boys to membership at 15 years of age and after 12 months, at the age of 16 and with the necessary sea service, they are entitled to the rating of ordinary seaman. There again the Bill conflicts with the award. Subclause (6) of Clause 114 is unnecessary as under the Navigation Act every seaman must at regular intervals take part in boat drill, and further, the examination requested by the Seamen's Union for seamen after two years' service, before becoming A.B.'s, makes it necessary for all to pass a boat ticket examination.

Subclause (1) of Clause 115 contradicts Subclause (2) of the previous clause as it admits a boy aged 14 as deck boy, and after 12 months' service he would have had sufficient time at sea, while Clause 114 would not entitle him to ordinary seaman's rating until he reached 17 years of age. It is also contradictory to the present arrangement, as to the age of deck boys, between the Seamen's Union and the Maritime Industry Commission. Boys must be 15 years of age before they can go to sea. Subclause (2) of Clause 115 does not conform to the ruling of the Maritime Industry Commission that all workers employed in the engine-room and stoke-hold must be adults of 20 years or more. Paragraph (c) of Subclause (5) of Clause 124 does not conform to any award or any agreement that has been made between the ship owners and the Seamen's Union. Under such awards or agreements the victualling allowance is 6s. 6d. for a bed and 2s. 6d. for each meal, or a total of 14s. per day.

The Bill provides an allowance of 5s. per day. Subclause (d) provides for 3s. per day or 1s. per meal victualling allowance when travelling, whereas the awards and agreements of the Seamen's Union provide for 7s. 6d. per day, three meals at 2s. 6d. each. Subparagraph (i) of Paragraph (a) of Subclause (1) of Clause 169 provides berthing accommodation for seamen or apprentices as follows:—

For each seaman and apprentice a space of not less than one hundred and forty cubic feet

and of not less than eighteen superficial feet measured on the deck or floor of that place, and of not less than five feet measured between bunks clear of all encumbrances at the forward or narrow end.

That does not comply with the standard set by the Seamen's Union and the Australian Shipbuilding Board. If we get away from that standard we will strike trouble, as was the case with the "River" class vessels. Those are the main objections I have to the Bill. It is essentially a Committee Bill, and I found little fault with it until I reached Clause 100. I support the second reading, but hope that the necessary amendments will be agreed to in Committee.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands) [5.41]: I hope that the Minister, when replying to the debate, will clear up one or two points that I will raise on behalf of our yachting clubs. I understand there is provision in the Bill to control pleasure boats. If I interpret that provision correctly, it will mean that a canoe on the river will be subject to controls and regulations, and perhaps even to licensing. I do not think the surveillance exercised by the clubs over pleasure boats can be faulted, and it may be that the Minister intends to take special precautions to see that there is no recurrence of the tragedies that have occurred on the river from time to time. It might well be said that, whatever regulations are made, people cannot be prevented from doing foolish things, and that is borne out by the toll of our roads, in spite of all our traffic laws.

The yachting clubs are disturbed at the prospect of people, subject to all sorts of controls and restrictions on six days a week, being subjected to further regulations when they take their boats out for pleasure on Sunday. It will probably be found that under the regulations inspections will call for additional staff, and consequently for licensing fees, which I submit are not warranted. I concede the necessity for regulations to deal with boats for hire, and I would like the Minister to clear up these points when replying to the debate.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—North Perth—in reply) [5.43]: I will take first the questions raised by the member for Maylands. No

provision is made in the Act for dealing with craft of the kind mentioned by the member for Maylands and used by their owners. The Act applies only to craft of that nature when let on hire, so no difficulty will arise in that regard. I do not propose to discuss now the objections raised by the member for Fremantle because I think they can be more appropriately considered, as he himself suggested, at the Committee stage and, if there are any inconsistencies, as suggested by him, I think they can be satisfactorily cleaned up then.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 113—agreed to.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I suggest that we report progress because we are now coming to a vital part of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I would like to hear the hon. member's comments on the clause, after which I would be prepared to report progress.

Clause 114—Rating A.B.:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I think it will be necessary to delete the word "three" and insert the word "two" in lieu. The Seamen's Union of Australia asks for two years, plus an examination after that period to be held by a responsible person in each of the capital ports.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.