members were to receive. Over the years, it was found that there was no uniformity within the boards that operated, and consequently a committee was formed—in fact, the Premier set up the committee—and this committee determined a schedule which could be followed in broad principle. This schedule is not available; it was just a—

Mr. May: Hedgehog.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —particular schedule that might be followed at the time.

Mr. Bovell: It was not a hedgehog; it was intended to bring uniformity.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This was done; and since, whenever the board has agreed, the Acts have been amended to enable the Governor-in-Council to determine the fees, or the remuneration, as the case may be. In this particular case, the matter will be referred to the Public Service Commissioner, who will determine what the fees will be. At the present time, I just cannot tell the honourable member what they are.

Mr. DAVIES: I am pleased to get that information because it is a matter that has puzzled me greatly, not only in regard to this Act but in regard to other Acts as well. I am sure it will be a matter which will receive further investigation as time goes on. I imagine that the remuneration will be adjusted in accordance with the number of meetings and the amount of time put in.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is right.

Mr. DAVIES: Therefore, over a number of boards and over a number of services, this would balance out fairly well.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And the type of board has to be considered.

Mr. DAVIES: I did not know of this schedule but I am pleased to learn that it does exist and that some standard has been set.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 14th September, 1966

CONTENTS

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (8): ON NOTICE

PASTORAL LEASES

Pastoral Appraisement Board Meetings, and Inspections of Stations

1. The Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Minister for Mines:

   (1) How many times has the Pastoral Appraisement Board met since the 1st July, 1964?

   (2) Has there been a full attendance of members at meetings?

   (3) How many inspectors are employed and now working under the authority of the board?

   (4) How many stations have been inspected?

Compliance with Lease Conditions

   (5) How many station owners or managers have submitted the re-

ports and information required by the new lease agreement?

(6) How many owners or managers of stations have not complied with the requirements?

(7) Have any of the station owners or managers of the more seriously affected stations, including the Vesteys interests, received notice to carry out—

(a) any specified pasture development programme;

(b) any fencing programme;

(c) any water supply development programme?

(8) If the answer to (7) is "Yes", what are the stations involved?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Ten.

(2) Full meetings, except on two occasions when an apology was received from one member.

(3) Five pastoral inspectors are employed by the Lands Department.

(4) 152 since the 10th January, 1964, the date on which the amending Act came into operation.

(5) Fourteen.

(6) Thirteen lessees have not supplied the information within the required period of 12 months after commencement of the lease.

(7) No. Inspections of many leases, particularly in the Kimberleys, now in progress are to be used as a basis for a decision concerning the matters referred to.

(8) Answered by (7).

BEER

Alcoholic Content: Comparison with Other States

2. The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Will the Minister advise the House of the alcoholic content of Western Australian beer?

(2) What is the content in other States in comparison with Western Australia?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

This question was incorrectly directed to the Minister for Mines; the matter is administered under the Health Act. The replies to the queries are as follows:—

(1) Varies from 4.36 per cent. to 4.94 per cent.

(2) The only current figures available are—

Tasmania, 4.74-5.61 per cent.
Victoria, 5.23-5.26 per cent.

HOUSING AT EAST MANNING

Development of Project

3. The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Mines:

Further to my question on Thursday, the 1st September, 1966—

(1) Will he indicate definitely that State housing residential development will be undertaken at East Manning?

(2) Has the Housing Commission revised its original estimation that approximately 500 homes would be erected in this area?

(3) If so, what is the revised estimate?

(4) (a) Has the date of the next meeting between the Housing Commission and the South Perth City Council been fixed?

(b) If so, when will this meeting take place?

(5) Is it anticipated that at this meeting finality regarding the utilisation of commission land at East Manning will be reached?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) to (3) As previously advised on the 1st September, 1966, the commission is conferring with the South Perth City Council to ascertain its views as to the effects of various ideas which could be utilised for the future development of both commission and Crown lands at East Manning.

(4) (a) and (b) No.

(5) No. There could be need for further discussions in view of the extensive engineering and subdivisional problems to be resolved.

GOLDMINING

Research into Non-explosive Means of Ore Recovery

4. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is it a fact that research is being carried out in South Africa by the Chamber of Mines that promises to alter the economics of ore breaking?

(2) Does this research involve a non-explosive means of recovering ore, thought to be ultra-sonic waves, and other methods?

(3) Will the Minister endeavour to obtain particulars and tell the House if it would be of possible assistance to the goldmining industry of Western Australia in future?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) to (3) I have no knowledge of the matter, but will seek information and inform the honourable member, if and when it is obtained.

SEWERAGE

Extension to Carlisle and Lathlain

5. The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Local Government:

(1) With reference to my question on the 17th November, 1965, relating to the construction of deep sewerage in the Carlisle-Lathlain districts, and in view of the notice of intention by the M.W.S.S. & D. Board to undertake sewer construction in part of the area, as described on page 2429 of the *Government Gazette*, No. 83 of 1966, will the Minister advise why part of the area has again been omitted from the works proposed?

(2) When can it be expected that the residents of the remaining area will be provided with this essential service?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) Part of the area is not being provided with deep sewerage owing to shortage of loan funds, and the balance of the area because the Rivervale main sewer is not available.

(2) The part not now being sewered because of shortage of loan funds is expected to be included in next year's programme subject to availability of loan funds; but no firm date can be given for the provision of sewerage in the area which is awaiting the availability of the main sewer.

6. and 7. *These questions were postponed.*

LAND RESUMPTION

Property of Mr. Markavich at Kewdale

8. The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) Did the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority purchase the property from Mr. Markavich at Cohn Street, Kewdale?

(2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", would the Minister advise—

(a) How much land was involved in the purchase?

(b) To what use was the land being put prior to the purchase?

(c) What, if any, improvements were on the land?

(d) Why was it necessary for the authority to purchase the property?

(e) Was any compensation for injurious affection, or any other reason, paid?

(f) What was the total sum paid to Mr. Markavich, and on what bases was the amount assessed?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) Two acres.

(b) Residential and unauthorised warehousing, etc.

(c) Substantial residence, several outbuildings, tennis court, reticulation, and gardens.

(d) The land was reserved for public open space and approval for further development had been refused.

(e) *No.*

(f) $35,700—value of land and improvements including nonmovable fixtures and fittings.

BILLS (3): THIRD READING

1. State Housing Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

2. Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment Bill.

3. Country High School Hostels Authority Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and passed.

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [4.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments contained in this measure concern, in the main, the operations of fruit-fly foliage baiting schemes. This form of community fruit-fly control, introduced in 1948 in the south suburban area, has led to greatly increased activity in dealing with the fruit-fly menace.

There have been in all 32 baiting schemes established and operating in country districts, and these are in addition to the one in the metropolitan area. Four more schemes are in prospect, one of which should be in operation in the Shire of Belmont during the coming fruit season. Numbers of other areas are showing interest in this type of scheme.

I might mention that the administration of these baiting schemes has, as its basis, the appointment of independent committees nominated by the local authorities or the fruit growers in a particular district where it is desired the scheme be instituted. The necessary provisions to enable this to be done are contained in the Plant Diseases Act. With the general popularity of these schemes, and the consequent increase in the number of committees, certain procedural difficulties have cropped up.

There are numerous details of procedure involved in the appointment and qualification of members and it may be expected that, from time to time, errors and omissions occur. In order that subsequent proceedings of a particular committee be not invalidated because of a technical omission, it is considered necessary to provide in the Act for all acts and proceedings of a committee to be validated, even though some defect in the appointment or qualification of a committee member may be discovered at a later date.

The usual method of fruit-fly control is by the baiting of fruit trees, and sometimes it has become advisable to spray as well as bait the trees. This gives an added protection, particularly in places like the metropolitan area where the limits of the baiting scheme area abut on an infested district where no scheme operates. Spraying thus provides a more immediate effect on fruit fly on the fringes of a baiting scheme's district. With a view to allowing baiting committees using the method of fruit-fly control most suitable for a particular area, the Bill provides for the addition of the words "or spray" to the various references to baiting fruit trees.

The Bill also includes a provision relating to fruit-fly foliage baiting schemes being introduced or operating within districts adjacent to one another in the same municipality. Under the provisions of this amendment, the Minister may, if in the circumstances he considers it expedient to do so, direct that a particular scheme be extended to an adjacent district and be amalgamated with a scheme already operating there, or later to be introduced. By these means, the administration of baiting schemes will be improved and the duplication of committees and activities, within a municipality where separate areas desire a scheme, will be eliminated.

I should mention in passing that the introduction of these fruit-fly foliage baiting schemes has provided a very successful method of cambating the fruit-fly menace. The success of the initial schemes has, doubtless, increased their popularity with the consequent increase in the establishment of independent baiting committees.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main reason for introducing a Bill to amend the State Electricity Commission Act is to modify the formalities presently required in the administration of the contributory extension scheme, and to provide the means for enabling the modified financial arrangements to be effected.

I shall now deal with the clauses in the Bill as they occur. Passing over the short title and citation, we have in clause 2 the insertion of the amount of 63c in lieu of 6s. 3d. as representing a weekly supplementary allowance payable where a wages employee of the commission was, on the eighth day of March, 1955, or, after that day, had become entitled to receive a superannuation allowance payable out of the superannuation scheme constituted under the Act.

The amendment in clause 3 has indirect reference also to the superannuation scheme moneys, and the significance of the alteration of the name of the fund from the Electricity Commission General Fund Account at the Treasury to the State Electiricity Commission Account referred to in Section 44 of this Act will be better appreciated by members when I have occasion later to explain in more detail the proposed new method of State Electricity Commission banking.

In clause 4, we have presented very clearly the details of the modified arrangements constituting the contributory extension scheme. This scheme, as members will know, has been in operation for some time and was drawn up with a view to enabling suitable financial arrangements to be made between the State Electricity Commission and prospective consumers for the extension of power to supply electricity to certain places from a point beyond which the commission would not ordinarily be enabled to supply under economic conditions.

It has been a general practice under this scheme to permit repayment to the commission for the additional cost of this service over a period of 30 years. In 1959, the use of *caveats* was introduced with a view to providing a guarantee repayment to protect the commission's interests. Such *caveats* have been lodged over the registered titles of the land on which the electricity supply was installed.

The operation of the guarantee system under the contributory extension scheme has proved to have worked so satisfactorily it is now considered unnecessary to continue with this method in order to protect the State Electricity Commission's interests. The involvement of *caveats* add to the administrative work, entails registration fees payable by the consumers, many of whom do not like a *caveat* being recorded on their titles for it delays the completion of the agreement with the commission and, in the event of further transactions taking place on the title, the withdrawal and relodgement of the *caveat* is necessary.

Therefore, in view of the satisfactory experience of the commission with this type of business, the commission is pre-

pared to take a reasonable business risk in supplying farmers and others under the scheme and feels it does not now require the added protection of a *caveat*.

If members will peruse section 32A of the Act, which it is now proposed to repeal and re-enact, it will be quickly appreciated that much of the existing procedure introduced by Act No. 68 of 1959 is being retained, but in a somewhat modified form.

Under paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of the existing section 32A, the consumer is at present required to pay the amount of the minimum annual revenue required by the commission. In the re-enacted paragraph (a) the consumer will be required to pay to the commission the appropriate standard tariff for electricity supplied.

The period of 30 years remains unchanged. This is at present contained in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) and is now to be found in paragraph (c) of that subsection.

The requirement under paragraph (c), under which the consumer pays a capital contribution assessed by the commission, is retained in paragraph (b) of the re-enacted section. Under existing arrangements, the consumer is required to undertake, in a form acceptable to the commission, to pay to the commission on demand made after the expiration of each year, the amount, if any, by which the total revenue received by the commission in that year for electricity supplied over the distribution works to the consumer, is less than the amount of minimum annual revenue demanded.

In view of this requirement, it was necessary to provide in 1959 that the commission would review the supply of electricity at least annually to determine at what point it would be reasonable to withdraw the *caveat* lodged under the section.

The new provisions will enable this review to be carried out normally every three years or, in any case, when the commission thinks fit, with a view to enabling the commission firstly to refund the whole or part of the amount of the capital contribution or, secondly, to reduce the amount of the quarterly instalments necessary to meet outstandings.

Irrespective of the foregoing, the commission, at the expiration of the 30-year period, will be obliged to refund any amount held by the commission as representing a capital contribution by the consumer.

Turning now to paragraph (c) of the re-enacted subsection (2), it will be apparent that the quarterly instalments payable may require to be guaranteed by the applicant or some other person either jointly or severally, having regard to the circumstances of the particular case as may require.

Under subsection (5), the commission may discontinue the supply of electricity agreed to be supplied to the applicant if any moneys due to the commission in respect of the supply remain unpaid for seven days after they become due; or, should the applicant fail to comply with the terms and conditions of any agreement made by him with the commission pursuant to subsection (2) of the new section. This cut-off action is allowable without in any way affecting the right of the commission to enforce any right it may have against the applicant in respect of the services rendered.

There is provision in subsection (6) for the reconnection of the supply upon written application by any person to accept the supply upon the same terms and conditions as those in force immediately preceding the date on which the supply was discontinued, or upon some other acceptable terms and conditions varied as by agreement between the commission and the applicant. Furthermore, under subsection (7) there is a provision enabling existing agreements to be cancelled or brought under the new provisions.

It is submitted that these proposals in the overall will simplify the procedure and save expense, time, and inconvenience to prospective consumers without having detrimental effect on the operations of the commission.

The next amendment, the one contained in clause 5, is of a nominal nature to change the word "Commissioner" to read "Commission", for it is the commission which administers the Acts and not any individual member of it.

This brings us to clause 6, amending section 44, contained in part VI of the Act dealing with finance and accounts. This amendment is proposed as a result of financial arrangements made to cover the cost of the projected new administrative building for the commission.

When the commission decided to proceed with this venture, avenues of finance were looked into with a view to obviating the necessity for calling upon the Treasury for loan funds or semi-govermental loan allocations. As a consequence of the investigations made, a feasible proposition submitted by the Rural and Industries Bank has been under consideration. The bank is willing to advance the funds required for the new building and, if this be accepted, it would be reasonable for the commission to conduct its banking business with the R. & I. Bank.

The State Electricity Commission has an account with the Treasury at the present time, as required under the Act. Its banking transactions pass through the Government of W.A. account at the Reserve Bank.

The R. & I. Bank proposal is to provide an overdraft for the purposes of financing the new building and, as already indicated, if the commission's banking business is to

be conducted with this bank, it will be necessary to transfer the State Electricity Commission's banking operations from the Treasury to the bank.

Clause 6 of the Bill accordingly provides that the commission may open and maintain an account with a bank approved by the Treasurer, and known as the State Electricity Commission account. Into this account would be paid all moneys received by the commission and, from that source, applied to the purposes of the Act.

The four clauses which follow—Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10—are complementary amendments necessitated by the provisions contained in clause 6.

Finally, in clause 11, is a small amendment to the third schedule dealing with the power of attorney in the matter of State Electricity Commission of W.A. inscribed stock. It is required under paragraph 6 of part III of the schedule that a power of attorney may be signed by a stockholder and is to be attested by two or more credible witnesses. It is submitted that many general powers of attorney are witnessed by one witness only. The Crown Law Department confirms that this is the accepted custom. It is not unreasonable, therefore, for the commission to fall into line rather than to insist on a special power of attorney being signed for the commission with quite unnecessary inconvenience being caused the subscriber. It is therefore proposed that the schedule be amended to allow for one credible witness instead of "two or more" as now required under the Act.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. V. J. Ferry.

SWAN RIVER CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (West) [4.59 p.m.]: This Bill of quite a few words, and quite a number of clauses, has been made necessary so that other fruits can be brought under the provisions of the Agricultural Products Act through the Apple Sales Advisory Committee. It appears that this committee has been operating for some time, with the object of trying to help the industry which, over the past number of years, has been doing poorly.

Fruits of various sizes were being placed on the market, and many growers were dumping their fruit in the shops. No control whatever was exercised until the Apple Sales Advisory Committee was established. Now the pear producers have asked that the Act be amended to include them, in order that they might come under the protection of the committee.

Under this Bill another committee will be established in order to watch the interests of the citrus growers, and therefore oranges, lemons, mandarins, and grapefruit will come under the Act. It appears that the apple and pear growers will not be asked to pay very much in the way of fees, because the committee in operation at present has indicated that it has a sufficient number of inspectors to carry out the work connected with both apples and pears. Consequently little additional cost will be involved as far as pears are concerned.

With regard to the citrus fruit growers, they will have to bear the nominal costs of the formation and functions of the committee, including payment for attendance at meetings.

The Bill also gives the committee power to advise the Minister on the type and size of fruit, and any other general advice he may require as to the anticipated crops, so that the Minister may then, if necessary, direct that fruits of a certain size must be kept from the market altogether, be sent overseas, or be kept for local consumption. This Bill is a gallant attempt to do something for an industry which has fallen on bad times.

On the notice paper is a Bill complementary to this one—the Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill—and rather than rise to speak to that Bill at a later time, I will say now that it is necessary in order that these additional fruits might come under the same provisions concerning branding, packaging, etc., which already apply to apples.

I feel this legislation is worth while and I trust it will achieve what the producers hope it will; that is, of course, to obtain a better product and also more overseas markets. Although canvassing overseas is being carried out at present, those concerned are finding it difficult to obtain new markets for the fruit. I commend both this measure and the following one to the House.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [5.5 p.m.]: This measure is similar to other Bills which have been before this House from time to time for the purpose of renewing the activities of the Apple Sales Advisory Committee. The present Bill proposes to extend the authority for a further two years to the 31st January, 1968.

Doubts have been expressed by some growers that this is the best way of handling the sale of apples on the local market, and they have been considering various schemes over the years since this one has been in operation, with the idea of devising a better one. However, up to the

present time, the fruit growers concerned have not been able to come up with a better idea and, in fact, they must be coming to the realisation that this is the best scheme which can be evolved, because the pear growers have now asked to come under the same advisory committee.

Last season a heavy crop of pears, particularly Bartlett pears, was harvested, but unfortunately a big proportion of the fruit was blemished or was small in size. A lot of that fruit found its way onto the local market with the result that at least one grower to my knowledge—he is one of the biggest growers of Bartlett pears in the State—lost £300 to £400, and that was after he had harvested only about half his crop. Although his fruit was of a good size and quality, and was clean, all the rubbish on the market depressed it so much that he had to let the rest of his crop drop to the ground. Many growers were in a similar position and I feel that is the reason this amendment has been requested.

I personally feel it would have been better had this Bill provided for the legislation to continue for an unlimited period, rather than for just another two years. I am sure the fruit growers will not, at the end of this two years, be able to suggest any better scheme.

The coming apple season is expected to be one of the heaviest in the State's history. Unfortunately, as has been mentioned, the export market for apples has been declining, largely because of increased production in other countries, including Italy, but more particularly South Africa, whose production has the greatest effect on Australian producers. No doubt members have seen the Press reports to the effect that the packaging and presentation of the product in South Africa is far in advance of Australian packaging and presentation.

In an overall sense, that is true, unfortunately. However, Western Australia is not responsible for this decline in the presentation and packaging of fruit. The other States are to blame, and particularly Tasmania. With the idea of saving in costs, the producers there have lowered the standard of their cartons. In so doing they have done nothing to enhance the appearance of their product for export. Thank goodness this has not been the practice in Western Australia!

Yesterday, in company with my colleague (Mr. Ferry), I inspected some of the cartons which will be used for the export of the fruit in the coming season and they are certainly up to standard. The companies operating here are interested in keeping it that way.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Where are they?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: At the moment, in Fremantle and O'Connor. However, a company is intending to manufacture the cartons at Donnybrook, and another company has just purchased land in Bridgetown to establish a distribution centre there because of the difficulty experienced in servicing the industry from the metropolitan area. I understand that, as time goes by, the company in Bridgetown intends to manufacture there also.

I just referred to the difficulties of servicing the industry. One of the main reasons for this is the difficulty of assessing the crop for the coming season. Many of the growers have not paid sufficient attention to assessing their crops. Those in charge of exporting must know what space to allow on ships, and so on, and this is impossible unless an accurate assessment of the crop is provided by growers. Many of the growers treat this matter in a haphazard way, but they will have to be right on the ball in future. This does not apply to all growers, but in future they must all make a reasonably correct assessment if the situation is to be improved.

If we are to maintain our present overseas markets, and attract new ones, we must ensure that our product is of a high standard—much higher than in the past. If we raise the standard for export, automatically more and more fruit will be available for the local market. Fruit which has been rejected for export is very good fruit in many cases, and is quite suitable for the local market. The size of the fruit is an important factor because if it is large it is not suitable for export, but is very acceptable on the local market.

If the right price is to be obtained on the local market for this fruit, the Apple Sales Advisory Committee will, in the coming season, have to be even tougher than in the past in connection with quality, quantity, size, and varieties. Some of the growers are still using the old varieties instead of gradually changing over to the more popular ones. The old varieties will have to be taken off the market altogether to make room for the better types of fruit.

This applies equally to pears and is one of the reasons those concerned are asking to come under this system. As Mr. Jones mentioned, the citrus growers are also making the same request.

Therefore, although a few growers do not think this is a satisfactory way of dealing with the matter, more and more of them must be in favour of it. The scheme will have to be continued unless the growers themselves can suggest a better one and, as I have said, they have not been able to do so up to date.

As I mentioned, companies are intending to commence manufacturing cartons in the country areas. Members probably know that previously wooden boxes were used almost exclusively in the export of fruit, but in recent years the cell-pack carton has taken over. In these cartons each apple is packed into a separate cell,

and this system of packaging will have to be developed if we are to compete successfully, particularly on the United Kingdom and European markets.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: They must be made from a good quality hardboard.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes, and that is being produced in this State. Unfortunately, these cartons are not being used in the Eastern States, and our apples are exported with those from the other States and are known overseas simply as Australian apples.

Western Australian growers will have to become more individualistic, as far as the State is concerned, and do all they can to improve the quality of fruit shipped from this State.

There is nothing further I wish to say on this Bill, but I do express the hope that the fruit growers of Western Australia will either come up with a better idea regarding the control of the marketing of their fruit, or they will request that this legislation be made permanent instead of its having to be brought here every year or two for renewal. I support the measure.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [5.16 p.m.]: Normally I would not have spoken to this Bill, but in view of some of the interesting remarks just made by Mr. Willmott, in regard to the export of fruit, I thought I would have a few words to say on it. I did a trip to the Orient in 1960-61, and it seems to be the usual practice, when any member makes a trip of this kind, for him to refer to it on the next Address-in-Reply debate. I did not do that, and on several occasions since then I have thought there would be an opportunity for me to mention certain things that I saw, and which would be of interest to the people of this State. Now the opportunity has occurred.

As regards the quality of export fruit, I do not know how many members realise it, but the Chinese New Year is usually about the 13th, 14th, or 15th February, and the Chinese people eat oranges during that period in much the same way as we eat Christmas pudding. It seems to be a national custom at that time. I was the guest of an R.A.F. officer in Penang for 10 days and while there he took me around to the various markets. I was disgusted to see the quality of oranges that were arriving in Penang on the 11th and 12th February, 1961. This fruit was from our Eastern States and the oranges were small —barely two inches in diameter—with very freckly or rusty-coloured skins.

As a contrast to those oranges, two days later a shipment of oranges arrived from Canada and, if anything, they were a little too big, but they looked absolutely perfect, so much so that the people of Penang were pushing one another out of the way so that they could buy these oranges at the market for their New Year festivities. I wanted to draw attention to the difference between the Canadian oranges and the oranges which were shipped from the Eastern States of Australia.

However, tinned fruit from Australia—that is, pears and peaches—is very popular in Penang and Malaya generally. Australian tinned peaches and pears hardly had time to hit the shelves of the importers before they were purchased, but the people there are not very keen on our tinned apricots. I was told that tinned apricots sit on the shelves for months. Apparently what attracts the Asian people to our tinned pears and peaches is the label that is used. One of the importers told me that this was the reason for their popularity and, of course, when the people open tins they find that the fruit is of very high quality and they are prepared to pay a fairly high price for it.

I spent three weeks altogether in Singapore, coming and going.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: In Singapore they sell apples by the slice instead of by the apple.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I was the guest of an officer of the Department of Law and Labour in Singapore, and at that time Mr. Owen, who at one time was a member of another place, was also in Singapore representing Western Australian growers.

My object in speaking was to draw attention to the fact that the potential markets for fruit and vegetables in the Asian countries are tremendous, particularly as Western Australia is so close to that part of the world and we are in a position to export to those countries. However, the fruit we do export must be of good quality and properly marketed; that is a point to which a great deal of attention must be given.

Some people say, "Why do we export all our good fruit and leave only the second-class fruit for our own tables?" I think we can get good fruit for our own tables but, at times, the price certainly gets out of hand. Mr. Stubbs bought some very nice Delicious apples in the city today, but the price was 24c a pound, which is a little too high. I support the Bill and I merely wanted to draw attention to the possibility of exporting good-quality fruit to Singapore and Malaya.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [5.21 p.m.]: Members who have spoken to the Bill have not raised any queries, but I would like to make one or two observations on this matter. First of all, I can assure Mr. Willesee that under this Bill the conversion of pounds to dollars is a straight-out conversion, and no alteration is being made to the amounts already set down in the legislation.

The Hon. J. Dolan: We checked them.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This time it is a straightout conversion.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Hallelujah!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: As Mr. Willmott has said, it is obvious the growers are unable to find an alternative marketing system for the control of fruit on the local market as the pear growers have now asked to be included, and the citrus growers also want to be included but they want to have their own special committee to control their type of fruit. Therefore I agree with Mr. Willmott that it is obvious the time has arrived for this legislation to be made permanent instead of its having to be renewed every year or two.

The only other comment I want to make is in regard to Mr. Willmott's remarks about radio news and the export of Australian apples. I think the situation is much worse than he thinks it is. I saw a film on this matter on television recently. I do not know if any other members saw it but, had they done so, they would have realised that it was one of the most damaging TV shows that could have been put on the screen so far as the export of Australian apples was concerned.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: It was very bad for the other States.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I saw the film and those who did not know the true position, and who saw that film, would say that the Australian apple was not worth buying. This film was shown throughout England and I would say it would have a great effect on the sales of Australian apples in the future, so much so that I would venture the opinion that the purchasers of Australian apples in the past will think twice about buying them in the future.

I do not know how that sort of propaganda can be counteracted, or whether the film was shown for the benefit of other countries who also export apples to England. The film was not entirely factual—far from it in many instances—but it was shown throughout England and it must have a detrimental effect on our apple sales in the future. I do not know whether any steps have been taken to try to counteract this propaganda but I would suggest that the officers of the Department of Agriculture, and the growers, get together with officers of the Visual Education Department to see if we can produce our own film which can be sent to England and shown throughout that country as some means of countering the false impression that has been created by the other film to which I have referred.

I realise that Western Australia is probably suffering as a result of some poor-quality fruit being grown in and exported from the other States. However, that would not make any difference to the impact this film will have had on the purchasing-public in England. All they will know is that the film was on Australian apples and we are classified in the same group as the other States. Australia as a whole would have suffered by this false propaganda.

The Hon. J. Dolan: What did the growers do to counteract it?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know whether anything was done. That is what worries me. Some of the growers must have seen it, and they must have appreciated what damage it would do, particularly to growers in the Eastern States and Tasmania, and many people in Tasmania rely to a large extent on the export of apples as a means of livelihood.

I do not know what action, if any, has been taken—there has been none to my knowledge—other than a rebuttal in the Press. But that is not good enough. We must do something to let the people generally know, and that can be done only through television. Films shown on television reach the people in their own homes.

The Hon. J. Dolan: That is so. Make a film on it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is why I am suggesting someone should take action, and a film be made so that the British people can be given the true picture. In that way this false propaganda will be counteracted.

I thank members for their support of the Bill because it will be the means of enabling good fruit to be placed on the market. I am satisfied that most customers are prepared to pay a little extra if they can get good fruit, particularly these days when living standards are so much higher.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

FRUIT CASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 8th September.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

INDUSTRIAL LANDS (KWINANA) RAILWAY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [5.31 p.m.]: This is an enabling Bill to allow private access to the new superphosphate works that are to be built at Kwinana by CSBP. After I secured the adjournment of the debate I spent about an hour travelling around the area to see how things were moving. I found that the railway proposed in the Bill will mean the closing of that portion of Thomas Street from the standard gauge railway, which comes in from Jarrahdale to the alumina works; and that portion of Pioneer Road not yet built will result in an over-pass where the railway leaves the Kenwick line to enter the CSBP grounds and the marshalling yards in the area concerned.

There is no reason why the Bill should not be supported. I feel it is a most necessary measure. I do not agree with the Minister for Industrial Development when he said there was no necessity to bring the Bill before Parliament. It is very necessary that it should come before Parliament, because of the area concerned; also, because of the tremendous amount of traffic that will be carried across the railway.

One portion of the line which is not mentioned in the Bill turns into the area occupied by the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. Another portion of the line will turn into the power station of B.H.P. So, three looplines will emerge from one section of railway. The engineering side of this venture leaves nothing to be desired.

I would, however, like to remark that the area of land involved in the loopline is a fairly large one, and the people who have been disturbed by land resumptions for this new venture now see, of course, the reason why they have had to move out. Once again I would like to draw attention to the Department of Industrial Development for doing a fine job in purchasing the land at unfair prices!

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.34 p.m.]: I thank Mr. Lavery for his comments and for his support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

WUNDOWIE WORKS MANAGEMENT AND FOUNDRY AGREEMENT BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.37 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a third time.

In moving the third reading I would like to take the opportunity to say that I undertook last evening to check the question raised with me by Mr. Dolan pertaining to clause 5 (1) (b) of the agreement. The position is this: As the paragraph reads, 20 per cent. of the improvement in the trading result in each year of the company's management, beyond the adjusted trading result of the year 1965-66—hereinafter referred to as the base year—is to be given the company as an incentive.

I can best demonstrate that by saying that if the benefit that is made by the new management is $100,000 in the first year, then 20 per cent. will be paid as an addition to paragraph (a). But paragraph (b) must be read in conjunction with paragraph (a), because the management fee is $35,000, and this is reducing progressively as each year passes.

If the trading result is the same in the third year as it is in the second year, then, naturally enough, the return of 20 per cent. would be identical. If the amount were $120,000, instead of $100,000, in the third year, then the figure would be 20 per cent. of the $120,000. Mr. Dolan thought that this would be a compounded amount. I do not think this is right, because the trading of each year is taken into account separately for each year.

Let us assume that in the first year the saving was $100,000. Under paragraph (b) the inducement would amount to 20 per cent. of $100,000, which would be $20,000. If the saving were exactly the same in the following year the honourable member would not expect the amount to be any different.

The Hon. J. Dolan: By saving, I read it that each year the return must be based on the base year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right.

The Hon. J. Dolan: So if they make a further saving of $100,000 in the second year they get paid $200,000, because you refer it to the base year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is pure conjecture as to what the saving will be. I agree that if the saving in the first year is any amount greater than the saving in the second year, the 20 per cent. will be paid on the actual amount. But the reverse may be the situation. The amount of $100,000 may be saved in the first year, but the second year might reflect less than $100,000. The honourable member would not expect the amount in actual consideration to the management to be less in the first year than it was in the second year. The argument must go one way or the other.

I might not have explained the situation to the satisfaction of the honourable member, but we are not in the Committee stage, and we cannot keep on bobbing up and down. It is not a question of compounding the amount to trading in the first year as a separate entity. We are

using the base year of 1965-66, and whatever the amount proves to be at the time. We are also using the second year separately to relate the amount to the saving in the first year.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If it showed a saving of $100,000 over five years it would mean that the company would get the entire $100,000 on the fifth year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, because five times $100,000 is $500,000, and it is not predicted, or anticipated—whichever word the honourable member wishes to use—that the loss for 1965-66 will be $500,000. I think the honourable member is making a difficult mathematical sum out of the situation. The only point at issue between us is that this is not in fact compounding the situation, although it may occur that the change in the second year could well be a great deal more; and let us hope it is, because this is the encouragement the company is being offered to improve the situation.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Year by year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes.

The Hon. J. Dolan: But not going back to the base year each time?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It does go back to the base year, but perhaps the honourable member is suggesting it should not.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I suggest that it go back from year to year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is intended to go back to the base year, and this is intended as encouragement to the management, and as a reward in the event of its being able to improve the situation from year to year. Let us say this year the amount was £500,000—and this is all conjecture, because I have no basis on which to make these remarks. If that amount were reduced by $100,000 in the first year the company would be paid 20 per cent. of $100,000.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Suppose it made no further improvement. It would still get $200,000 in the first year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It would be paid the difference between the base year and the profit it made.

The Hon. J. Dolan: That would be compounding it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is treating the second year in relation to the proposition on which the agreement is based.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That gets back to my exercise.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think it does, because the honourable member is drawing the bow too far. The trading loss for 1965-66 would not be as much as he envisages.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Let us say it is $100,000. If $20,000 is returned to them next year, and there was no improvement in the next four succeeding years, they would have recouped that $100,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Even though in four out of five years they made no improvement whatsoever, they are getting paid for it. It is an incentive not to improve.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If there is no improvement in successive years the company will not be paid; but I come back to the point that if the improvement in the second year is the same as the first, or if it is better or worse, then the basic amount of the base year of 1965-66 is the amount to be taken into consideration.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.46 p.m.]: I realise I cannot speak to the motion that the Bill do now pass.

The PRESIDENT: The motion before the Chair is that the Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I will have two opportunities to speak on two third readings. At this stage, with this Bill, I will content myself by suggesting to members that they read the debate in last week's and this week's *Hansard*, when they are available, and decide for themselves who indulged in the quibbling on the subject.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WOOD DISTILLATION AND CHARCOAL IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 4A amended—

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 36—Delete the words "twelve months" and substitute the words "two years."

This amendment is necessary if the Bill is to do exactly what is intended. A greater period than 12 months is desirable. Twelve months, in some instances, would barely give a person time to construct the building; and, if this amendment is passed, we will be safeguarding ourselves.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: As I promised Mr. Willesee last night, I contacted the Minister in charge of this measure and he has raised no objection to the alteration

from 12 months to two years. Therefore I will leave the matter to the Committee to decide.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9: Section 10C amended—

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: When the Minister was replying to the debate he gave me the impression that when a penalty was changed from pounds to dollars there was an increase to take cognisance of the fact that there had been a decrease in monetary value. In both sections 10B and 10C of the Act the word "penalty" is used, and in clauses 8 and 9 of the Bill the penalties have not been increased; they have merely been converted from pounds to dollars.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the honourable member looks at the clause he will find that one part deals with an unregistered builder who builds contrary to the law, and the other deals with an individual supervisor. They are entirely different classes of crime, if one may use that term. It is not desired to increase the penalty on the individual but only in the case of a builder who is breaking the law.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 15 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

LESLIE SOLAR SALT INDUSTRY AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 7th September.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [5.57 p.m.]: This Bill is a very favourable one so far as the company is concerned. If we have a look at page 6 of the measure we will see that paragraph (c) of clause 2 (2) of the agreement reads as follows:—

> the State may by agreement acquire or compulsorily take or resume as for a public work within the meaning of the Public Works Act, 1902, any land or any estate or interest in land which in the opinion of the State is reasonably required for the objects of this Agreement. . . .

It then goes on to say that certain sections of the Public Works Act shall not apply in respect of the said lands acquired or resumed.

Turning to clause 20 (2) (a) of the agreement, one finds that once the agreement comes into effect, the Government cannot compulsorily resume land from the company for any public works.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where are you?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: On page 24, clause 20 (2) (a) of the agreement. The paragraph goes on to say that the operations of the company shall not be affected by any resumption. However, the company will not withhold arbitrarily or unreasonably any land that may be required. We write these things into an agreement whereby a company will have protection once the agreement is ratified by Parliament, yet we twist it around as far as the individual is concerned and give him no such protection. In addition, we have learned from bitter experience just what this sort of thing means in an agreement.

The Australian paper mills Act came before this House during 1960 or 1961. Virtually the same conditions apply in this Bill as apply in that legislation. The provision in the A.P.M. Act means that in the development of an urban area, where main or arterial roads are required, the local authority—or even the Government—cannot trespass to resume, acquire, or do any other thing on A.P.M. property. That applies not only to the property that was included within the agreement, but also to any further property which that company may acquire in the future.

Here we see where companies have got protection, whereas the individual person has no protection whatsoever against resumptions. I think whoever prepares these agreements—and members of Parliament—should look seriously at such provisions. However, if this Bill dealt with land in the metropolitan area, or with land which could be utilised in the future for a public purpose, I would ask for a lot more opposition to the two particular clauses I have referred to than is the case now. I have had a look at the marshy land in and around Port Hedland and I feel that the company is utilising land which would probably lie idle for possibly another 50 to 100 years, unless someone came forward with an idea similar to that of the Leslie Salt Co.

I have no objection whatsoever to the company starting its operations in the north-west, around Port Hedland. The only regret I have in this respect is that I would have liked to see some Australian component in the company. We have all seen the way various companies are coming into Australia. We are losing much of our business, and our commercial interests are controlled by overseas companies. Our food manufacturing companies are being taken over by American and other interests. While we still have time, we in Western Australia should apply some brake to the takeover bids. When companies such as the Leslie Salt Co. are prepared to come into the State we should say "Yes"; but make a provision that an Australian component exist within the company. That is not so with regard to this company.

I am also concerned with clauses 17 and 22 (e) of the agreement. Those clauses, too, deal with something which is written into the legislation. Whether or

not they serve any purpose in the agreement, I do not know.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: So that I can follow you, what were the clauses you mentioned?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Clause 17 on page 20, and clause 22 (e) on page 25. Clause 17 reads as follows:—

> The parties hereto acknowledge the principle that in the operation of a solar salt plant all employees during their respective normal working hours are not continuously or fully engaged in the performance or discharge of their respective duties and hence from time to time there is or could be a surplus in the number of employees required by the Company. To avoid this so happening and to maintain so far as practicable full employment for all its employees at all times the Company proposes to use employees whilst not engaged in the performance or discharge of their respective duties to assist in the loading of ships at wharf with salt produced at the work sites and in the supervision thereof and to perform or discharge such other duties as may be assigned to them from time to time by the Company.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What are the waterside workers going to say to that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The clause goes on, but I want to stop at that point.

Sitting suspended from 6.6 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Prior to the tea suspension I had quoted portion of clause 17 of the agreement—I say portion of it because I had not completed the full clause—whereby the company, in order to allow for smooth operations, has had written into this agreement that it can move labour from point to point, from the work site to the loading of ships, or involve the men in any other type of employment that is deemed necessary in order to keep them fully employed.

When Mr. Willesee was speaking to this Bill previously, he said the A.W.U. would possibly have union coverage in the Leslie Solar Salt Co.'s leases. The same applies in Port Hedland in respect of waterside workers. The A.W.U. also has coverage in Port Hedland and I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate on this. The House has been told that the one union possibly would have the coverage for both operations.

I do not think it is in the best interests of harmony to write such a condition into an agreement, particularly when a new company is establishing itself in Western Australia and possibly, at this stage, would know very little about our arbitration laws, the smooth working of these, and the functions they have fulfilled over the years.

Is this to allow for the flexibility which has been mentioned? A deputation was made by the Trades and Labour Council to the Minister for Industrial Development, and both at the time of meeting this deputation, and in a letter which the Minister wrote to Mr. Cooley of the Trades and Labour Council on the 6th September, this flexibility was mentioned. I have a copy of this letter which I obtained from the Trades and Labour Council.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Which I supplied to the Leader of the Opposition. I think you saw the copy I gave him.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is true. I saw this letter before it was sent to the Trades and Labour Council and, for this, I thank the Minister.

The Trades and Labour Council wants to know the purpose of this provision. There may be existing industrial awards which will apply to the employees in question, or it may be that a new award will be set if the company thinks it necessary to obtain some degree of flexibility in regard to its employees. Of course, the proper course to adopt in order to effect this is to bring the matter within the framework of the Industrial Arbitration Act, and, at the same time, this would ensure protection for all employees concerned.

Irrespective of what we write into this Bill, I do not think it is the company's intention, nor indeed the Minister's intention, that the Industrial Arbitration Act would be overridden. In fact, the Minister for Industrial Development says as much in his letter to the Trades and Labour Council. He says it is a straightout agreement, and it is not intended that the Government, or the company, should cut across existing industrial arbitration laws, but that it was thought necessary to incorporate this provision in the Bill so that people could be moved along the line because this would be a type of seasonal work.

That may be so, but in Western Australia we have many phases of employment which are seasonal. I mention work connected with wheat, wool, meat, fruit, and probably crayfishing. These are but a few and, unquestionably, there are many more. One could go into many of these union awards and examine them and one would find no such condition existing. If this condition were placed in other agreements, and the Industrial Commission saw fit to make this a condition of employment, the whole of our arbitration system would be defeated.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you know whether the Trades and Labour Council is satisfied with the Minister's letter?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, up to the time that I received this copy of the letter. The Trades and Labour Council did meet last night but I have not been in contact with its officers today.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The letter merely sets out in writing what the Minister said to the deputation on the 1st September.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The only comment I can make as to what is thought of this letter is to refer to paragraph 2, where it is claimed that the matter is for arbitration. The whole purpose is for the Trades and Labour Council to deal with the regulation of an industry, and there is no need for the Government to attempt to treat this company differently from others in similar positions. I have just referred to the others which could be similarly affected; namely, those concerned with wheat, wool, fruit, meat, and so on.

Consequently, I am not in complete agreement with such proposals as this coming before Parliament for ratification. I must be completely honest and say that the Minister for Industrial Development, in his letter to the Trades and Labour Council, qualified his statement by saying that the company had to construct a number of houses in order that it could have sufficient employees on the site. That may be true but, irrespective of what is written into this agreement, I certainly hope that at all times the awards and the conditions of unions will be adhered to. From the point of view both of the employer and of the employee, these awards and conditions have been enjoyed in Western Australia for very many years and I trust that they will continue to be enjoyed for very many years to come.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you think the Trades and Labour Council would do if the letter written by the Minister was not adhered to?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am making my contribution to the debate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes, I know, but isn't that a reasonable question to ask?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would not know what the Trades and Labour Council would do because I cannot make up its mind. I would like to continue by quoting another portion of clause 17, and I would mention that this is the part which I do not like. It says—

> To enable the foregoing objectives to be put into practice the State will at the request of the Company made to it from time to time use reasonable endeavours to assist in the implementation and achievement of these objectives.

Let us assume that there is some disagreement on the work site and the conciliation commissioners make the parties concerned attend a compulsory conference.

Under the terms written into this Bill the State will, at the request of the company made to it from time to time, use reasonable endeavours to assist in the implementation and achievement of the objectives in the agreement. This means that it would not be unreasonable—and I do not think the Minister would say it would be unreasonable—for the company to ask that the State be represented at such a hearing. The officer from the Department of Labour, who would be the responsible person, would say, "Well, there it is; it is written here that we have to side with the company to see that the workers reasonably carry out the request that has been made to them."

The position would be that the parties at the hearing would consist of the employer, the employee or his representative, and the conciliation commissioners, and something which is unheard of, except in the public interest, the State could intervene. It is written into our Industrial Arbitration Act that the State can intervene only when it is acting in the public interest. This would not be in the public interest, if it is a condition of employment. Even in the event of a health hazard, or in the case of dangerous working, the State could intervene and possibly sway any hearing before the conciliation commissioners. It says, in black and white, that this could be done.

This is not a hypothetical argument which I am putting forward, but it is something realistic and could be put into effect. The Industrial Arbitration Act would be limited in its functions, if this came to pass. I sincerely hope it will not. As I have said, it would possibly be the first intervention of this kind which has been written into any award. For that reason, I am not happy with the condition.

Now I turn to clause 20 (2) (e).

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Clause 22?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON. Clause 20 (2) (e) at the bottom of page 25, and I quote—

> (e) during the currency of this Agreement and subject to compliance with its obligations hereunder the Company shall not be required to comply with the labour conditions imposed by or under any Act in regard to any lease of any land within the work sites.

That clause might easily be interpreted as referring to mining leases—in both the Land Act of 1933 and the Mining Act of 1904. However, that information is not specifically stated.

If my memory serves me aright, in his address to the House the Minister mentioned this clause. Although I do not have his notes, and it was some days ago, nevertheless I feel sure he mentioned this would refer to the Mining Act in particular, but it should also refer to the Land Act of 1933.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you know what labour conditions the Land Act of 1933 contains?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If one is dealing with the Mining Act, one has to read the Land Act in conjunction with it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said it also might pertain to the Land Act.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If it pertains to the Mining Act, possibly it would pertain to the Land Act as well.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I ask you: What labour conditions are contained in the Land Act?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There is no need to answer the Minister's question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Particularly when the honourable member does not want to do so. I am only trying to be helpful.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would refer the Minister to clause 3 of the schedule which deals with leases, and this is where the Land Act would have an effect upon a mining lease.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: All I was trying to do was to be helpful by saying that I did not know of any labour conditions.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I want to be helpful, too, so I would refer the Minister to this clause of the schedule which states—

> 3. As soon as conveniently may be after the coming into operation of the ratifying Act the State shall on the written application of the Company cause the production site or so much of it as the Company in that application specifies to be leased to the Company under either the provisions of the Land Act, 1933, or the Mining Act, 1904, ...

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The reason for that, Mr. Thompson, is that Leslie Solar Salt Co.'s lease is let under the Land Act and not under the Mining Act.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Did I disagree with that?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But there are no labour conditions under the Land Act.

The Hon. J. Dolan: By-pass the Minister.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would ask the Minister to allow me to make my speech, but I would also ask him to give his answers if he wishes. I have had a careful look at this and if labour conditions are to be written into the agreement as being applicable to clause 3 of the schedule and, as mentioned, applicable to the Mining Act of 1904 and the Land Act of 1933, it may be that this agreement could cause all kinds of trouble industrially if the company chose to put those provisions into effect.

What is the reason for including these provisions in the agreement? In a letter the Minister for Industrial Development has stated it is a straightforward agreement. What is the purpose of that? What is the purpose of including these provisions in an agreement we are asked to ratify if they are not worth the paper they are written on? In his letter the Minister for Industrial Development has virtually stated they are not worth the paper they are written on.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where does he state that the agreement is not worth the paper it is written on?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is my assumption. I said, "virtually."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: My word, you are drawing the long bow!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There is no virtue in the agreement at all.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is no virtue in what you are saying.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If the Minister does reply to the debate I will be interested to hear what he has to say. Why are these provisions incorporated in the agreement, and why will the State intervene at the company's request if something is happening which is not in the company's interests? Why are conditions set aside? Why are land resumptions permitted to take place under the agreement, without any redress?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I reckon you are getting your fishing inquiries mixed up with the red herring you are trying to draw across the trail.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is the Minister who is drawing the long bow now. By and large I have raised most of the points on which I seek an explanation. To refresh the Minister's memory I will go over them again. In particular, I would like to know the meaning of clauses 17 and 20 (2) (e) in the agreement, and why they are written into the agreement. Both clauses are foreign to anything I have seen in any Bill or agreement. They are so foreign to an agreement that even some of the companies that have had their agreements ratified by Parliament are very interested. A spokesman for one company in particular said to me, "I want as many copies of that Bill as I can get because I think we can make some good use of it." He was referring to his company making good use of it and not to using it for the smooth working of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who was this?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not telling the Minister who it was because I was asked by him to obtain some copies of the Bill. That is my criticism of the measure. As I said previously, it is to the benefit of the State that this industry is being established in the north-west. However, it will become another company like General Motors-Holden because the profits that are made by the company will leave Australia, with no benefit to Australian interests. That is not good for the sound economy of this country. I sincerely hope that if other companies are asked to establish new industries in this State in the future the suggestion will be made

that there should be an Australian shareholding; because we can pay too high a price for the establishment of these industries.

I support the Bill except for the reservations I have made in regard to clauses 17 and 20 (2) (e) of the agreement. Unless I can obtain a satisfactory explanation from the Minister to refute that they are not worth the paper they are written on, I will again voice my opposition to them in Committee.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [7.54 p.m.]: The area to which Mr. Thompson has referred, and many other areas in the north-west which are suitable for solar salt production have been there for a long time, and the opportunity for any Australian company that desires to pursue the establishment of such an industry as this has been in existence for some time. The fact remains that until the advent of this particular arrangement, we have not had a solar salt industry operating in Port Hedland.

For his information I can advise Mr. Ron Thompson that many inquiries have been pursued from time to time about the prospect of establishing a solar salt industry, but in this instance an established arrangement, in pursuance of the agreement in the Bill, is brought before Parliament for ratification. At this point I will leave the remarks that have been made by Mr. Ron Thompson so that I may reply to some of the questions raised by Mr. Willesee when he spoke to the Bill.

First of all, Mr. Willesee asked for some information on clause 5(e) of the agreement which relates to priority being given to ships loading salt. I am advised that the salt ships will have a capacity of the order of 40,000 tons. Ships of this size cannot be inconvenienced by small ships, so a special berth is being provided for the salt ships and so the priority does not apply to the harbour generally. Also, the priority is limited to 100 days in any year, as provided in the agreement. Other jetties that will be available will be the Goldsworthy berth and, of course, the existing harbour berth at Port Hedland. Also, there is the prospect of the Newman berth being available.

Mr. Willesee also raised a point concerning clause 8(3) of the agreement which has reference to the sliding scale of royalties. This is not unique in agreements of this nature. If reference is made to other Acts it will be found that a similar principle is embodied in other agreements. The Alumina Refinery Agreement Act provides for a sliding scale, and the Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Agreement Act provides for a similar arrangement. So there is nothing unique in this agreement.

Another reference was made by Mr. Willesee to clause 8(3) on the question of wharfage.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: If you are going to refer to that subclause, I think you have become confused between subclauses 8(1) and 8(3). I was referring to the telescopic wharfage rate.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The telescopic wharfage rate is covered by 8(3). Did I say 8(1)?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Subclause 8(3) deals with wharfage, and Mr. Willesee asked why the provision could not apply to other ships. The reason is that under clause 5(2)(d) the company is also committed to paying to the State an annual charge of $60,000.

Another question asked by Mr. Willesee was in respect of clause 16 which relates to the limitation of liability concerning levees. This is a necessary provision. Levees will provide protection for adjacent land now flooded, but we cannot hold the company liable to provide this protection in perpetuity. If a person builds on such land after the levees are erected he must do so at his own risk. Therefore it is not reasonable to hold the company liable, because in the course of time the industry could become defunct and the levees will deteriorate and the land will become flooded again.

In the main those were the points raised by Mr. Willesee. He joined with Mr. Ron Thompson in referring to clause 17 of the agreement, and this clause seems to have given the latter a good deal of concern. My understanding of the clause is that following the introduction of the Bill in the Legislative Assembly, the Trades and Labour Council sought out the Minister for Industrial Development, and on the 1st September its representatives saw the Minister in deputation.

Later, as the letter dated the 6th September states, the Minister said—

> I understand that you have been in touch with my office seeking a letter setting out the several assurances which were discussed when I saw you and your colleagues at Parliament House on Thursday, 1st September. This I am only too pleased to do.

This letter was addressed to Mr. Cooley, President of the Trades and Labour Council. The letter went on to set out in writing the understanding that the Minister had conveyed to the deputation on the 1st September.

It occurs to me that instead of raising all sorts of objections against the clause, Mr. Ron Thompson would have been well advised to find out from the Trades and Labour Council whether it had any objection to the letter. By doing so he would have saved himself a great deal of worry, but I do not know whether or not he did

that. He has indicated that the Trades and Labour Council has since held a meeting, but he was not aware of the results. I have had the results of the discussions conveyed to me, and I have made available a copy of the letter to the Leader of the Opposition to show him that the Minister has dealt with the request of the Trades and Labour Council in reference to clause 17 of the agreement. One would have expected, if the letter had not been accepted, that by now some objection to its contents would have been raised.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I can clear that one up.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I asked the honourable member to clear that point up when he was making his speech.

The Hon. R. Thompson: My objection was this: Why was it written into the Bill?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is not the point I am raising.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is my objection.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am simply pointing out that the Trades and Labour Council, being aware of the contents of clause 17 of the agreement, approached the Minister, and subsequently the Minister put in writing the assurances which he gave. To the best of my knowledge no objection has been raised in respect of that matter, but I stand corrected.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There is a good reason for that. The Trades and Labour Council might have received the letter, but the secretary did not get back to Perth until Friday last, and on that day the Minister for Industrial Development left for overseas.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let me conclude by saying there will be time, before the Bill is read a third time, to ascertain whether there is any objection. It occurs to me that had there been any objection it would have been conveyed to the Minister by Mr. Cooley, but so far I have not received any information.

Clause 17 of the agreement states that this is the type of work in which continuity of employment cannot be expected in the solar salt industry, and therefore, in the interests of maintaining continuity of employment for the people who will be engaged in the industry, it is proposed to do as the clause provides.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That surely answers the question as to why the clause has been included in the agreement.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That has been followed by the points raised by the Trades and Labour Council, and the answer given by the Minister. I must let the matter rest for the time being until it is raised on the third reading of the Bill.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I will raise this point during the Committee stage.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member referred to the clause in the agreement relating to labour conditions. This is a matter on which I thought he got well and truly tangled, and I tried to help him out.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How did I get tangled up?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thought the honourable member was. His advice to me was that I should allow him to make his speech and he would allow me to make mine. I now say to him, "Ditto, brother Smart."

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Neither of you is of much help.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am afraid we are not, but we are not helping this industry to get under way. The purpose of including clause 20 (2) (e) in the agreement is to set out the situation in regard to labour conditions which apply under the Mining Act. As those interested in the mining industry are aware, there are certain provisions in respect of labour conditions under the Mining Act which must be adhered to. The solar salt industry is not included under the Mining Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How did I get tangled up? I conceded that point.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member cannot put me off. I think I am certain of what he said. He tried to tell the House that what we should do was to read the contents of clause 3 of the agreement in conjunction with the provision on page 25.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said the clause relating to labour conditions could be applicable to clause 3.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think I know what the honourable member said. To the best of my knowledge no labour conditions are expressed in the Land Act, as they are in the Mining Act. The inclusion of this provision in the agreement will ensure that the area in question is not subject to the type of labour conditions which are set out in the Mining Act, and which require the employment of certain workers according to the acreage of the lease.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It means no labour conditions will be prejudiced.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No labour conditions applicable to the Mining Act will be prejudiced. If the honourable member looks at the Mining Act he will realise how impracticable it is to relate the labour conditions in that Act to this particular industry. Another matter which worried Mr. Ron Thompson was that the State could resume land for the company, but the company could not have land resumed from it. If we examine the provision in the agreement we will find that is not exactly the case.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said a little more than that. Be dinkum!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: An industry of this nature requires ground upon which to establish its operations, and common to all agreements of this type is a provision which states that the State undertakes to make the ground available in order that the industry can pursue the activities which it intends to pursue. A similar provision has been included in the agreement and is to be found on page 24 of the Bill. On the next page is set out the position so far as the company is concerned.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I quoted that provision.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sure the honourable member does not mind if I now quote it again. The provision states that the State will not be able to resume land from the company which may unduly prejudice or interfere with the company's operations without the consent in writing of the company first having been obtained, which consent shall not be arbitrarily or unreasonably withheld. I draw the attention of Mr. Ron Thompson to the concluding words, "shall not be arbitrarily or unreasonably withheld." If consent is withheld, the parties simply go to arbitration.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I quoted that part of the agreement.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Then we are talking at cross purposes.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I drew a comparison with the Bill dealing with Australian Paper Manufacturers, under which local authorities and the Government cannot enter the property of the company.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not if the situation is of an arbitrary nature. In all agreements of this nature there is always a basis for arbitration. If either party thinks that consent is being withheld unreasonably then it can go to arbitration. That has been provided in the agreement before us. The industry must have the working tools for its operations; and they are the land on which the plant is to be established. It can expect the Government to make the land available. I do not think any other matter was raised by Mr. Ron Thompson, with which I have not dealt.

The Hon. R. Thompson: No.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank Mr. Willesee and Mr. Ron Thompson for their support of the Bill, and hope the explanations I have given will be acceptable to them.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Schedule—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I want to ask the Minister a question in relation to clause 17 of the agreement, the last part of which states as follows:—

> To enable the foregoing objectives to be put into practice the State will at the request of the Company made to it from time to time use reasonable endeavours to assist in the implementation and achievement of these objectives.

Although the Minister dealt with this matter, he did not give me an answer to my question. Probably the meaning of the clause could depend on the way a person reads it. It could mean that the Government could intervene before the Industrial Commission in the interests of the company even though existing awards were involved. Does it mean that only general assistance will be given to the company, and that representations will not be made before the Industrial Commission or any such tribunal?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Before I attempt to answer the question I would like to know what is in the mind of the honourable member. Does he think there is something suspicious about it?

The Hon. R. Thompson: No; I said it could depend on the way you read it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It could depend on the way the honourable member reads it. Do not talk for me.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It could be the way any individual reads it. I want to know the meaning of it and why it is there.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The clause caught the eye of the Trades and Labor Council.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is not happy about it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Members of the Trades and Labor Council asked to see the Minister for Industrial Development, and he saw them. They sought an expression of his opinions and undertakings in writing, and he did this in a letter, a copy of which I have here. Paragraph 2 reads—

> The incorporation of Clause 17 in the Leslie Salt Agreement currently before State Parliament for ratification, was not intended by the Company or by the Government to cut across the existing Industrial Arbitration Legislation. It was intended as a very straight forward statement of a situation which exists within the Salt Industry and both the Company and the Government felt it desirable to make specific reference to the fact that one side of the Industry is essentially part-time and seasonal.

I do not intend to read the remainder of the letter because the honourable

member has a copy. I want to know if this letter the Minister wrote is not acceptable. What is in the mind of the honourable member which makes him suspicious? I am anxious to try to clear this matter up. Before the third reading stage I will try to get some further information if he can tell me what is in his mind.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Simply and honestly the only query in my mind is what is intended by the last four and a half lines of the clause—nothing more and nothing less.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is wrong with those four lines?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Do they mean that if a dispute arose over working conditions, and, because a motor mechanic, or a fitter and turner, covered by an existing industrial award was directed by the company to work on board a ship, and he refused to do so as he is not permitted under his award, the Government would intervene before the Industrial Commission, or back the company in the enforcement of its direction, contrary to the award? That is all that is in my mind.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let me read paragraphs 4 and 5 from the letter, as follows:—

> It was always intended that the company should negotiate with the appropriate Unions with a view to obtaining an Industry Award. So far as the Government is concerned you will appreciate from a reading of Clause 17 that there is nothing which overrides the existing Industrial Arbitration Legislation and the Government's position is not an unusual one.
>
> In practice it would be expected that the Government would, if called upon, assist in negotiations with the appropriate Unions in an endeavour to arrive at a workable arrangement.

The last four lines of the clause, upon which great emphasis has been placed, state that the Government will assist in enabling the objectives of clause 17 to be fulfilled; but they do not mean that the arbitration laws are to be overridden. The clause does not say that at all.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I did not say it did. I merely asked what it meant.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am telling the honourable member what it means. I do not think he wants to arrive at a conclusion on this.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I do want to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Having explained it three times, the best thing I can do is to sit down and hope the honourable member will accept the explanation I have given.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: When I was speaking during the second reading debate I said these words were not worth the paper they were written on, and the Minister said I was drawing a long bow. After listening to his explanation I believe what he says and I trust that in the future what he has said will be put into practice and the Government will not intervene at the request of the company in the circumstances I have outlined.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Was the object of your exercise to get me to say that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No. I did not try to put words into the Minister's mouth. If we read the reply of the Minister for Industrial Development to the council's queries, we would realise that the words in the Bill are hardly necessary.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The only comment I make is that if the honourable member thinks I came down in the last shower, I did not.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: This clause has had a lot of airing up to date. I held the view that it would be better if it were not in the agreement, but the agreement has been signed, and I pin my faith on the words "reasonable endeavours." If the Government has a full sense of responsibility it will not precipitate anything which would invoke an industrial situation. A section of workmen in this industry will be difficult to place and this is a precautionary measure to ensure that they have, as near as possible, full-time employment. If the Government ever did take sides in a quarrel then it would be breaching the spirit of this clause.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Thank you very much.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

CORNEAL AND TISSUE GRAFTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 13th September.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.27 p.m.]: This to the medical profession and to the public generally is a very important measure. A number of members here recall the introduction of the Act under which it was possible for individuals to give approval for the removal of an eye or a cornea after their death. I have no intention of going back over the whole story which can be found in *Hansard* of November, 1956.

I might say that from my point of view this all started in a most extraordinary manner, and by chance. We have realised for quite a long time, of course, that it would be necessary some day to obtain the right to use pituitary glands for certain conditions. Last May I went to South Australia to the conference of the College of Physicians, and at the dinner which is always held at such conferences, I happened to be alongside Dr. Robert Vines

who has been one of the prime movers in this type of legislation. I asked him how he was getting on with his problem, and he replied that there was a difficulty because one State had not yet introduced a Bill, and that State happened to be our own. Why this is necessary is that the Commonwealth Government will undertake a good deal of the expense and investigation which will follow provided all six States agree to the legislation. I think it might be as well to read the letter received from Dr. Robert Vines, as follows:—

> The most important product we hope to obtain from human pituitary glands is growth hormone. I anticipate that the main use of this will be in the treatment of hypopituitary dwarfism though, if enough becomes available, it may well be of value in other forms of dwarfism, in certain forms of hypoglycaemia, etc. Follicle stimulating hormone will also become available for the management of infertility in men and women.
>
> Small quantities of thyroid stimulating hormone are also required by several groups concerned with the investigation and management of thyroid disorders. The need for these hormones in the community is so great that it is most unlikely that we will be able to satisfy demands for them fully. This makes it essential that research be carried on so that they may be used most economically and to their best advantage and also in the hope that substitutes for them may eventually be found. The committee has these points in mind and the Commonwealth has agreed in principle to the setting up of a committee to deal with all matters concerning the human pituitary gland and to the appointment of sub-committees to deal with such matters as fractionation methods, and the distribution of products and analysis of the results of their use.

The main use will obviously be in dwarfism due to the lack of pituitary hormones, but it can also be used for those who are under height but show no pituitary disability. For the last few years we have been using a mixture, or a treatment, in the way that we used male hormones and thyroid in order to try to achieve a height of at least 5 ft. for males. It is a very great day in the life of young people, both boys and girls, if they can reach this height because, when shoes are worn, it is the height which is acceptable even to employers. It is very difficult for a person under 5 ft. to obtain employment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I remember you showing me one case.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, we have had three or four who have been in this category and who have grown to over 5 ft. However, this is not the true method by which we should accomplish the growth height. In this measure we speak also of other hormones. The follicle-stimulating hormone is now prepared like the gonadotropic hormone is prepared from post menopausal urine so that when a female has passed that stage the urine contains a considerable output from these hormones. These can all be manufactured through the pituitary gland.

I am convinced that whilst we will not, as Dr. Vines said, be able to supply sufficient for everybody who wants growth hormones, we will, in time, be able to synthetise these hormones. That, of course, has been done with almost every hormone with the exclusion of the growth hormone.

One of the other most important hormones to be found is what is known as the thyroid-stimulating hormone; and it is rather interesting that at that meeting in Adelaide the discussion centred around Lats—this means long-acting thyroid stimulation and the term "Lats" refers to the first letter of each word. To a large extent this hormone is now referred to as "Lats."

This hormone will certainly make a tremendous difference to a great deal of the hormone work that will be possible within this country. For instance, one could almost say quite definitely that the most brilliant piece of hormone work ever performed was done by Dr. Ruzicka in the synthetising of male hormones, because only a limited amount can be found in any human body, and it is only used at active periods. If this can be done then I am certain that all the other hormones can be prepared in the same way.

As time goes on it will be interesting to see the difference that these synthetised hormones make. I am quite certain that in the future there will not be the number of small people under 5 ft. that we have today. Very few people, in the normal way, stop growing before they reach 5 ft., but there are considerable numbers of young girls who do not reach that height. They grow to 4 ft. 10 in., or 4 ft. 11 in. and they wear high-heeled shoes to overcome their disability. However, I am certain that the time is coming when that will not be necessary.

The legislation which is now before us is almost identical with the New South Wales Act, but we still have disabilities in this regard for the reason that before the cornea, or the eye can be taken, or before the pituitary can be taken, some person in authority, such as a relative, must give approval to the hospital or the pathologist to remove such sections of the human body.

I hope the day will come, if we cannot synthetise this hormone, when we will realise that once we have passed on

what happens to us afterwards is of no great account. If we reach the stage where, after we are dead, part of our body that can be of use to lighten the burdens of some of our living individuals can be used freely, it will be of tremendous benefit to the community. Unfortunately, so far, we have not reached that stage.

One of the queries that has been raised in other States is whether there can be a removal of the pituitary gland after a coroner's inquiry. I do not know how long it takes, after a death occurs, for the coroner to hold an inquiry, but I think the pituitary gland could still be active up to 36 hours. Therefore, if the coroner's inquiry took place within that time the pathologist would be justified in removing the pituitary gland. But again that could not be done without consent.

I am very grateful to the Minister for introducing this Bill because, from the point of view of many individuals in this State, he has done something real. I am certain that once the Commonwealth committees, and the various pathological organisations throughout Australia get moving it will not be long before the growth hormone is accepted as a very active piece of medicament in Australia, and we will have the satisfaction of being able to have, possibly, a synthetic preparation of Lats.

It is extraordinary how long this long-acting thyroid stimulant acts on a deficient thyroid. It is probably the latest advance in the field of thyroid and it is of tremendous interest to all of us. The gonadotropic hormone can be used at the moment in some conditions. I am certain that later on there will be a greater use of the long-acting thyroid stimulant, and the follicle-stimulating hormone, and by this means we will have almost conquered, as it were, those hormones which we have not been able to produce in sufficient quantities in recent days.

There will still be the other problem which we will have to face up to, and there will still be things that we do not know, but we will have gone a long way towards assisting the medical profession and the citizens of Australia. I support the measure.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8.41 p.m.]: I would like to express my gratitude for the instructive and helpful discourse that Dr. Hislop has just given us.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE BILL

Second Reading

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 1st September.

Point of Order

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I rise to ask your advice, Mr. President, on a point of order, and I seek your permission to indicate why I rise on this point of order. This Bill deals with the establishment of a medical centre. Clause 13 of the Bill deals with the functions of the trust to be appointed under the Act. Paragraph (b) of subclause (3) of clause 13 states—

> The Treasurer on behalf of the State is authorised to guarantee, on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit, repayment of any money borrowed by the Trust under this subsection and the payment of interest thereon.

In asking you to rule in this connection, I contend that section 46, subsection (8), of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act is infringed by the inclusion of a clause involving a charge in a Bill of this kind which has been introduced without a Message. In elaboration of that point, and to enable you, Sir, to consider the matter from the angle from which I raise it, I would firstly draw your attention to page 713 of the Seventeenth Edition of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Might I ask, Sir, at this stage, if you will allow various references to be raised from both sides of the House, or if this line of rising on a point of order is, in fact, in order?

The PRESIDENT: I rule that Mr. Wise is presenting his reasons for asking for a point of order on the Bill that is before the House. Until I hear what the honourable member has to assert, I cannot make a decision. So I think Mr. Wise should continue to make his point, and it will then be for me to rule.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: With all respect, Sir, you, as President of this Chamber, are fully aware of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* and the various references contained therein.

The PRESIDENT: That is so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Therefore, if the honourable member is permitted to bring these references, then it would appear to me it might be reasonable, should I require to do so, for me also to be given the opportunity to draw your attention to certain references which might help you reach a contrary opinion.

The PRESIDENT: In reply to the Minister for Health, I do not propose to allow a debate on a point of order at this stage. I would ask Mr. Wise to make his point of order as brief as possible. I can look up any references that may be necessary, in my opinion, to help me reach a decision.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: With respect, Sir, I submit that the matter which should come before you is a ruling as to whether this Bill is in order to be proceeded with without a Message; without having with it an explanation why an honourable member of this Chamber does not think it competent for the Bill to be proceeded with. This is a matter for you to decide.

The PRESIDENT: I was allowing Mr. Wise to make his point, because it is possible that we could proceed immediately. So I would ask Mr. Wise to make his point and permit me to make a determination. I will find any references that may be necessary.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Without elaboration, may I respectfully draw your attention, Sir, to page 713 of the Seventeenth Edition of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, particularly to the first page of the chapter dealing with the scope of financial procedure, and charges upon the public revenue.

Might I further comment on the points I wish to raise to enable you, Sir, to consider this matter? In doing so, I draw your attention to page 782 of the same edition in which appear the words—

> The following examples may be given of such charges which require the Queen's recommendations.
>
> (2) Contingent or prospective charges on the Consolidated Fund (such as might arise from a Treasury guarantee).

Therefore, in the light of the words "such as might arise from a Treasury guarantee" having application to clause 13 of the Bill, I seek your ruling.

The PRESIDENT: It is my intention to give a decision on the request made by Mr. Wise for a ruling on whether this Bill is in order at the next day of sitting. Standing Order 402 provides that all questions of order which have arisen since the last sitting of the Council shall, until decided, be given precedence over any other question appearing on the notice paper. Therefore, I propose, at the next day of sitting, to give my determination on the question that has been raised.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [8.50 p.m.]: I move—

> That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 20th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.51 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 14th September, 1966

CONTENTS

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

QUESTIONS (14): ON NOTICE

POINT SAMSON JETTY

Maintenance Programme

1. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Works:

   What is the maintenance programme for the Point Samson jetty for the current financial year?

   Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

   The completion of repairs to the head of the jetty, which was damaged during cyclone "Shirley." Included in this work is the replacement of 11 timber piles.

   The routine maintenance of the neck of the jetty, together with the associated shore works, and the maintenance of plant connected with port operations. Included in this work is the replacement of 40 piles.