

Mr. NALDER: —as far as Western Australia is concerned.

Mr. Graham: A colourful product.

Mr. NALDER: A quality product.

Mr. Graham: Colourful.

Mr. NALDER: Colourful, if you like.

Mr. Graham: You said there was no difference in the quality.

Mr. NALDER: We in Western Australia, as I endeavoured to say, are very proud of the agricultural products that we are able to sell on the overseas market. One could refer to meat. Only just recently—

Mr. Hawke: Kangaroo?

Mr. NALDER: —a representative of a firm that is exporting much of the meat to the United States commented on the quality of the meat that is going from Western Australia to America.

Mr. J. Hegney: They were not too favourable about kangaroo meat in America.

Mr. NALDER: As far as fat lambs are concerned, we had very favourable comment last year from London. Many other of our exportable products are commented on favourably. That is because producers are encouraged to produce a quality product; and this amendment is an endeavour to help producers and encourage them to market a quality product.

I think most members will agree that is very commendable. All this amendment seeks to do is to pay a premium to those who are prepared to take a little more trouble to feed their flocks in the manner which has been recommended, and which is not a costly method of feeding. As a matter of fact, grass is probably one of the cheapest feeds for flocks. It is not as costly as grain, or the mashes referred to by the member for Middle Swan.

I think it is quite clear that the evidence already given proves the point; and I see no reason why, when given an opportunity in this way, we should not endeavour to encourage it with the utmost energy. This is one of the ways in which the Egg Marketing Board feels it can improve the quality of our overseas products and also encourage local consumption. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, our local market is the best market, and we therefore want to encourage producers to produce a quality product that will commend itself to our local people. This amendment endeavours to do that.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

House adjourned at 9.26 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 8th September, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY—	
Presentation	1014
DEATH PENALTY ABOLITION BILL—	
Personal Explanation: Inaccurate Press report	1014
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Child Welfare Payments: Effect on assessment of rent	1017
Fishing in Southern Streams: Restrictive by-laws	1015
Gascoyne River: Inquiry by Mr. Furphy	1017
Giving way to the Right: Penalties for non-observance of regulations	1015
Goomalling Water Supplies: Re-laying of mains	1017
Guildford Railway Station—	
Improvement of lighting	1017
Increased parking space	1017
Key West Enterprises—	
Protection of South Perth Council	1018
Tabling of agreement	1018
Town Planning Department's views	1018
Laverton Hospital Board: Tabling of papers	1014
Mental Hospitals: Payments to aged and invalid patients, and burial expenses	1015
Midland Junction Abattoir: Improvement of adjacent road	1017
Off-course Betting: Introduction of legislation	1015
Railway Freights: Effect of increase on wheat farmers	1018
State Finances: Details for last ten years	1015
Swan River: Dredging beyond Causeway	1015
Vermin in the North-West: Bonuses for dog scalps and eagle hawks	1017
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Maylands: Additional police control	1018
BILLS—	
Country High School Hostels Authority Bill—	
2r.	1028
Com.	1030
Report	1031
Health Act Amendment Bill: 1r.	1018
Health Act Amendment Bill (No. 2): 1r.	1018
Licensing Act Amendment Bill: 3r.	1019
Local Government Bill—	
2r.	1019
Message: Appropriation	1031
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill: 3r.	1019
Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill: 1r.	1018
Northern Developments (Ord River) Pty. Ltd. Agreement Bill: 1r.	1018
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill: 1r.	1018
Police Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1031
Com.	1037
Stamp Act Amendment Bill: 1r.	1018

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Presentation

THE SPEAKER: I desire to announce that, accompanied by the member for Canning, the member for Toodyay, and the member for South Fremantle, I waited upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament. His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms:—

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

DEATH PENALTY ABOLITION BILL

Personal Explanation: Inaccurate Press Report

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [2.20]: With some reluctance I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, in order to make a personal explanation. In what purports to be a report of my remarks in introducing, last evening, a Bill to abolish capital punishment in Western Australia there is a grave error which has been made by the newspaper; and it has been accentuated by the fact that the paper has wrongly reported me and then taken the unusual step of checking an authority and using that to prove that I was wrong. All the paper has done is prove that its own version of my remarks is wrong.

If I may be a little more explicit: In this morning's account it says—

His Bill was almost identical in words, effect and application to one submitted by Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver, former Liberal member for Subiaco, in 1941. Attorney-General Watts, Sir Ross McLarty (Lib., Murray) and Mr. J. I. Mann (Lib., Avon Valley) had supported the measure on that occasion, he said.

I repeat that is not true, because I did not make that statement. There is a footnote to the Press report as follows:—

Hansard shows that the 1941 measure was agreed to on the voices on second reading. However, in a division on the third reading, when the motion to defeat the Bill was lost by 25 to 10, both Sir Ross McLarty and Mr. Mann voted against it.

As a matter of historical interest I mentioned there are present in this House today six on this side of the House and three on the other side of the House of those who were present when Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver's Bill was being dealt with. The only reference I made at

the time to anybody speaking to it or supporting it was to the now Attorney-General. Subsequently I made reference to the fact that the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition had spoken. These were the words I used—

At that time there were six members in the House who now comprise part of the Opposition and there are three who are still with us and who are sitting on the Government side of the House who were present when the Bill went through this Chamber, in its entirety, without a division being taken.

Literally, I am incorrect in that latter remark because, whilst no division was taken on the second reading or at any stage during Committee, it is true that a division was taken on the third reading. I continue reading from my remarks last night—

I refer to the present Attorney-General, the member for Murray, and the member for Avon Valley.

During the second reading debate, the present Attorney-General, if any estimate can be made from the words appearing in *Hansard*, spoke strongly and feelingly in support of the abolition of the death penalty in the State of Western Australia.

Then I referred to the Bill being passed to the Legislative Council. Whatever else I might think of the report, it is, in my estimation, a 99 per cent. coverage of interjections and a 1 per cent. coverage of my remarks. That is the business of *The West Australian* if it cares to treat this House in that manner. But to publish something that is untrue and not in accordance with what was said, and then go to the extraordinary and extreme lengths of seeking to prove that what was said was in error, makes me, if it is allowed to pass unheeded, entirely vulnerable and completely suspect in regard to any of the statements that I made or authorities that I quoted in introducing the measure.

Without any rancour in connection with the matter, I hope that whatever the newspaper itself might think of my measure, it will take appropriate steps to see that the public has a reasonable estimation of my integrity, instead of otherwise, which no doubt is the case from this morning's newspaper report.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LAVERTON HOSPITAL BOARD

Tabling of Papers

1. **Mr. NULSEN** asked the Minister for Health:

Would he please lay upon the Table of the House, for at least one week, all papers dealing with the hospital board at Laverton?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:
Yes.

GIVING WAY TO THE RIGHT

Penalties for Non-observance of Regulations

2. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

What are the minimum and maximum penalties which can be imposed on a motorist who fails to give way to a vehicle approaching from his right?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The penalties which can be imposed are, for a first offence upon conviction, a fine not exceeding £20 or imprisonment not exceeding one month.

For any subsequent offence, a penalty not exceeding £50, or imprisonment not exceeding fifty days with or without hard labour. No minimum penalty is prescribed in the traffic regulations for this offence.

OFF-COURSE BETTING

Introduction of Legislation

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Attorney-General:

(1) As he is reported to have told the Country Party conference held in July this year that the Government would soon reach a decision on off-course betting, is he able to advise whether a decision has yet been made?

(2) If so, when is—

(a) an announcement likely to be made;

(b) legislation likely to be introduced?

(3) Does he appreciate the necessity for an early statement in view of the uncertainty of many persons whose livelihood as bookmakers or clerks may be in jeopardy?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1) to (3) Legislation is now being drafted.

STATE FINANCES

Details for Last Ten Years

4. Mr. ANDREW asked the Treasurer:

(1) What is the total indebtedness of the West Australian State Government?

(2) Will he inform the House—

(a) the loan moneys granted;

(b) the total revenue collected;

(c) the interest payable;

(d) the percentage of interest compared with revenue;

for each of the last ten financial years?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) £246,787,292.

(2)—

Year	Loan Expenditure	Loan Revenue	Interest Payments	Interest as Percentage of Revenue
	£	£	£	%
1950-51	11,433,011	28,156,181	3,580,583	12.72
1951-52	13,777,471	33,955,157	3,848,365	11.33
1952-53	19,027,004	38,884,236	4,190,698	10.78
1953-54	15,917,283	43,145,840	4,370,384	11.29
1954-55	16,524,755	45,719,846	5,025,199	12.30
1955-56	15,211,816	49,612,408	6,300,881	12.71
1956-57	18,468,186	54,330,934	6,091,560	12.87
1957-58	17,670,982	57,053,977	7,041,711	13.92
1958-59	18,366,842	60,063,237	8,545,825	14.23
1959-60	19,525,610	64,387,912	9,428,506	14.64

SWAN RIVER

Dredging Beyond Causeway

5. Mr. ANDREW asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware of the unsightly appearance of the Swan River on the far side of the Causeway?

(2) Should not this eyesore situated so near one of the most important entrances to the city, be cleared up and beautified?

(3) If so, will he make a dredge available without delay for the purpose of starting this very necessary work?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) The matter is under consideration.

MENTAL HOSPITALS

Payments to Aged and Invalid Patients, and Burial Expenses

6. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Has the recommendation made by State Ministers for Health to the Federal Government to pay aged and invalid pensions to patients in mental hospitals, been agreed to?

(2) Can a person or persons providing burial expenses for patients in mental hospitals or mental institutions, claim an allowance towards burial expenses from social services?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) No.

(2) Yes, if the patient was a social service pensioner before entering a mental hospital or institution.

FISHING IN SOUTHERN STREAMS

Restrictive By-laws

7. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware that by-laws made by the Gnowangerup Road Board under the Road Districts Act, 1919,

and headed *Fishing By-laws* are preventing professional fishermen from fishing Beaufort Inlet, Wellstead Estuary, and that a like position exists at Bremer Bay?

- (2) Is he aware of the proclamation dated the 17th April, 1957, made under the Fisheries Act, allowing fishing with nets of not more than 150 yards in length and meshes of no more than 2½ inches, in the Beaufort Estuary and the whole of the rivers, tributaries, and other streams flowing into the Beaufort Estuary, more especially the Pallinup and Salt Rivers?
- (3) Who was the person responsible for granting permission to the Gnowangerup Road Board to formulate by-laws, overriding the proclamation made by His Excellency with reference to fishing in Beaufort Estuary and the Pallinup and Salt Rivers?
- (4) Can he advise the true position in respect to Bremer Bay Estuary, and the river at Wellstead Estuary?
- (5) Have approaches been made to him by the South Coast Licensed Fishermen's Association on this matter, and what was the date of such approaches?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. I understand that the intention of the provisions of the by-laws is to prevent unrestricted netting in waters within reserves controlled by the Gnowangerup Road Board. Licenses issued pursuant to the by-laws restrict the length of nets to a maximum of 100 yards.
- (2) By notice in the *Government Gazette* on the 4th March, 1960, the boundaries of the reserves vested in the Gnowangerup Road Board were amended by the inclusion of portions of the rivers flowing into the Wellstead (Bremer) and Pallinup Estuaries. The proclamation dated the 17th April, 1957, in respect of the river waters referred to, is superseded by the road board by-laws.
- (3) By amendments made to the Fisheries and Road Districts Acts during 1938, power was given to road boards to make by-laws in relation to the control of fishing in waters vested in such boards, such by-laws to supersede any regulation or proclamation made under the Fisheries Act covering such waters.

- (4) The whole of the waters of the Wellstead and Pallinup Estuaries and portions of the Pallinup and South-West Bay Rivers are vested in the Gnowangerup Road Board. Fishing in these waters is controlled by the board.
- (5) Yes—indirectly through the W.A. League of Professional Fishermen's Associations during July this year.

KEY WEST ENTERPRISES

Town Planning Department's Views

8. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

Has the Key West proposal for the development of the South Perth foreshore the full support of the Department of Town Planning?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The Town Planning Department supports the scheme subject to amendments, to which the promoters' representative has already agreed, being incorporated in the final plans.

Tabling of Agreement

9. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Will he table the proposed agreement between the South Perth City Council and the sponsors of the Key West development project?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

Neither the Minister nor his department has seen or is in possession of the agreement referred to.

Protection of South Perth Council

10. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Attorney-General:

- (1) Has the Crown Law Department examined the proposed agreement between the South Perth City Council and the sponsors of the Key West development project?
- (2) If so, does the agreement give the South Perth City Council adequate protection?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) The matter is one for the South Perth City Council and its own legal advisers.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

11. *This question was postponed.*

VERMIN IN THE NORTH-WEST

Bonuses for Dog Scalps and Eagle Hawks

12. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What bonus is paid for dog scalps and eagle hawks in the under-mentioned districts—

- (a) Gascoyne;
- (b) Pilbara;
- (c) Kimberley?

(2) How many Government doggers are employed in the—

- (a) West Kimberley;
- (b) East Kimberley?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) The Agriculture Protection Board provides a uniform bonus throughout the State of £1 on wild dog scalps and 5s. on eagle hawks. In many cases local authorities supplement this bonus by varying amounts.

- (2) (a) West Kimberley—one.
- (b) East Kimberley—none.

GOOMALLING WATER SUPPLIES

Re-laying of Mains

13. Mr. LEWIS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Is it proposed to commence the re-laying of water mains in Goomalling this financial year?

(2) If so, when will the work be commenced?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) It is likely that work will be commenced before Christmas.

GASCOYNE RIVER

Inquiry by Mr. Furphy

14. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has Mr. Furphy, of Scott and Furphy, of Melbourne, started his investigation into water conservation in the Gascoyne River?

(2) If not, when will he start and when can his report be expected?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) No.

(2) Mr. Furphy is due to arrive in Perth on the 11th September. It is not possible to predict at this stage when his report will be available.

GUILDFORD RAILWAY STATION

Improvement of Lighting

15. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it proposed to improve the lighting of the Guildford Railway Station?

(2) When will the work be carried out?

Increased Parking Space

(3) Is it proposed to increase the area of parking space at Guildford Railway Station?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) and (2) This work is currently being undertaken and it is anticipated it will be completed early next week.

(3) No. The present parking arrangements are adequate for railway patrons.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

Improvement of Adjacent Road

16. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has he received any requests for improvement in the lay-out of the road running past the Midland Junction Abattoir?

(2) Will the proposed improvements be carried out in the current year?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The Main Roads Department has surveyed and designed a deviation via Military Road. The Abattoirs Board is arranging the necessary resumption of land, and when formalities are completed road works will be put in hand.

CHILD WELFARE PAYMENTS

Effect on Assessment of Rent

17. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

(1) Is he aware that under the previous Government, a man, wife, and family receiving social service and child welfare payments were assessed for rent on social service plus two-thirds of child welfare allowance?

(2) Is it correct that under the present Government the entire child welfare payment is taken into account in the assessment of rent?

(3) If so, why the change of policy with the change of Government, as that change imposes hardship on those persons already suffering hardship on social services?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Previously the child welfare allowance was paid to the wife and was classed by the S.H.C. as her income, but owing to some cases where the wife collected the allowance after the husband resumed work, the allowance was made payable to the husband; and under the Code of Practice for Rental Rebates included in the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act of 1945, all income received by the husband is included as the assessment. Where the allowance was paid to the wife, the Code of Practice allows for all of the highest income—i.e. the husband's and two-thirds of the next highest, i.e. the wife's.

RAILWAY FREIGHTS

Effect of Increase on Wheat Farmers

18. Mr. HAWKE asked the Attorney-General:

Is he aware that the president of the Barley and Oats Section of the Farmers' Union (Mr. H. L. Kelsall) is reported in *The Farmers' Weekly* of the 18th August, as having said—

The announcement that freights are to rise generally and that grain in particular, amongst other items, is to rise by as much as 20 per cent. is a very serious one from the farmer's point of view.

And also—

With wool prices so low, wheat hard to sell and both barley and oats having to meet intense competition in the world's markets at keenly cut prices, added costs like this rail freight increase can easily become the last straw to break the camel's back?

Mr. WATTS replied:

Yes.

LAVERTON HOSPITAL BOARD

Tabling of Papers

19. The SPEAKER: I wish to clarify a point in connection with question No. 1. I am informed that it is the intention of the Minister to table the report required for one week.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I have moved that.

The SPEAKER: Is that satisfactory to the member for Eyre?

Mr. Nulsen: Yes.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

MAYLANDS

Additional Police Control

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) With reference to the well-known trouble spot at Eighth Avenue, Maylands, which was the scene of a brawl last evening, would the Minister inform the House whether it is a fact that neither the police nor the local authority can deal with the present trouble owing to existing legislation, apart from increased police surveillance of the area?
- (2) If so, will the Minister undertake to see that increased police supervision will be given to this area; and that amending legislation will be brought forward in order that the menace can be dealt with?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) and (2) No doubt strengthening of the powers of the police under the Police Act would give the police greater control. But there is always the danger, of course, of extending those powers so far that objection might be raised by members of this House on the score of the powers being used in such a way that their use might be repressive to other citizens. I think the best reply I can make to the honourable member is that the police will give greater attention to this particular area, and I will keep in close touch with them and will see whether any further amendment of the law is necessary to deal with the problem.

BILLS (6)—FIRST READING

1. Stamp Act Amendment Bill.
On motions by Mr. Brand (Treasurer) Bill introduced and read a first time.
2. Health Act Amendment Bill.
3. Health Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
4. Optometrists Act Amendment Bill.
On motions by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health), Bills introduced and read a first time.
5. Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill.
On motions by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), Bill introduced and read a first time.
6. Northern Developments (Ord River) Pty. Ltd. Agreement Bill.
On motions by Mr. Court (Minister for the North-West), Bill introduced and read a first time.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING**1. Licensing Act Amendment Bill.**

On motion by Mr. Burt, Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

2. Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL*Second Reading*

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport) [2.43]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has been before the House in various shapes and forms since it was first introduced in 1948 and, therefore, really needs very little introduction or explanation. The idea of a single Act to cover both road boards and municipalities was first put forward as long ago as 1926, when the Metropolitan Local Government Association urged that there should be a single Act. A committee was set up in 1947; and in 1948, this committee, which consisted of a majority of representatives of local authorities presented to the Minister a Bill which was duly introduced and read a first time in December, 1948, and brought before the Assembly for its second reading in June, 1949.

There was considerable criticism of that Bill, and it was withdrawn and referred to a Royal Commission, which was composed of representatives of local authorities with a departmental officer as chairman. The Royal Commission heard representations from interested persons and submitted recommendations for an amendment or alteration of the 1948 Bill. The Bill was redrafted and submitted to Parliament in 1953 when, again, there was considerable criticism. It was again before Parliament in 1954, 1956, 1957 and 1958. In 1957 it passed through both Houses; but, because of disagreement between the Houses, and certain amendments made in the Legislative Council, the Bill went to a conference of managers and, because of disagreement, it lapsed.

It was again introduced in 1958; but, because of criticism from an Eastern States barrister who was visiting this State, and who was asked by the local authorities for advice on the Bill, it was again withdrawn; and, in 1959, it was redrafted by a committee consisting of three representatives of local authorities with a departmental officer. The Bill as provided by that committee is substantially the one which I am now introducing. In one or two matters only has there been a departure from the recommendations of that committee.

The Bill seeks to replace the existing Road Districts Act and Municipal Corporations Act with a Local Government Act to cover all types of local authorities. Under the Bill the existing cities and municipalities will become known as cities and towns, and the existing road boards will become known as shire councils, all of them being regarded as municipalities. The main difference between the Bill as it now appears, and the Bill as it was when last before Parliament, is in connection with four major items which caused criticism and contention at the earlier sessions of Parliament. Those four major items are—

(a) The franchise.

(b) The method of electing the mayor or president.

(c) The compulsory use of unimproved values as a system of rating.

(d) Compulsory Government audit.

The Bill now provides not for adult suffrage, as it did when last before Parliament, but for the continuation of the property franchise and system of plural voting which has served this State so well during its past experience of local government.

However, the franchise has been modified to some extent and extended as far as is justifiable. Whereas under the existing Road Districts Act the owner of land is automatically enrolled as an elector, and may be displaced by an application from the occupier, and the Municipal Corporations Act provides for the automatic enrolment of the occupier in preference to the owner, the Bill provides for the enrolment of both owners and occupiers, although the latter may have to apply if their names are not automatically included in the roll when this is prepared as a list by the town or shire clerk.

Where a person both owns and occupies land, provision has been made that the spouse of that person may be enrolled as the occupier so that in respect of that land also there will be both an owner and occupier enrolled. Provision has also been made that where Government employees are occupying houses belonging to the Government they will be entitled to be enrolled as electors if the Government is paying to the local authority an *ex gratia* payment at least equal to the rates which would be charged on the land if it were, in fact, rateable.

It will be realised that this represents a considerable extension of the existing restricted franchise. A further liberalisation of the existing legislation is a provision that no matter how many corporations a person may represent, he cannot vote in a representative capacity and in a personal capacity so that he will exercise more than four votes for the election of a mayor or president, or more than two votes in any ward in which he is entitled to vote at an election for a councillor.

The plural voting system set out in the existing legislation was based on money values which were considerably higher than those of today. The Bill has, therefore, recognised this fact by increasing the values necessary to have more than one vote; and I feel sure that members will appreciate the necessity for this change in order to keep in line with the changing value of money.

When the Bill was last before Parliament, certain criticisms were made of the adoption of the full preferential system and, therefore, this has been modified in the Bill I now present. In the case of single vacancies, the position is still the same; and this was not the source of objection. However, in cases where there are two or more vacancies to be filled at the same time the Bill now provides for the elimination of the candidates with the lowest number of votes until there are left remaining only sufficient candidates to fill the vacancies, when these are to be declared elected. There is now no question of the distribution of the votes of the first candidate elected, which was the feature considered objectionable by a number of members when last discussing the Bill.

The question of whether the mayor or president is to be elected by the electors as a whole, or by the members of the council among themselves, has been resolved by providing that the electors of existing municipalities will continue to elect the mayor, and existing road boards will continue to elect their president from among the members; but provision has also been made that, in certain circumstances, a change in the system may be made so that the mayor may be elected by the councillors from among themselves, and the president of a shire may be elected by the electors at large. This should meet all objections.

In the same way, the question of which system of valuation to be used has also been determined. Municipalities under existing legislation normally use annual values, but may use unimproved values with the Governor's approval, whereas in the case of road boards the position is exactly the opposite, in that road boards must use unimproved values unless they obtain the consent of the Governor to use annual values. They may, of course, use annual values at present in respect of a townsite within the district.

The Bill will require that municipalities continue on annual values unless either the ratepayers or the Minister authorise a change to unimproved values; and the same will apply to road boards in the reverse direction—that is, they will be required to continue on unimproved values unless either the ratepayers agree or the Minister agrees to a change. This should prevent any serious criticism of the type of valuation or system of rating to be used.

The other main question—compulsory Government audit—has likewise been dealt with. Under existing legislation the books of road boards are audited by audit inspectors appointed by the Minister, and in the case of municipalities the accounts are audited by auditors elected by the ratepayers for a term of two years. The Bill accepts the view that the election of auditors is not a desirable practice as a person's ability to secure election may have no relation whatever to his ability as an auditor.

Therefore, provision has been made that, in the case of existing municipalities, these may continue with a private auditor; but he will, in future, be appointed by the council and not elected by the electors. Existing road boards will continue with the system of Government audit which has worked so satisfactorily for them. Provision has been made, however, for an existing municipality—which will be a city or town under the Bill—to adopt the system of audit by Government inspectors; and, likewise, provision has been made that a road board which wishes to do so may adopt the system of audit by private auditors appointed by the council. This appears to be a compromise which should be generally acceptable to the local authorities.

There are numerous other small changes in the Bill since last it was before the legislature, but most of these are of very little real consequence. Much of the criticism of the Bill from outside sources was found to have little justification although there were, of course, numerous minor matters which required adjustment. One important change has been made in that whereas, under the Bill as it was when last before the House, the right to veto loans was held by the electors, this Bill provides that loans must be dealt with not by the ordinary electors, but by the ratepayers. Under the existing legislation, the Road Districts Act reserves the right to veto all loans to owners of rateable land who reside in the district; whereas, in municipalities, all owners of land have the right to vote at loan polls.

Under the Bill, all ratepayers will have the right to veto; and a ratepayer is defined in the Act as a person from whom rates under the Act are recoverable. This means that the owner will be the person normally responsible, and he will have the right to veto loans; whereas the person who is an occupier or spouse of an owner will not be entitled to vote at a loan poll. This will meet objections which have been manifest in a number of districts concerning the unfairness of restricting voting at loan polls to resident-owners; and it will also prevent loans being authorised by the vote of occupiers who may be more transient in their stay in a district than normally would be the owners. In the

great majority of cases, of course, the owner is also the occupier, and he will not be affected by the change.

In any case the preparation of the roll of resident-owners has become very burdensome in large road districts in the metropolitan area and a change would, no doubt, have been necessary even if there were no Local Government Bill.

The Bill is a very large and bulky one, and I do not think it desirable to endeavour to explain the provisions at any great length. A large number of the amendments made previously have, in fact, been adopted in the drafting of this Bill and there is no need, therefore, to go into those questions. Where previous amendments have not been accepted there has always been a good reason, and in most cases that will be evident when the particular clauses are studied. However, if there are any doubts on the clauses involved they can be given consideration in Committee.

I therefore commend the Bill to the members of this Chamber, and I would point out to them that it has been drafted with the assistance of local government representatives and is acceptable to local authorities; and that the two associations concerned—namely, the Local Government Association and the Road Board Association—are particularly anxious that the Bill should be accepted in the condition in which it is presented to Parliament.

Adjournment of Debate

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [2.57]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned for two weeks.

Mr. Perkins: No, no. That is too long.

Mr. Hawke: Make it three weeks!

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport—on adjournment) [2.58]: I move an amendment—

That the words "two weeks" be deleted with a view to substituting the words "one week."

In my opinion, an adjournment for one week is reasonable. It will take a long time to go through this Bill in Committee because there are a large number of clauses in it, and nearly all the discussion will be in Committee. The main principles of the Bill have been discussed by Parliament at great length on two or three occasions over a long period, and I think I would be failing in my duty to the local authorities if I did not make an attempt to expedite the consideration of the Bill as much as possible.

It must be realised that after it is passed by this Chamber—if it is passed—it will still have to be considered in another place. Therefore, I hope that members will agree to the resumption of the debate on the

second reading in a week's time, because I am particularly anxious that we get on to the Committee stage as soon as possible.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo—on amendment) [2.59]: I oppose the amendment even if only to remind the Minister that, in similar circumstances, in a previous session, when the present Deputy Premier, as the Opposition speaker, was moving for the adjournment of the debate for two weeks after it had already been discussed at great length, I objected to the adjournment for two weeks, and the Minister was most vocal in his condemnation that opposition should be shown against a period of two weeks for the consideration of such a bulky document as the Local Government Bill.

If it was justified on that occasion—and there have been a number of amendments made, as indicated by the Minister—surely it is justified on this occasion, for the Opposition to have at least the two weeks asked for by the member for Eyre to give consideration to the various amendments that members of the Opposition may desire to place on the notice paper. I oppose the Minister's amendment.

MR. TOMS (Maylands—on amendment) [3.1]: I, too, would like to oppose the amendment moved by the Minister. Surely it is not unreasonable for the Opposition to ask for a fortnight's grace to consider a Bill which contains 694 clauses. It would be right and proper if the Minister agreed to the two weeks' adjournment of the debate moved by the member for Eyre. When all is said and done, what difference will another week make? As the Minister himself said when introducing the measure, it has been mooted for a number of years; and I am certain that a further week's delay will make no difference whatever.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan—on amendment) [3.2]: I, too, oppose the amendment moved by the Minister, because I think the motion for the adjournment of the debate for a fortnight, as moved by the member for Eyre, is quite reasonable, particularly when we take into consideration the fact that the Minister has read his speech here this afternoon as it was prepared for him by the Local Government Department; and it is difficult to hear the Minister at all times, because his voice is low, and so many people on that side of the House seem to be engaged in conversation while he is talking.

Another point is that members will not receive copies of the Minister's speech until Wednesday next; and they will not have the opportunity to study the salient points made by the Minister. I am sure it will be agreed that the Minister made some important points; and I think members are entitled to a copy of the Minister's

speech before the Bill is further debated. The only member who will receive a copy of the speech made by the Minister will be the member for Eyre; the rest of us will have to sit like nitwits in complete ignorance of what the measure contains.

We are here as representatives of electorates, which contain local governing authorities. Surely it has been a principle of responsible and representative government that the member who represents an electorate should be given a little time to consult those in his electorate concerning amendments which might be introduced into Parliament. I have not many local authorities in my electorate. At the moment the two important local authorities are the Belmont Park Road Board and the Bayswater Road Board. But there are other members who represent far-flung areas, the local governing authorities of which would have matters of importance to submit to their members for discussion in connection with the amendments contained in this Bill. Accordingly, I think the request of the member for Eyre is reasonable, and I oppose the amendment.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland—on amendment) [3.5]: For many reasons I oppose the amendment moved by the Minister. I will not go into all those reasons now, because it would take up the time of the House. First of all, however, I would like to point out that this measure is the largest Bill that has been introduced into this House for many years. It contains no fewer than 694 clauses. The Minister did say that the Bill had been before Parliament previously; but you know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of members in this House at the moment who are seeing the Bill for the first time; and it is impossible for them, in one week, to comprehend all that it contains. The members concerned might be brilliant, but they cannot possibly understand the full import and implication of all these clauses in one week.

As the member for Middle Swan said, we have our hands tied behind our backs, because it is not possible for us to read the speech made by the Minister, as it will not appear in *Hansard* till Wednesday next. This is a Constitution for all the governing bodies in Western Australia, a number of which consider themselves equally as important as Parliament itself. It is absurd to suggest that justice can be done to those local governing bodies by the consideration of the Bill for only one week. I hope the Minister will endeavour to take a grip on himself in regard to these important matters. I will be telling him about some other important matters a little later, when dealing with another Bill.

This measure, however, requires the greatest consideration. I made inquiries this afternoon and endeavoured to secure extra copies of the measure for people who are vitally concerned; for those whose

living might be influenced by the provisions of the Bill. I found, however, that there are no spare copies available.

Have we, as members of Parliament, a responsibility; or have we not? If we have such a responsibility then we need ample time to study this measure to enable those who will be affected by it to weigh its import and advise us of the steps they desire us to take. Even in his own interest the Minister is wrong in trying to bulldoze this Bill through Parliament; particularly as some members have not even seen the Bill; and neither have we been able to obtain copies for our constituents. So I hope members on the Government side will have some regard for their responsibilities, even if the Minister is lacking in this direction. I hope the Minister will accept the motion.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn—on amendment) [3.8]: I oppose the amendment moved by the Minister for Transport. His amendment to the motion stands out in striking contrast to the attitude he adopted last night when another simple motion was before the House; and when he asked me to agree to the adjournment so as to enable him to introduce his measure. The motion concerned contained only about 12 lines; but the Minister asked that this motion of mine be delayed until his Bill was introduced. At the same time, however, the Minister did not say whether it would be introduced next week or next month.

Now we find that the Bill has 694 clauses. This afternoon the Minister gets up and reads from notes—and I do not blame him for doing so, because it would not be possible for him to absorb all that is contained in the Bill—and makes a second reading speech. This Bill is not the measure which was introduced in 1959. Its title is "Local Government Act, 1960." That is the title of the measure before us now; and, as I have said, it contains 694 clauses, and hundreds upon hundreds of pages in which there are very important provisions.

Apart from what I heard from the Minister when he read his typewritten second reading speech, I am not at all sure whether this Bill coincides with the measure which was introduced some time ago, or whether there have been a series of amendments embodied in it. All that the member for Eyre has asked for is the adjournment of the debate for two weeks. The only purpose in asking for this is to enable members—and not only members on this side of the House; for, as the member for Guildford-Midland said, there are members who are new to this Parliament—to have an opportunity to look through the measure and study it to the best of their ability in the time at their disposal, so that, if they desire, they can take part in the debate when the Bill is before the

House in a fortnight's time. Yet the Minister opposes the fortnight's adjournment for which we have asked. The Minister has nothing to gain by insisting that the debate be resumed in a week's time.

Our request is only fair and reasonable. I cannot understand the remark of the Minister that this Bill has to go before another place. In any case, if it is passed in this House, it will go to another place. This is only the second week of September, and there is plenty of time left in this session to consider the measure. I do not know whether the Minister has introduced the Bill in this manner with the connivance of the senior Ministers.

It is unfair and unreasonable to expect members on this side of the House to assimilate everything in the Bill in a week before continuing with the second reading debate. I suppose my appeal to the Minister will fall on deaf ears, but perhaps the Premier will have a word to say to the Minister for Transport and ask him to withdraw his amendment to the motion for the adjournment of the debate. Perhaps the Minister will exercise some commonsense.

MR. MAY (Collie—on amendment) [3.12]: I would be lacking in my duty to the road board in my electorate were I not to oppose the amendment. After all, the local government authorities are the main parties interested in the Bill. The debate should be adjourned for two weeks in order to give the road board in my area sufficient time to go through and examine the measure. The members of that road board will not meet again until the week after next, and the Minister would render a service to that board and to other local governing authorities if he were to agree to adjourn the debate for a fortnight.

No Government, irrespective of its political colour, should bludgeon through Parliament a measure as voluminous as this, especially after good reasons have been given by members as to why the second reading debate should be delayed for a fortnight. If the amendment is agreed to, no harm will be done to anyone. As was pointed out, there are some new members in this House, and the Bill is completely foreign to them. However, my main concern is the local authorities; we should consider them.

When this Bill was before the House on the last occasion one of the most urgent contenders for a fortnight's adjournment of the second reading debate was the Minister for Transport himself. If his argument held good then, how much better is the argument advanced by members on this side on this occasion! I do not know whether the Bill has been altered since it was last introduced. If it has, the local authorities are very much more entitled

to a sufficient period to examine it. It would be reasonable and just for the Government to take a true perspective of the arguments raised by members on this side of the House. I oppose the amendment.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle—on amendment) [3.14]: I also oppose the amendment for the reasons outlined by members on this side of the House—out of consideration for new members like myself. I regret that the member for Canning, who is also a new member, is leaving the Chamber at the moment. On a casual perusal of this involved Bill, it could be safely said that I feel I am attempting to read a foreign language.

Mr. Cornell: Would a fortnight help you?

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not know whether that interjection was meant to be a reflection on my intellect; I shall not consider it as such. I say quite frankly that new members on both sides of the House should have more than one week in which to consider this Bill and discuss it with their respective local authorities. On those grounds I hope the motion for the adjournment of the debate for two weeks will be agreed to.

Mr. Perkins: Make it Tuesday week, and I shall agree.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment) [3.15]: The Minister would be well advised to meet the request of the member for Eyre on this matter. He might find that by granting an adjournment for a fortnight the Bill would receive a more expeditious passage through the House than it would if only a week's adjournment was granted. It is a good rule of commonsense that the more that people who are to decide a measure know about it before they start discussing it, the more speedy will be the consideration of that measure.

If only a week's adjournment is to be granted, then obviously members will not be as well informed about the Bill as they will be in the event of a fortnight's adjournment being granted. Therefore, if the debate is to be resumed within a week, there will almost certainly be a great deal more discussion and questioning; and many more attempts will be made to amend the measure than will be the position if members are given a reasonable opportunity to inform themselves fully about the contents of the Bill.

Reference has been made to the position of local authorities. I suppose one answer to that could be that the associations which represent the local authorities have had a look at the Bill, or at least at its principles; and presumably to a very large extent, if not totally, have agreed to the principles. However, we could be unwise to allow the views of associations to become binding, as it were, completely on each individual local authority.

Western Australia is a very big State in area. Some of the local authorities are hundreds, and even thousands of miles away from Perth and from Parliament House. I doubt very much whether any of the members of those local authorities would know about all the principles in the Bill.

Mr. Perkins: Copies of the Bill are being sent out to all those local authorities forthwith.

Mr. HAWKE: That is another reason why the motion of the member for Eyre should be agreed to.

Mr. Perkins: If the motion were to adjourn the debate until Tuesday, the 20th September, I would agree. I am not prepared to go further.

Mr. HAWKE: I hope the Minister will not close his mind completely to what I am saying, just because he has made up his mind that, although he was wrong in seeking to give a week's adjournment, the best he is now prepared to offer—in order to try to remedy that wrong on his part—is some compromise between one week and a fortnight.

Mr. Perkins: That is another full week-end.

Mr. HAWKE: There are different kinds of full weekends.

Mr. May: That does not give my local authority any chance to consider the Bill.

Mr. HAWKE: If copies of this Bill were today, or very recently, mailed out to local authorities in Western Australia, that is the best argument I have heard during this debate as to why the resumption of the second reading should be adjourned for a fortnight. Who could expect local authorities in the more far-flung areas to receive this Bill—they have not got it yet—and give it the adequate consideration which its importance deserves, and then convey their views—if they have any to convey—to their individual members of this House?

Mr. J. Hegney: Some will need over a fortnight.

Mr. Lewis: If you granted us pairs, would you go out and discuss it with them?

Mr. HAWKE: If the honourable member was prepared to press that question, we would give him a pair for the next 18 months.

Mr. Perkins: Don't you want the Bill to pass this session?

Mr. HAWKE: I hope the Minister will try to be serious. He has already admitted he is on weak ground in regard to his move for a week's adjournment. Now, in an endeavour to sort of get out of the logic of what is being said in favour of a fortnight's adjournment, he is inclined to ask silly questions. I have not the time to answer

those sorts of questions today. If he wants to ask them, let him see me when the House is not sitting.

We have an obligation to members of local authorities, especially those in the more distant areas. Surely they are entitled to a reasonable opportunity to study this Bill, because it will give them a new charter and will contain some very important new principles under which they will operate. I would like to hear what the Minister would have to say if somebody proposed a new Constitution for Parliament which would, in some very important degrees, alter the main principles of our existing Constitution, and he was to take the adjournment; and the Government of the day—whatever Government it might be—wanted to force him to take that adjournment for only one week! The Minister would almost pull down the walls and the ceiling of this Chamber in his rage and opposition to such unjust and unfair treatment.

There are other people vitally concerned, in addition to the members of local authorities. I suppose we could easily think the most important people in local government are the members of local governments; but if we were a bit deeper in our thinking, we could easily come to the conclusion—and a right one—that the rate-payers are a bit important. What opportunity are they going to have to get to understand the vital alterations in principle which this Bill proposes to bring into operation? They are entitled to consideration. They could not possibly get any consideration at all if the adjournment of the debate were for only one week. It seems to me, therefore, that under all important headings, there is every justification to have this debate adjourned for two weeks. After all is said and done, it is not that long.

As I said at the commencement of my remarks, I think an adjournment for two weeks could easily save a week's discussion when the debate is resumed. So, taking the long-range view, an adjournment of the debate for a fortnight would probably not affect by more than one day the ultimate date on which we, as members of this House, would have completed our total consideration of the Bill in all its stages.

So I hope that the Minister, on reconsideration, will agree to the fortnight; and I certainly hope that the Premier and the Deputy Premier will agree to that course being followed. I think it has ever so much more merit than the move which the Minister himself has proposed.

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Attorney-General—on amendment) [3.24]: I had no intention of being drawn into this debate had it not been for the remarks of the member for Beeloo, because the honourable member was good enough to observe that I

moved for an adjournment for a fortnight when the Bill was introduced in 1956; and that I expressed myself very strongly when it was suggested the period should be a shorter one.

The latter is true, because the suggestion it should be a shorter period came from the member for Beeloo—not the Government of the day. This is what he said:—

I wish to protest strongly against delays of this nature. It would be quite reasonable if the Bill had not been before the House on previous occasions, but, in principle, this is the same Bill as we have been dealing with for several years.

Mr. Graham: Which this is not.

Mr. WATTS: Neither was the other one, because the principles had changed in the meantime.

Mr. Hawke: This one certainly is not.

Mr. WATTS: To continue—

In effect, according to the interjections coming from the member for Stirling, he knows as much, if not more, about the Bill than the Minister who is handling it in this House.

Mr. May: Are you going to read what you said?

Mr. WATTS: Yes. Continuing—

Therefore, I feel, as I did in the case of the previous Bill dealt with this afternoon, that I must object to the delay because it is quite unjustified. It is time we got on with the job we are paid to do and proceeded to formulate statutes of the State.

Mr. Jamieson: The Bill was the same as the 1954 one.

Mr. WATTS: The member for Beeloo then moved that all words after the word "adjourned" be deleted. He wanted to do so because—

Mr. May: Read your version.

Mr. WATTS: In a minute. He wanted to do so because fortunately it would be a Tuesday, because the day the matter was discussed was a Thursday. Curiously enough, it is Thursday today.

Mr. W. Hegney: All day!

Mr. WATTS: What was the decision of the House? To adjourn the debate to Tuesday week. That is just what the Premier has proposed to my honourable friend opposite. I think it is quite a reasonable proposition. This is what I had to say—

Mr. Brand: I said we would follow any good precedent.

Mr. WATTS: At that time, having said that I regretted the action of the member for Beeloo, I went on to say:—

I did not move the motion in the form that I did without having first consulted the Leader of the House.

At that time I had asked the then Leader of the House if he would agree to an adjournment of ten days. To continue—

It is all very well for the honourable member to say I know more about the Bill than the Minister who introduced it, as I doubt very much if that is so.

That is what I think about it still. Continuing—

The Bill comprises in the vicinity of 700 clauses. It has been in the hands of the Crown Law Department and the Government—and I am addressing my remarks mainly to the member for Beeloo—for a considerable time and there have been some alterations made to it. Therefore, I am entitled, as the Leader of the House readily acknowledged, to make such inquiry into the Bill as I see fit.

That was an adjournment from Thursday to the following Tuesday week.

Mr. May: The only difference is that we have changed places in the House.

Mr. WATTS: The principle is exactly the same. I am not asking for anything less than Tuesday week.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister moved something different.

Mr. WATTS: The Minister and the Premier both told the Leader of the Opposition that that is their intention. I rose to my feet to object strongly to the remarks of the member for Beeloo who now says that an adjournment for 14 days is barely long enough, while an adjournment of 10 days, four years ago, was a waste of time. He would have given us until the next day. Let us be reasonable and make the adjournment Tuesday week.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre—on amendment) [3.29]: In moving the adjournment of the debate I felt I was being considerate as far as the Minister was concerned. This is a big Bill; there is no question about that. It will take a lot of understanding. There are many members in this House who have had no contact whatsoever with the Local Government Act—they have not been associated with it—but now they have a responsibility to their electors and should know something of the Bill before the debate is resumed. So far as road boards are concerned, what chance have I to get this volume down to the three boards which I represent?

Mr. Watts: The same chance that we had—10 days.

Mr. NULSEN: I always like to keep my electors well informed—

Mr. Brand: So do I.

Mr. NULSEN: —as well as those with whom I work. I would say to the Premier that unless he reduces the work that he

has in his office, and so on, and applies himself only to this Bill, he will know very little about it when it comes up for further discussion.

Mr. Brand: That is very true; and I would not be the first to know very little about it.

Mr. NULSEN: That applies also to myself. There are some contentious matters in this Bill; and I agree with my leader very much that if we give an opportunity to all members to become well acquainted with the Bill's contents, the legislation will have a quicker passage. I am anxious to help the Government—

Mr. Graham: All of us are.

Mr. NULSEN: —to get this session over by the end of this month or next month. The sooner the better. I did give consideration to the adjournment of this debate; but if I had given it further consideration, I would have asked for an adjournment of one month so that we could all become well acquainted with the Bill.

Mr. Watts: We will follow the excellent precedent of 10 days.

Mr. NULSEN: However, for the reasons I have already mentioned, I hope still that the Minister will give consideration to my motion. There are certain contentious matters contained in the Bill; and the people we represent, as well as the local governing authorities, should have a fair chance of expressing their views in connection with them. Only in that way will we ensure that the Bill is passed in the best possible form. It is true that the darned thing should have been passed last time, but it was not the fault of the Opposition that it failed. I hope the Minister will give consideration to my motion and grant us an adjournment for at least—

Mr. Perkins: Tuesday week.

Mr. NULSEN: —two weeks.

Amendment (to strike out words) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell
Mr. Brand
Mr. Burt
Mr. Cornell
Mr. Court
Mr. Craig
Mr. Crommellin
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Guthrie
Dr. Henn
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Lewis
Mr. Mann

Mr. W. A. Manning
Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Nalder
Mr. Nimmo
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Owen
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Roberts
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. I. W. Manning
(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

(Teller.)

Majority for—2.

Amendment thus passed.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport) [3.33]: I move an amendment—

That the words "one week" be substituted for the words deleted.

There is a difficulty in connection with the wording of this motion because the word "for" still remains in it. However, I give an undertaking that the debate will not be continued until Tuesday week.

Mr. W. Hegney: What are you apologising for now?

Mr. PERKINS: I am moving to insert the words "one week."

Amendment put and passed.

Motion, as amended, put and passed.

Debate adjourned.

COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [3.37]: The Bill before the House, if passed, will be entitled the Country High School Hostels Authority Act, 1960. I have studied the Minister's speech which he delivered when outlining the provisions of this Bill; and, as far as I can see, such provisions cover the usual pattern of these measures. There are certain machinery clauses, and certain provisions for the appointment of the authority; certain powers to be vested in the authority; and provision for the appointment of members to the authority. Where certain circumstances arise, additional members may also be appointed.

I was not quite sure, when the Minister was speaking, in regard to the three extra members making the total number nine. I know that under the existing circumstances, two organisations qualify, these being the Church of England and the Country Women's Association. They are at present qualified for representation on the authority; and any other body or church organisation that may be approved

by the Minister to conduct or look after three hostels under the provisions of this Bill, will be entitled to representation.

I have nothing against the Bill, of course, but I studied the borrowing provisions together with the powers of the authority, and it seems to me that in the final analysis the Treasurer will be called upon to provide quite an amount of the finance required from time to time.

I would say that the organisations to which I have referred and others—like the Methodist Church in Albany, I think it is—have, for quite a time, performed an essential function in so far as they have provided accommodation for children who live in country areas some distance from the high school centres. Were it not for those organisations, a number of parents would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to ensure that their children received a secondary education.

An alternative would be for the Education Department itself to conduct the hostels; and the Minister, in the course of his remarks, said that nobody in this Chamber viewed with equanimity—I think that was the term he used—the Government entering into the business of operating boarding houses. I would like to tell the Minister—and I am open to correction—that this is already in operation under the provisions of the Education Act inasmuch as—and I will deal with the agricultural side first—the Muresk Agricultural College is under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department, which makes the appointments, selects the students, and conducts the institution. As far as I know, there is no outside organisation that looks after the children there. As far as I am aware they are Government employees—such as the cook, and so forth—who conduct that institution.

I will go further and say that in similar colleges at Denmark, at Harvey, and certainly at Narrogin, boys who are receiving a secondary education with an agricultural bias are accommodated in the colleges; and, as far as I know, there is no outside organisation looking after those students.

It may be said there is a difference between a high school such as Albany, or Northam, or Bunbury, with an Education Department hostel alongside it, compared with an agricultural college; but there is no essential difference.

Mr. Nalder: They live on the property.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Exactly. But in principle, although they may live on the property—and it is quite right that they would if they are to receive a secondary education with an emphasis on agricultural pursuits—there would be nothing to stop the Education Department, provided finance is available and if circumstances warrant it, setting up boarding institutions in places like Albany, Geraldton, Northam, and Bunbury.

However, the Minister envisages that this authority will be able to raise or acquire reasonable funds for the purpose of maintaining, repairing, extending, and building new premises in which the organisations mentioned in his speech—such as the Church of England and the C.W.A.—would take over the supervision, with more or less the direct co-operation and the indirect overriding power of this authority.

Personally, I cannot see that there will be any difference of opinion, or anything other than cordiality, between the organisations that are interested in the welfare of the children, and this authority. I know that at this stage the Minister should not be expected to indicate the whole of the personnel of the proposed authority, but I have no doubt there will be suitable persons appointed when it is set up.

The only other thing I would say in regard to this matter is that as time goes on it may be necessary for the department to establish further institutions; and if there are no organisations, apart from the Education Department, that are prepared to look after the children when they are obliged to board away from home, I have no doubt that very serious attention will have to be given by the Education Department to the question of providing necessary accommodation.

I will close now, to save resuming the debate after the afternoon tea suspension; but in Committee I would like to make one or two small suggestions to the Minister with regard to the wording of one clause.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

MR. HALL (Albany) [4.5]: This is a commendable measure and I hope it will be passed. There are several hostels in the Albany electorate and they have always been well conducted. I have nothing to complain about from that angle; but representations have been made in regard to this matter from time to time and, unfortunately, there is no authority to which one can appeal. From time to time the local C.W.A. has made representations for certain sporting facilities, or additions to the C.W.A. hostel which is known as The Rocks. Much repair work had to be done there; and, finally, after strong representations had been made, the Public Works Department did the job. But it gets back to what I have just said—there is no authority to which one can appeal.

The same thing happened with The Priory, which had to be remodelled. In that case the residence was taken over and re-established. The work done at Norman House is also to be admired. The main feature is that with these hostels, better living conditions can be provided for the boys and girls who will be catered for. With the growing population in the country districts it is obvious that the hostel

accommodation will have to be increased to cater particularly for those students who come in from the outlying districts.

There is one point about this measure which may have to be attended to later on—I refer to the fact that there is no mention of denominational schools in the Bill; it simply covers high schools. The denominational schools are catering for students of the same age and the same educational standard as those catered for by the high schools. I think it would be of advantage if the authority could have some control over hostels where accommodation was provided for students at denominational schools.

The hostels in the country areas definitely give the boys and girls a better outlook on life. They rub shoulders with one another and get that spirit of good fellowship which they carry with them into their future lives. That feature has been outstanding in students who have attended the Albany High School and have been accommodated in the hostels. They have made friendships which have helped them in their later years.

The idea of the authority is a good one, because in these hostels the children will be under some form of control. If the children are controlled there will be less likelihood of seeing articles such as we saw in the paper this morning concerning gangs of boys who were out knifing each other. When we read such articles it makes us realise that an authority with some form of control could be a means of preventing happenings like that in the future.

There is nothing more I wish to say except to commend the measure to the House and to hope that its implementation in the future will be assured.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [4.11]: Like previous speakers, I am of the opinion that the Bill will serve a good purpose. However, I am rather concerned as to who shall be eligible to stay at these hostels in the remote areas. It appears to me that such hostels will benefit only those children who are attending secondary schools. In the remote areas of the Gascoyne, and even of the Kimberleys, where there are numbers of children on the various stations, which are perhaps 200 and 250 miles distant from the nearest town, the W.A. Correspondence School serves the educational needs of those children up to the third or fourth grade. From then on the children are sent either to Perth or Geraldton for their schooling in the higher grades.

The point that concerns most parents of these children is that they have to send them away from home for long periods. However, if a hostel were established at Carnarvon to accommodate those children, it would be much more convenient for parents to visit them at the hostel or to take them home during their school holidays.

Whilst I was on a tour of the stations in my electorate recently, it was suggested to me that an excellent plan would be for the people at one station to convey the children from the hostel to the stations; and the people at another station could reciprocate by transporting them back to the hostel when they were due to resume their schooling. If such an arrangement were made between the parents at the various stations, it would save them a considerable amount of money and travelling.

I would like to see the Minister consider either moving an amendment to the Bill or giving an assurance that, in remote areas, the children who attend primary schools shall be eligible to be accommodated at the school hostel. The branches of the C.W.A. in the various districts will be very pleased when they hear about this Bill; but, on the other hand, they will be disappointed when they learn that younger children, or those who attend primary schools, will not have access to these hostels, because it is mainly the younger children the parents wish to keep in contact with for as long as possible.

When a child leaves his home in the country to attend a school in the city or some other large centre, it is generally the start of the family breaking up; but if it is possible for a child to attend a school within a reasonable distance of his home, the parents are able to see the child fairly frequently and the family is kept together for a period longer than if the child were sent away to a school more distant.

I therefore ask the Minister to give the House a definite assurance that, in remote areas, primary school children will be served by these hostels.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [4.13]: Like the speakers who have preceded me, I commend the Bill to the House and compliment the Minister who introduced it, because I am certain it is his own brain child. It fulfils a promise that he made to a deputation in Manjimup some months ago; namely, that he would do his utmost to bring such a Bill before the House to make it possible for school hostels to be erected in country districts. At the moment it is not possible to do this because of a lack of finance. I believe in giving praise when it is due. I do not pull my punches when I am of the opinion that censure is necessary; but I also believe in the cause of sweet reasonableness—which we often see neglected in this House—and that praise should be given when it is justified.

In particular I would like to impress upon the Minister that wherever it is possible to erect the hostel in the school-grounds, it should be done. We should aim at a completely integrated school, at which the scholars can attend not only for their education, but also to build up the

traditions that have been mentioned by a previous speaker and which count so much with boys and girls in later years. I know it is the wish of the people of Manjimup that, when the building of a hostel is mooted, if it is at all possible it shall be built within the schoolgrounds.

The Manjimup Parents & Citizens' Association is trying to beautify the school grounds as much as possible, and its members are of the opinion that better supervision of the children would be achieved and it would be of greater advantage to the pupils themselves if the hostel was erected in the schoolgrounds. I am pleased to learn that the erection of these hostels will have no effect on the finance available for the building of new schools and additions to existing ones. That will make it possible for the hostels to be erected in the near future.

Although I realise that these hostels will give a great deal of comfort to the parents of those children who are sent away from their homes to receive their education, every assistance should be given to parents who are willing to allow their children to live at the hostels. Personally, I have obtained great benefit from the C.W.A. hostel because both of my children lived at hostels, my daughter being accommodated at an Anglican Church hostel for girls, and my son at a C.W.A. hostel for boys.

As parents, both my wife and I were very pleased to know that not only were our children's studies being supervised, but also their lives away from school were being controlled by responsible persons. Therefore I look forward with great pleasure to the establishment of hostels not only for five-year high schools, but also for junior high schools, which are now widespread throughout the State, and which serve children who are brought to them in buses.

If that were done, it would enable the educational authorities to cut down considerably on transport costs. I can visualise that the pupils would thus be enabled to live adjacent to the junior high schools and so would not have to travel backwards and forwards to the schools in buses as they do now. It would also be of great benefit to the children themselves. I have nothing but praise for the Bill, and I commend it to the House.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [4.19]: I believe I should support the Bill because I am greatly concerned about something being done along the lines envisaged in it. In fact, I am particularly pleased to give my support because I will then be in line with my friends on the other side of the House who seem to consider that at last the Government has done something worth while.

There has been a problem for some time in catering for children who enter high schools and who are unable to find accommodation. Perhaps that is an indictment of the people in the homes in those towns where high schools are established, because they have not thrown their doors open to receive these young people. However, not everybody can, or desires to, accept the responsibility of having somebody else's children on their hands.

In other cases homes that have been tried have been found unsuitable, because of the lack of control which is necessary for young people of this age. In hostels, where there is suitable control; where there are regular hours for study; and where regulations are set down to enable students to study under normal conditions, the position has been found to be most helpful. The Minister has certainly done a good job in providing for this authority which can go ahead with the provision of hostels on the basis suggested.

The member for Gascoyne has mentioned that in his area, in particular, there is opportunity for younger boys and girls. I think this would also apply in other areas, though perhaps to a lesser degree. But for the time being the real responsibility is to those students who are pursuing a course of secondary education at higher levels. They must obviously come first because of the necessity for more intense study and the provision of bigger schools. No doubt the provision for younger boys and girls could follow at some later date.

There is no need for me to enlarge on this matter to any great extent; but I did wish to make a note of my endorsement of the plan, because I am particularly interested in the Narrogin Agricultural High School; although most of the students that would benefit are not those in the towns themselves, but those outside my electorate. I realise the provision is highly necessary and urgent, because otherwise there would be students of high school age who would be deprived of the education they deserve.

Mr. W. Hegney: Those boarding at Narrogin are controlled by the Government; those at the agricultural college.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: They are in a different category altogether. They are specially selected by the authorities to study agriculture.

Mr. W. Hegney: But the Government is accommodating them.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That represents a special wing which takes the place of the Narrogin School of Agriculture; it is now called the agricultural wing of the Narrogin Agricultural High School. It is for boys who are students of agriculture, whose studies are partly academic and partly practical. Those to whom I refer are normal high school students not necessarily interested in agriculture at all.

I have known many cases where people living in outlying areas have had to leave their properties for the sake of their children; or perhaps they have had to change their vocation simply because it has been necessary to cater for the educational needs of their children. This should not be so; and I feel that this Bill will go a long way towards improving the conditions of education and home life for those who are far distant from centres of population.

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Minister for Education—in reply) [4.24]: I thank members who have spoken for their comments on this Bill. In first dealing with the remarks made by the member for Gascoyne, I could at this stage give him no undertaking in regard to the primary children; because I agree with the member for Narrogin that the immediate problem is in connection with those places—certain places particularly—where high schools have been established, and where, in order to obtain that class of education at all, children have been obliged to travel a very considerable distance. At the same time I would not for one moment deny the possibility of consideration being given to the reception of primary school children in outlying places, such as Carnarvon.

I remember, as a matter of fact, in view of this difficulty that the member for Gascoyne mentioned, authorising some years ago the erection, at the Government's expense, of a building at Hall's Creek for a hostel, which was subsequently completed; and I understand it has given remarkably good service under the control of the Australian Inland Mission. So while I cannot give the honourable member an assurance of any early action along the lines he desires, I would say it is a matter that could be taken into consideration in certain circumstances in the future.

It was, as the member for Warren said, largely as a result of a deputation at Manjimup—and at or about the same time of another one elsewhere—that the suggestion for the presentation of a measure such as this came up. I hope the authority, when created, will be able to make a fairly substantial contribution to the solution of the difficulty.

I recognise very fully the great work that has been done by all those bodies which have taken upon themselves the duty to maintain, or supervise, or manage the hostels that exist at the present time; and particularly, of course, because of the considerable number, do we appreciate the work of the Country Women's Association, and of the several committees of that body that have been set up; and also of the church bodies which, to a greater or lesser extent have assisted in the work. There is no intention or desire, of course, to minimise their interest; but rather to increase it, and to make it practicable to

deal with some of the problems that are facing us with regard to accommodation where it must be provided.

It is true, as the member for Mt. Hawthorn said, that at the Narrogin Agricultural School there has been accommodation for boys for a long period. The same has been the case at Denmark. But, of course, as the member for Narrogin pointed out, there is a considerable difference between that type of place, and what is contemplated in this measure. There, the pursuit of agricultural knowledge necessitates a great deal of work being done in connection with animal husbandry and agriculture generally; and that renders it absolutely essential that, for much longer periods than the normal school hours, the boys must be upon the property; and, in consequence, there is little or no alternative but the provision of some type of boarding facility.

Those places are limited in number; whereas, on the other hand, the number of high schools in country districts is rapidly increasing. I repeat that I do not think any of us would look forward with equanimity to the establishment, by the Government, of boarding houses at all these places in increasing numbers. The system that has operated with the co-operation of those splendid people whom I have already mentioned—and so far as their organisations are concerned—is one that for the advantage of all of us should be extended; because I have no hesitation in saying that it is much easier for there to be a proper type of supervision and control so highly commended by the member for Albany, from bodies of that nature than to have those who are merely running a series of boarding houses without that personal and very great interest which is always found in committees from the C.W.A. and the other bodies to which I have referred. So I am very grateful to members for their reception of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister has discussed the definition of "high school" contained in this clause. In my view the definition should be as follows:—

A Government school established or maintained as a senior high school or high school under the Education Act, 1928, and situated in the country areas of the State.

The Minister has visualised that later on it may become necessary to establish accommodation facilities in centres where there are junior high schools. High schools are now classified as junior or senior high schools. The proposed authority would hardly establish accommodation in a district where there was a junior high school, except with the sanction of the Minister. Clause 8 states that in the exercise of its powers and functions, the authority shall have regard to any representations that may be made by the Minister to give effect to any decision of the Government in relation thereto, conveyed to the authority in writing by the Minister. By having a shorter definition, the same objective will be achieved.

Mr. WATTS: The draftsman was of the opinion that in view of the Education Department's regulations, the discretion should be provided as in clause 3 in regard to the two types of high schools. Originally it was contemplated that junior high schools should be left out. A senior high school is one which provides higher education up to the fifth year; whereas a junior high school provides higher education up to the third year. As it was apparent that junior high schools in places like Carnarvon might have to be attended to whilst remaining junior high schools, it was proposed that a discretion should be afforded to the Minister to include junior high schools.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 19 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL

Message: Appropriation

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

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [4.39]: I have looked through this Bill, which seeks to amend the Police Act, and I have read the speech of the Minister when he moved the second reading. He pointed out—in my opinion quite rightly—that the Bill was separated into three sections. The first section revises penalties. The second part seeks to amend sections 66 and 90A of the Act because of the highlighting of recent incidents—one in the North-West, and another in the metropolitan area where attempts

were made to blow up motor vehicles. Thirdly, the idea is to give the Commissioner of Police control over persons carrying placards in the metropolitan area and, for that matter, throughout the State.

There is some merit in certain of these proposed amendments; but when one has regard for the penalties proposed, one cannot help but feel this measure is vicious. I do not know whether the Minister gave consideration to the Bill before he introduced it into the House, because most of the penalties are increased by 400 per cent. In one case, the penalty is increased by 900 per cent.; and in another case, the increase is 1,900 per cent. I think I might be excused for saying it is vicious to introduce penalties of that description.

I regret that to some extent the Minister, in introducing the Bill, tried to pass the buck on to a previous Labor Government. He said that in 1957 the previous Government, in principle, had agreed to fines prior to 1949 being doubled. That might be true. However, I do not recall the particular incident; and I wish the Minister had quoted it. To use those words to bolster up his case for penalties being stepped up by 400 per cent., 900 per cent., and 1,900 per cent. is improper. I feel the Minister should have correctly stated the position to this House. This action in referring to a previous Government, when introducing a Bill to increase penalties by 1,900 per cent., is an all-time classic.

Members will no doubt be interested to know to which clause I am referring. Strangely enough, it is a very simple clause. I am referring to clause 35 which amends section 104 of the Act, under which a person at present may be fined £1 for bathing without a proper bathing costume; but under this amendment the penalty is to be £20.

Mr. Hawke: Back into the dark ages!

MR. BRADY: When introducing the Bill the Minister said that in view of the fact that other authorities may have some say in regard to penalties, they should be more or less uniform, despite the fact that he said it was not necessary that they be uniform. However, in one part of his speech the other evening he said it was desirable to make the penalties uniform. This is what he said—

I feel that to preserve uniformity, the maximum penalty in all these cases should be raised to £20. However, it has not been necessary to make such an increase in all cases.

I feel that the Minister has gone too far in this Bill. For the benefit of members I shall refer to a few of the clauses and the penalties for various offences. A policeman who leaves the Police Force and does not return the accoutrements of the force when he leaves is to be fined £5. The

punishment for attempting to bribe a policeman, or for a policeman assaulting one of his officers, is stepped up from £10 to £50. The penalty for a person impersonating a policeman has been stepped up from £10 to £50. For supplying a member of the Police Force with fermented liquor, or harbouring a member of the Police Force when he should be on duty, the fine is stepped up from £5 to £10.

On a conviction for interfering with the police, the fine is raised from £10 to £20. For people who refuse duty when they are foresworn as special constables—although they may not want to be sworn in the first instance—the fine is £20 instead of the present £5. A person who may be in a gaming house, or in a house where gambling is going on, or a person who is a prostitute or is otherwise of ill fame will be fined £20 on refusing to leave the premises when ordered by the police. The present fine is £2. That is, I think, an increase of about 1,000 per cent. That is the type of penalty which is included in this Bill.

There is a clause dealing with obscenity and other offences, including the wanton extinguishing of any light. The fines for these offences have been increased from £2 to £20. As the Minister stated the other night, there is a proposed new provision. On the one hand, it might appear that this clause has some merit; but, on the other hand, I am afraid it can be used in a manner which will cause some difficulty to innocent parties. It is proposed to add a new section to the Act to be section 59A, which reads as follows:—

Any person who in any street without the consent of the Commissioner of Police bears, carries or exhibits on or about his person any poster, placard or notice is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a penalty not exceeding £20.

As I said before, there are many people who, from time to time, could do any one of these things—bear, carry, or exhibit a poster. They might be quite innocent posters and be of very little concern to anybody. However, if those people do not get the consent of the Commissioner of Police, they could be fined £20. I think members have noticed in the Press, almost every week, that people meet ships at Fremantle and hold up posters of welcome or posters of farewell. We also read of students carrying posters in their processions. Various organisations, too, carry a poster, bear a poster, or exhibit a poster when they are trying to advertise something.

I wonder just how this amendment will affect commercial and industrial concerns in the city. The vehicles of these concerns bear posters. There is one particular firm—I will not name it because I might be accused of giving it a free advertisement—whose vehicles almost invariably carry

posters—no doubt, without the consent of the Commissioner of Police. I feel that the Minister or the commissioner may have some specific cases in mind, and it would have been desirable to have them mentioned in the Bill if the intention is that they in particular should not be permitted to carry such placards.

Another interesting provision is that which relates to any person who is or has been in or upon any premises or the curtilage, whether enclosed or fenced or not, of such premises without lawful excuse. The proof of lawful excuse shall be on such persons; and they shall be dealt with and shall be liable to a fine. Of course that particular provision is to suppress the activities of Peeping Toms, and no doubt many people will welcome it. However, by and large I feel that the good parts of the Bill are far outweighed by the bad parts, particularly this vicious increase in penalties.

There is one increase which is quite innocuous in relation to the amount of trouble which the offence would create. It relates to a person playing a musical instrument in the street. It is proposed to increase the penalty for this offence from £2 to £20—a 900 per cent. increase. This means that if some member of Parliament on Christmas Eve feels like playing a musical instrument in front of Parliament House, he will have to pay an increased fine of 900 per cent. I do not know whether it is expected that there will be a huge deficit in Consolidated Revenue next year, or whether, as the Police Force has just been granted an increase in wages, the idea is to collect some of it back from these penalties.

Mr. Brand: Your draft Bill has been used, that is all.

Mr. BRADY: My draft Bill might have been used; but none of these increased penalties were included in it. Apparently the draftsman has drawn on his own imagination, which has run riot. I cannot recommend the Bill to the House, and I do not think that any member who has a sense of proportion and responsibility will agree that the Minister should be permitted to introduce a Bill which caters for such a great step-up in penalties. My honest advice to the Minister is that, to save time, he should withdraw the Bill and study the penalty clauses again. Probably in half an hour he could reintroduce it, having reduced them by 75 per cent. That would, nevertheless, cater for an increase of 25 per cent. on the present figures; and that would no doubt be reasonable.

If the Minister is not prepared to do that, and insists that the House consider the Bill, clause by clause, about four or five hours will be spent just on divisions, which I think is unnecessary. I believe that the penalties in many cases could be increased; but I am not, as a member of the Opposition, going to agree to the

second reading of the Bill in which, as I have said, the majority of the penalties have been increased by 400 per cent.; one by 900 per cent.; and another by 1,900 per cent.

This last one is a most innocent one and deals with persons not wearing correct bathing costumes. I do not know how the nudist colonies are going to get on. They are going to be fined 1,900 per cent. more than they would have been before. Strangely enough, the places to which reference is made in the Bill, where the correct bathing uniform must be worn, are near jetties or near certain other places; but there is no reference to a person being near the water.

Mr. Brand: There are not many jetties away from the water.

Mr. BRADY: I believe that has been an oversight on someone's part, as water must be nearby if a person intends bathing. However, as I have said before, I cannot, while the Minister has provisions for the greatly increased penalties, in all honesty recommend this Bill to the House, and therefore I oppose the second reading.

Mr. Brand: I did not think you would come to that conclusion!

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [4.55]: I want to lodge objection to the Bill, but not in its entirety. My objection is to a very significant portion mentioned by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. I understand that at this stage we are not permitted to refer to particular pages or clauses in the Bill; but the clause to which I object strongly is the one relating to the people who, in any street without the consent of the Commissioner of Police, bear, exhibit, or carry on or about their persons any poster, placard, or notice. Those people are to be found guilty of an offence and will be liable on conviction to a penalty not exceeding £20.

I desire to submit for the benefit of members opposite that that penalty will be imposed upon trade unionists who carry placards without having first sought the requisite permission to do so, even though that omission could have been quite innocent. The Minister might say that is not the intention of the clause; but I can see significance in it, as would any other industrially minded person. I am not attempting to read anything into the clause. I do not have to, because I can see danger in it without doing so.

Mr. Brand: What do you mean by danger?

Mr. FLETCHER: I mean exactly what I have said. First of all, permission must be obtained from the Commissioner of Police before placards and so on can be carried.

Mr. Brand: That is right.

Mr. FLETCHER: Both the member for South Fremantle and myself know that frequently unions in our areas stage processions or some demonstration of an industrial nature—although not necessarily ones of hostility. During such procession or demonstration the members carry placards, and it is possible that some of them may not obtain the approval of the commissioner.

Mr. Brand: Why do you think the Commissioner of Police would refuse such permission to the unions to carry any banners?

Mr. FLETCHER: I can see it as a means of attempting to frustrate the trade unions; and, irrespective of interjections, I can only see it in that way. The inclusion of this clause seems strange to me, because it is out of tone with the rest of the Bill. It appears that the rest of the Bill is merely extraneous matter being used as a wrapping, as it were. That is how it seems to me; and because of that I voice my opposition to it, since I believe that such wrapping is intended to hide the very dangerous contents.

I am not interested, as are other members, in the interference with businesses, and so on. I have no doubt that they will be well looked after within the law. I say that the Bill is not aimed at a person who might desire to carry a business sandwich-board. He, no doubt, would have permission to do so.

The position is that our party has not the same access to the Press, radio, and television as have the parties which constitute the Government. Industrial and political issues do not receive impartial consideration. Therefore, our party is in the position where it has on occasions to resort to marches on such days as Labour Day, and May Day, the latter particularly applying in Fremantle. If further impositions are to be placed upon the members of trade unions, then I will take exception to them, whether it be on this occasion or any future occasion. It is for that reason that I am voicing my opposition to this clause.

I suspect and suggest that it is not as innocent as it appears; and, further, that it is another imposition, and an attempt to frustrate the trade union movement and the industrial wing of the Labor Party, as both groups may desire to use this medium as a means of voicing their opposition on any industrial or political issue. I therefore oppose the second reading of this Bill.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [5.0]: This Bill, in its present form, would appear to be a move on the part of the Government to cause a tax, rather than

a penalty, to be placed on wrongdoers. In view of the steep increases in the amount of fines listed under this measure, one would be perfectly justified in coming to that conclusion. After all, I feel that the penalty against wrongdoers is imposed, in the main, to prevent them from doing a similar wrong again, and not particularly to force them into financial straits which they are unable to get out of for some considerable time; and many of these fines do just that. That, to my way of thinking, would condemn this move on the part of the Government.

However, I feel that the main objection to the various sections of the Bill concerns the section to which the member for Fremantle has just referred. The carrying of a placard on or about one's person is rather a wide interpretation. No doubt all members of this Chamber have seen, in recent times, various fabrics—particularly for women's clothing—having scenes, and sayings, and all sorts of odd prints on them.

A member: Slogans.

Mr. JAMIESON: And slogans on the attire of young people. Am I to understand that the Commissioner of Police is to be given the power to take before the court people who wear such clothing, and have them fined up to £20? The provisions of this Bill make it so, and I feel it is undesirable in a community such as this to limit the activities of the public. Surely we already have enough controls and regulations in our everyday life, without being further controlled and placed under police authority such as this.

It would appear to me that this amendment has arisen out of the difference of opinion that the then Commissioner of Police had with the Australian Union of Women some few years ago when they paraded over Barrack Street bridge wearing aprons printed with various slogans. Whether they did very much damage or not, I do not know. I think most people would say, "Well, there is nothing in what they are up to." I do not think they particularly libelled or worried anybody; but evidently they worried some people in the Police Department to the extent that the department prevailed upon the Minister to introduce a Bill with this particular provision in it.

Surely we are not going to be so petty as to impose a condition such as this. The Premier, by interjection, said something along these lines: Why would unionists be refused permission to carry slogan placards? That, of course, is a very good question. But one cannot get the Police Commissioner's permission on the spur of the moment; it would be a matter of having to approach him in writing and of his giving permission in writing; and that would take some considerable time.

Industrial disputes at times have the habit of flaring up quite quickly, and being over just as quickly; and I see no reason why these people, if they are so interested in carrying a banner advising the general public of their objections, should not be allowed to do so, provided they are not doing harm to any other citizen in the community.

Therein lies the chief objection to this particular clause. I feel it is carrying police control in the community to a further extent than it is expected to be carried in a civilised community. There is no reason for it. There have been no riots caused because people have been carrying placards; and if people vent their feelings in this way, surely it is a sort of safety valve and they do not take other action. I feel that if the Government is going to suppress this sort of activity, these people are going to find other ways of venting their feelings within the community, and those other ways may be more dangerous to the public at large than the methods which have been used up to the present time.

I therefore suggest to the Government that it is a very unwise step to adopt—to bring in an amendment to the Police Act providing such high penalties and some additional obnoxious clauses that I have mentioned. I reiterate that I consider it unwise that taxing measures should be imposed upon wrongdoers to the extent that the Government is imposing them. The fines should be appropriate to the offence committed. I agree with that, and the need for some adjustments under certain circumstances is most apparent. In view of the change in the value of our money these days, constant adjustments at a certain level should be made. However, some of the adjustments proposed in the Bill can be described as nothing less than vicious and a determination to obtain from wrongdoers increased revenue for the Government rather than to punish them as wrongdoers.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Police—in reply) [5.9]: Members on the other side of the House have criticised almost every part of the Bill which I introduced. I had hoped that some portions could have been accepted without very much difference of opinion, although I realised that there might be some diffidence about members accepting some of the other proposals.

What I find somewhat incredible is the shortness of memory of the member for Guildford-Midland. Surely he remembers that he was Minister for Police, and surely he recalls what he wrote on various files. I looked through the files—I did not produce this Bill to the House out of thin air—and I am going to quote a Cabinet minute, which I found on the

file, signed by the present member for Guildford-Midland. Perhaps I should first of all read the minute from the Commissioner of Police to the Minister for Police at that time. It is dated the 4th August, 1958, and reads as follows:—

In accordance with your minute of February last on attached papers, a suitable amendment has been drafted to deal with this question of exhibiting placards on roads without obtaining the consent of the Commissioner of Police.

Item 20 at page 6 of the proposed draft Bill at which an amendment by Section 96 of the principal Act is outlined, deals with this matter.

As previously mentioned, the principal need for this amendment arises through the necessity to control persons carrying advertising matter around the streets, and is particularly necessary in a city such as ours where the streets and footpaths are so narrow.

The other amendments deal with the increase of fines which were fixed in 1892 when the Act was first passed, and are now quite unrealistic through the change in money values.

That is signed by the Commissioner of Police. Then I find this Cabinet minute dated the 7th August, 1958, and addressed to the Premier in Cabinet—

Last year the Full Court allowed an appeal and quashed a conviction under a regulation of the Traffic Act which related to the carrying of placards or notices. The Senior Puisne Judge held that such regulation was *ultra vires* and therefore invalid. It is, of course, necessary for the Commissioner of Police to have control over such matters and after consultation with Crown Law Officers an amendment to Section 96 of the Police Act has been drafted which prohibits the carriage of placards on roads without the permission of the Commissioner of Police.

I am informed that in 1957 Cabinet approved of the doubling of penalties which had not been altered since 1947. In the case of the Police Act many of the penalties have remained unchanged since they were imposed by the Police Acts of 1893 and 1894. It is therefore proposed to bring the penalties up to date and to aim for uniformity where similar offences are provided for in other Acts, such as the Health Act, Road Districts Act and Municipal Corporations Act.

In conformity with previous advice from the Crown Law Department, it is proposed to delete the provisions for minimum penalties.

A draft amendment Bill is submitted for Cabinet consideration, please.

That is signed "J. Brady, Minister for Police." Underneath that there is a note on the file which reads—

Cabinet decides no action this year.

That is signed "A.H., Premier," and is dated the 11th August, 1958. There was no sign of any righteous indignation on the part of members of Cabinet against the kind of proposals put up on that occasion. Instead of that I find a draft Bill almost identical, so far as the penalties are concerned, with the Bill I have introduced to this House. It was supported by the previous Minister for Police, the present member for Guildford-Midland. I also find that in 1957, during the time of the previous Government, this apparently had been approved in principle, and the member for Guildford-Midland supported the decision of the Government.

Mr. Brady: But Cabinet turned the recommendation down.

Mr. PERKINS: There is no sign of Cabinet's rejecting it; all the minute stated was that Cabinet would not go on with it that year.

Mr. Brady: That's right.

Mr. PERKINS: I suggest that the member for Guildford-Midland be his age. Would he bring minutes to Cabinet if he did not intend to support them? What sort of a Government was it if the Minister brought minutes to Cabinet with no intention of supporting them? Here we have the ex-Minister in the House denying a recommendation which he made to the previous Cabinet!

Mr. Brady: I did not deny it. You said the Government introduced the Bill, and I said it did not introduce the Bill.

Mr. PERKINS: The honourable member has attempted to deny it.

Mr. Brady: I want you to tell the truth. You are telling lies in the House.

Mr. Fletcher: Was the legislation introduced?

Mr. Brady: No.

Mr. PERKINS: On the 23rd June, 1959, after I became Minister for Police, I received this minute from the Commissioner of Police—

I am re-submitting this file concerning certain amendments to the Police Act which were proposed during the term of the previous Government.

You will note thereon that the then Cabinet decided on no further action last year, and I am accordingly re-submitting the papers.

If, however, you consider that the forthcoming legislative programme is already well filled, there is really no urgency about these proposed amendments, and if you so desire I will bring the file up again for a later session.

That is signed by the Commissioner of Police; and underneath it, on the 24th June 1959, in my handwriting, the following appears:—

Please defer this till a later session. It is signed by me; and, of course, I am doing what I think a responsible Minister for Police should do in submitting the recommendations from a most responsible officer in this community; namely, the Commissioner of Police. I took the proposals to Cabinet; they were almost identical proposals to those which the previous Minister submitted to his Cabinet. We have endorsed them and have brought them here for the consideration of the House.

I realise that some of these points may be controversial, and there may be differences of opinion in regard to them. However, I hope the Bill will be taken to the Committee stage; and, when we go into Committee, I will deal with the various points as they are raised and will produce the comments of the police officers and the officers of the Crown Law Department regarding the various penalties and the reasons why we ask that they be altered.

I have not conjured up any of these proposals out of the air; they are all firm recommendations from the Police Department and the Crown Law Department; and, as a Parliament, surely we have some responsibility to see that officers whom we charge with maintaining law and order in this community have the necessary tools with which to work!

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you apply the same reasoning to the Electoral Districts Act?

Mr. PERKINS: The member for Melville is getting off on to another question.

Mr. Tonkin: Yes, of course.

Mr. Brady: Many of the happenings to which the Minister has referred occurred after we went out of office.

Mr. PERKINS: The only real new proposal in this legislation, as compared with the legislation put up by the previous Minister for Police, and with which he should be conversant, is that in regard to Peeping Toms.

Mr. Brady: What about explosives?

Mr. PERKINS: And explosives.

Mr. Brady: Tell the truth. You are telling only half the truth.

Mr. PERKINS: If I made a mistake, I correct it.

Mr. Brady: You make a lot of mistakes.

Mr. PERKINS: They are the only new proposals; but I mentioned them to the House in my second reading speech. I am not trying to hide anything. The other proposal regarding placards, to which most exception has been taken in this Chamber, is in almost exactly the same form as the proposal produced by the previous Minister to his Cabinet.

Mr. Brady: I am not denying that I put it up to Cabinet.

Mr. Jamieson: He wouldn't have got far with that.

Mr. PERKINS: The member for Fremantle took exception to it, but I have tried to put some safeguards into the legislation to ensure that the placards will have to be carried on the person rather than be just some trade display or something which might be carried on a vehicle or something of that nature. I have no wish to interfere in that way, but one can imagine how something like this could get out of hand. In the case of political demonstrations, perhaps, this sort of thing could become a nuisance. However, the files indicate that the police were more concerned about the question of carrying advertising matter around the streets. I have no doubt that some members on the other side of the House might be offended if they saw someone walking down the street with a placard on his back, advertising: "Johnson's Sausages Produced in the Factory in the Garden."

Mr. Heal: He would get stopped for sure.

Mr. PERKINS: From all my experience of dealing with the Commissioner of Police and his officers I would say they are most responsible people. No matter what section of the community may be involved, I think everyone will agree that the police carry out their duties without fear or favour. All I am attempting to do is to give those police officers the necessary legislation to enable them effectively to curb some of the abuses which have been mentioned.

I hope the Bill will at least reach the Committee stage when some of the matters which have been referred to can be discussed in more detail, if members so desire. However, I give the House an assurance that there is a detailed explanation available in regard to each of the clauses in this Bill.

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

Ayes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nuisen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

(Teller.)

Majority for—4.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Section 12 amended:

Mr. BRADY: In order that the Committee may appreciate what this clause means, I intend to read section 12 of the Act to point out how unfair this clause would be to members of the Police Force who might seek some protection under this provision. Section 12 reads as follows:—

No non-commissioned officer or constable shall be at liberty to resign his office, or to withdraw himself from the duties thereof, notwithstanding the period of his engagement shall have expired, unless expressly authorised in writing to do so by the Commissioner of Police, or unless he shall have given to such Commissioner three calendar months' notice of his intention so to resign or withdraw, if stationed beyond two hundred miles from Perth, or one calendar month's notice if stationed within that distance, and every member who shall so resign or withdraw himself without such leave or notice shall, upon conviction thereof by any two or more Justices, be liable to forfeit all arrears of pay then due to him, and to a penalty of not more than five pounds, or may be committed to prison for a period not exceeding fourteen days.

In his Bill, the Minister proposes to increase the penalty from £5 to £10. In these enlightened days, when most people can retire from their jobs at a week's notice, it seems to be an unfair imposition on the members of the Police Force to be treated in such an indifferent manner. I consider that a member of the Police Force should be treated in the same way as any other employee. A police officer does not get many concessions, and he should be able to get a week's notice. To impose a £5 penalty, as is at present provided in the Act, is sufficient. I do not think a man should have to risk forfeiture of a fortnight's pay and, in addition, be subjected to a penalty of £10 instead of £5. I oppose the clause.

Mr. PERKINS: The honourable member who has just sat down recommended, when he was Minister for Police, this same clause for adoption in an amending Bill. Surely it is reaching the height of absurdity to say that a position in the Police Force is no different from any other position in the community! This clause was inserted in the Bill to ensure that law and order is maintained, and that before a policeman deserts his post he should give the commissioner some opportunity to replace him.

The Police Force can be compared to an army; and where would an army be if its members decided to "down tools" at a week's notice? The member for Guildford-Midland is out of touch with reality. The penalty in the Act was fixed in an earlier period, and the amendment has been given careful consideration by the commissioner and his senior officers; and their advice to me is that the penalty should be increased as the clause provides.

Mr. BRADY: The Minister has said that I recommended this to Cabinet when I was Minister for Police. Would he be good enough to quote my recommendation to Cabinet?

Mr. PERKINS: Yes. The Cabinet minute which I read during my second reading speech is that "a draft amendment Bill is submitted for Cabinet consideration." I have the draft here. I am afraid I cannot lay my finger on the relevant section at the moment. Irrespective of that, however, it is still in line with the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. BRADY: I must have it placed on record that I consider it most improper for the Minister to quote things in this Chamber for which he says I have been responsible, and for him not to be able to substantiate them. It could well be that I made such a recommendation in my capacity as Minister, because it is impossible for me to recollect all I did. But, as Minister, I tried to have regard for the effect that these things would have. I did not blindly accept the recommendations made to me by the departmental officers; I weighed their import and what effect they would have on the people. When the Minister makes a statement that I have been responsible for a particular recommendation he should be prepared to quote that recommendation, and not ask the Committee to accept something he cannot substantiate.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I would first like to support the member for Guildford-Midland. The Minister read out a minute to the effect that the then Minister for Police submitted to Cabinet a series of proposals made to him by the Commissioner of Police. As the Minister for Transport well knows, Cabinet is an indissoluble body, and any decision that is

reached by Cabinet on departmental recommendations is the responsibility of Cabinet as a whole. It is a joint decision. It does not do the Minister for Transport any credit to say that the previous Minister for Police recommended one thing while in that capacity, and then later somersaulted. It is unfair, to say the least of it.

The Minister says that the Police Force is in line with the Army. That is not correct; because in dealing with penalties, if a member of the Police Force left without reference to the commissioner, both the employer and the employee would have access to the Industrial Arbitration Act; and the police union would be entitled to approach the State Industrial Arbitration Court because the police officers are workers and not soldiers within the meaning of the Act.

In looking through these items it would seem there has been a comprehensive alteration to the existing penalties. Clause 3 seeks to double the penalty for policemen who resign within a certain period without the consent of the Commissioner of Police. How many such cases can the Minister quote? We are entitled to know that. It is similar to another clause referred to later. There is a tendency to say, "Increase this," or "Increase that"; but what is the justification? If the Minister could say, "Since we took office there have been a dozen cases where members of the Police Force have resigned and left the Commissioner of Police in a spot," it would be different; there would be some justification for the provision. But why double the penalty if there is only the odd case? It is carrying legislation too far. I would like the Minister to quote a specific instance where this provision has been breached.

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

Ayes—24.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes—20.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Molr
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Evans	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sowell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Majority for—4.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 4—Section 13 amended:

Mr. BRADY: Members should know the import of this clause, which seeks to increase the penalty from £5 to £10 in respect of default in the return of clothing and accoutrements issued to members of the Police Force when they are dismissed or cease to hold office. I draw attention to the wording of section 13. Having regard to my remarks on the previous clauses in the Bill, I must oppose the one before us. As was pointed out by the member for Mt. Hawthorn, police officers are regarded as employees of the Crown and should be treated as such. They are subject to the provisions of the Arbitration Act, and these penalties should not be inflicted upon them.

Not only are police officers to be subjected to this increased penalty of £10, but they also have to bear the indignity of having their homes searched for missing clothing, accoutrements, etc., which have been issued to them. It is as simple for an officer of the Police Force to lose items of clothing and accoutrement as it is for a soldier in the Army or an employee in the Water Supply Department. Whereas the employee in the Water Supply Department cannot be fined for losing an item, members of the Police Force can be fined up to £10. In view of the other penalties which now apply to police officers, that contained in this clause should not be increased.

Mr. PERKINS: Section 13 is a very old section. I do not want to argue about the merits of it. The penalty would not have been included in the Act had it not been necessary. It was included in the Act and was accepted in principle by the previous Government in 1957. We are now merely trying to bring the penalty into line with present-day value. If £5 was a satisfactory deterrent in years gone by, it should be increased to £10 today.

Mr. W. Hegney: How many cases have occurred in regard to this section of the Act?

Mr. PERKINS: The honourable member is on unsound ground. The fact that few cases where this penalty has been inflicted have occurred is a sign that it has been a deterrent. If it has been a satisfactory deterrent, the fine should be brought up to the present value of money. I suggest no injustice is being done by increasing the penalty.

Progress reported, and leave granted to sit again.

House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.