

vehicle for the rest of his life, and go to gaol! However, I still think the fines are too low for the offence compared with the fine for selling a few potatoes when one should not sell them.

I would like some further information from the Minister on giving a complete whitewashing to young people under the age of 18 years who have unlawfully taken control of a motor vehicle. A lad of 17 years and nine months although he has stolen, perhaps, a dozen vehicles, could get off scot-free under this proposal; but if he has reached the age of 18 he is regarded as being responsible, and he could have this accumulation of suspended periods held against him, during which time he is debarred from holding a driver's license. I would like some further information from the Minister.

What steps does the Minister propose to take to deter these young people from committing such offences? I understand this provision was borrowed from South Australia where it was found that it did have a definite effect, because when the law was amended to take away this precious right in the eyes of the young people there was a falling-off of this type of offence as compared with its commission in other parts of the Commonwealth. The Government now proposes to lift the lid; or, in other words, it is saying that it is not regarded as a serious offence.

Only a few years ago the majority of the offences of stealing cars, or the unlawful use of them was committed by adults, but at present the youngsters outdo the adults and the ratio is increasing every year. Does the Government propose to ignore this offence being committed by a young person even up to a dozen times? This is a growing problem and it is among the particular categories the Minister is whitewashing with this amendment.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Having drawn the Minister's attention to the provision in this clause, I hope he will listen to reason. It is a little late to propose making amendments to it at this stage. Nevertheless, there should be inserted in this clause a provision for magisterial discretion to be exercised and the offender would then have to prove to the magistrate that he had turned over a new leaf and was again a fit person to hold a driver's license.

Mr. CRAIG: The point made by the member for Warren is worthy of consideration. I do not know what number would be involved, but it would be considerable; and if the offence were to be the subject of inquiry in the first place, as suggested by the honourable member, this would take considerable time. Nevertheless, some consideration will be given to the suggestion, and an amendment could be made in another place. It was

intended to lift the suspension immediately because of the number that was involved.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 28 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.56 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 13th October, 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1401
Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—3r.	1400
Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1401
Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1401
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Intro. ; 1r.	1400
Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1401
Milk Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1401
Statute Law Revision Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	1400
Statute Law Revision Bill (No. 2)—Intro. ; 1r.	1400
Street Photographers Act Amendment Bill—Returned	1404
Supply Bill (No. 2) £23,000,000—2r.	1404
The City Club (Private) Bill—Receipt ; 1r.	1404
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Receipt ; 1r.	1404
Vermin Act Amendment Bill—Receipt ; 1r.	1404
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission Bill—3r.	1414
Wills Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	1400
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1415
MOTION—	
Noise in Primary and Secondary Industries : Inquiry by Select Committee—Motion	1418
Defeated	1427
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Commonage at Kalgoorlie and Boulder : Area	1400
Comprehensive Water Scheme—Quarterly Accounts : Effect on Administration Costs	1400
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act—Royal Commission : Appointment and Commencement of Inquiry	1400
Primary School at Helena Valley : Site and Commencement of Building	1400

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

QUESTIONS (4): ON NOTICE**MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT***Royal Commission: Appointment and Commencement of Inquiry*

1. The Hon. E. M. HEENAN asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Has the Government yet taken any steps for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act?
 - (2) Can the Minister give the House any indication as to when the inquiry is likely to commence?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Government is at present examining this question. If agreement can be achieved on the various points, such an inquiry may not be necessary. However, an early decision will be made and announced.

COMPREHENSIVE WATER SCHEME*Quarterly Accounts: Effect on Administration Costs*

2. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Is it the intention of the Public Works Water Supply Department to render quarterly accounts for charges on water service to farmers supplied from the comprehensive scheme?
 - (2) If so, does the Minister consider that rendering quarterly accounts in preference to half-yearly accounts will increase administration costs to a greater degree by necessitating more staff for meter readings and preparation of accounts?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is not expected that administrative costs will increase greatly, and it is considered that any additional cost is offset by virtue of a better service to the consumer.

COMMONAGE AT KALGOORLIE AND BOULDER*Area*

3. The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. J. J. Garrigan) asked the Minister for Local Government:

How many acres of land are there in the commonage adjacent to the towns of—

- (a) Kalgoorlie;
- (b) Boulder?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

Reserve 8767 (commonage) is adjacent to both the towns of Kalgoorlie and Boulder and contains 32,474 acres.

PRIMARY SCHOOL AT HELENA VALLEY*Site and Commencement of Building*

4. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Is the Minister aware that the Public Works Department resumed nine acres of land at Helena Valley for a primary school site approximately five years ago?
 - (2) Is it the intention of the Education Department to erect a primary school on this site within the next five years?
 - (3) If not, when does the department anticipate that a school will be built on this site?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) This depends on future development of the area. At the present time the existing schools cope adequately with the situation.

BILLS (4): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Wills Bill.
 2. Statute Law Revision Bill.
 3. Statute Law Revision Bill (No. 2).
 4. Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
- Bills introduced, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and read a first time.

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION BILL*Third Reading*

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

That the Bill be now read a third time.

The Minister for Agriculture has asked that I convey certain information to members in answer to some queries which were raised yesterday. During the Committee stage, reference was made to the desirability of reducing the maximum amount of stamp duty payable on the sale of cattle from 5s. to 2s. 6d. There was a suggestion that an appropriate amendment be made to the Bill in that direction.

The revenue for the fund is obtained through the imposition of a stamp duty on cattle sales; that is, under the Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Act of 1963, which is being superseded by the new legislation under the title of the Cattle Industry Compensation Bill, 1965. Consequently, no direct reference to the amount to be

charged on cattle sales is to be found in the Cattle Industry Compensation Bill. There appears in the second schedule of the Stamp Act the authority to charge a stamp duty on sales of cattle. This duty is set at a maximum figure of 1d. for every pound or for any fractional part of a pound of the amount of the purchase money in respect of one animal or one carcase sold singly.

But there is the added provision that this amount of a penny may be reduced to such other figure as the Governor may from time to time by proclamation declare. Notwithstanding the provisions of this item in the Stamp Act, the amount of duty collected in respect of one carcase, whether sold singly or as part of a lot, shall not exceed the sum of 5s. In this respect it is emphasised there is no similar provision in respect of the 5s. maximum to enable that figure to be set at any lower figure by the Governor's proclamation.

Members will appreciate that the figure of 5s. is based on a stamp duty at the rate of 1d. in the pound and is related to an amount of £60, which is considered to be a reasonable price at the present time for a beast. In response to inquiries made during the Committee stage, members are advised that it is the Government's intention, when general amendments to the Stamp Act are being introduced into Parliament, to reimpose the maximum figure of 1d. in order that it may apply to the Cattle Industry Compensation Bill when that measure passes into an Act.

It is intended, of course, to retain the provision enabling this to be reduced by Governor's proclamation; hence the prediction at this stage that a figure of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. will be imposed by proclamation in the first instance. It is further proposed that when these amendments of the Stamp Act are presented to the House, an appropriate amendment will be included to permit of the 5s. maximum being varied in the light of further experience.

This latter proposal answers the query raised by members as to whether it would not be appropriate, in view of the proposal to reduce the 1d. to $\frac{1}{2}$ d., to reduce the 5s. to some lesser figure, perhaps 2s. 6d. I trust that information answers the queries raised by members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILLS (4): THIRD READING

1. Milk Act Amendment Bill.

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

2. Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill.

3. Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill.

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

4. Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 12th October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan) [4.50 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to amend the Factories and Shops Act in several particulars, and the first amendment deals with a proposed new section 8A. This will have the effect of bringing government properties under the provisions of the Act whereas previously they have been exempt. The Minister, when referring to this proposed new section, had this to say—

This new section will specify more particularly the intention of the Act to cover factories which are operated by the Government or other Crown instrumentalities, to leave no doubt as to the obligations of such undertakings to comply with the health, welfare, and safety provisions of the Act, and also in respect of fees which apply to private industry.

With the reference to health, welfare, and safety provisions I entirely agree, but I am rather at a loss to see any advantage in the Treasury, on one hand, making fees available for a government department to pay because, on the other hand, those fees will ultimately be returned to the Treasury. While it is very nice to know that the Government is paying fees, the same as any other organisation, to me it is a case of the dog chasing its own tail.

The amendment to section 25 of the Act will give to the Chief Inspector of Factories a status which he previously held until 1964. Apparently it was found, in administering the Act, that to deprive the chief inspector of certain powers he had previously was a serious weakness and these powers will be returned to him under an amendment in the Bill. This amendment could also prove of benefit to people who desire to build factories, or alter factories; because under the present provisions of the Act these people merely have to submit plans to the local authority and it could be found, during the course of construction of the factory, that those plans were in conflict with the provisions

of the Factories and Shops Act. The provisions of this Bill, under which the chief inspector will be clothed with the same powers he had previously regarding the submissions of plans and so on, will mean a great improvement on the present position.

At the moment it is only necessary for the chief inspector to receive notification from a local authority in regard to certain plans, and I think the amendment will considerably improve the position and give the chief inspector a power of which he should never have been deprived. The amendment gives a protection not only to the chief inspector but also to builders and people who wish to build or alter factories, because plans will have to be submitted to both the local authority and the chief inspector.

To me section 32 of the Act is a somewhat strange section, or it will be when it is amended by this Bill; because the amendment will give the Minister power to exempt persons or organisations from the payment of fees. If we recall what the Minister said when he first introduced the Bill we will realise that proposed new section 8A will bring government instrumentalities into line with private concerns inasmuch as they will have to pay fees. As I said, when discussing this proposal, I cannot see any advantage in it so far as the taxpayer is concerned, except that a lot of red tape will be involved; but it seems rather strange that in the amendment to section 32, which is in the same Bill as the amendment to provide a new section 8A, we give the Minister the right to exempt certain people from paying fees.

I would appreciate it if the Minister would advise the House of the type of exemption he has in mind under this provision. It seems to me to be unnecessary and apparently it has not been needed in the past. The Act should cover all people and all organisations who are likely to come within its ambit, and I cannot see any reason for giving the Minister power to exempt certain persons or organisations when at the same time we propose to bring government instrumentalities into the field of being required to pay fees.

I think the amendments to section 33 could have serious consequences. I appreciate that in these days, when many companies have branches throughout the State, many records are kept at specific centres, but the idea of records being kept for perusal by inspectors appointed under the Factories and Shops Act is that those records shall be kept on the premises where the workers concerned are employed. For example, it is not much good providing that a firm which has a branch at Albany shall keep all its employees' records in Perth. That is of no advantage to the trade union organisation concerned or to an inspector appointed under the Factories and Shops Act. Any information they want should be available on the spot; and

time and wages records, and the like, should be kept at the place where the people concerned are employed.

If such records are kept at some other place there is a tendency for the principle covered by this section to be rendered useless; and I would like more time to pursue this angle with a view, possibly, to placing amendments on the notice paper at a later date.

New section 50 introduces a new principle under which, if the Education Department sees fit, it can allow a child to seek employment. If the department is of the opinion that a child will derive no benefit from further education it can allow that child to be employed under the provisions of this Act. There is no reason why, a child exempted by the Education Department under such circumstances should not be employed, and it is reasonable that officers of the Education Department should be given this authority to ensure that those children are the only children who are employed in shops and factories. I do feel, however, that there is a tendency in the Bill to introduce some suggestion of child labour; something that we have endeavoured over the years to get well away from.

Factory work and shop work is onerous and, in the main, envisages long hours. While I think the clause in the Bill generally means well, I feel it is somewhat of a retrograde step. Section 56 of the Act deals with the reduction of the minimum age at which a person may be employed, and there is a reduction in the employment age from 18 years to 16 years.

The introduction of this amendment, I feel, raises many problems. At this stage of our economy we do not desire people to enter employment at anything but the higher age groups, and we endeavour, where possible, to provide adjuncts to their education by way of technical colleges, and the like, so that they may, if they are forced to leave school at the minimum age, by self-education and by help on a Government basis, give themselves greater opportunities for the future.

Factory work in general does not lend itself to the opportunity of study or of further education. In the main, factory work calls for long hours and periods of overtime which do not permit of study during hours when there is no employment. Accordingly I feel that by altering the word eighteen to sixteen, and thus reducing the age, we will under this legislation take from many of our young people any opportunity they might have to further their education or their desires for better employment at a time of life when most of them need such education.

The next provision in the clause that I feel to be of serious consequence is the addition of the passage "for more than nine hours a day." If we look at section 56 (1) as it now reads—and I have already

dealt with the fact that the age is reduced from 18 years to 16 years—we will see that that follows on with the problem that arises with regard to overtime rates. There is to be a deletion from the last subsection of section 56 of the words “for the first four hours worked in excess of the prescribed daily hours and double time thereafter”. That is in lines 5 and 6 of subsection (3). At the moment the Act reads—

The hours of employment mentioned in subsection (1) of this section may be exceeded if wages at the rate of not less than time and a half are paid to each male employee who is employed on wages for the first four hours worked in excess of the prescribed daily hours and double time thereafter for all overtime and not less than rate and a half is paid to each such employee who is employed on piece work . . .

If this Bill passes it will take out the employment section which reads, “for the first four hours worked in excess of the prescribed daily hours and double time thereafter.” With these words taken out the provision will read that time and a half can be paid to each male employee who is employed on wages for all overtime and not less than rate and a half to each such employee employed on piece work.

Once we read those words into the Act by deleting the four hours of double time we prevent any double time being paid under the Act at all. I know that is not the intention of the Bill as introduced in another place. I am aware that this clause was somewhat of a problem clause and that even after the Bill was introduced it was amended to give this reading, because it was found that by introducing the reduction of 18 years to 16 years there was really no provision for overtime whatsoever between the ages of 16 and 18 years.

Complications were then found because, in trying to provide for the new age group by leaving the double time provisions in, the original Bill was not a workable one. I feel the problem has not been solved. The impression that can be gained at the moment is that, with the taking out of the double time provisions, the first four hours of excess will be at time and a half, and that double time will prevail after that period. I do not think this can happen, because of the present wording in the Bill. Furthermore if, basically, double time is a penalty period—and that was the intention of the Act—whereby there is a discouragement of work because of long hours involved, then it becomes essential that we retain in the provisions of the Act through this Bill the ultimate penalty of double time.

It was not easy to arrive at the conclusions that brought about this amendment to section 56 in its entirety, from

the point of the reduction of the age from 18 years to 16 years, and of the inclusion of the words “or more than nine hours in a day.” I am a little concerned about that very phrase. Surely nowhere today, outside of contract work, do we have a normal nine-hour day! I hope there will be some explanation forthcoming that the nine-hour day really incorporates an hour for a meal, or some such thing. I think it would be a retrograde thought, and certainly a most retrograde step, to introduce under this legislation a nine-hour day in shops and factories, which must be worked prior to the earning of overtime, whilst in the same Bill we include the desirability and appreciation of a 40-hour week.

I do not think for one moment there was any desire in the proposals in the Bill to make it other than a workable proposition. I feel that in its introduction the Minister was endeavouring to give effect to the amendments that he had proposed, but which had proved so difficult of achievement. Accordingly I feel the Bill needs more study. I would like further time to consider it and to discuss it with people who are associated with shops and factories in their everyday life.

At this point I will not oppose the measure, because I believe some of its clauses are quite good. But I do think the points I have mentioned need further consideration, at least on my part, and for my own benefit; and I would ask the Minister if he would consider leaving the Committee stages of the Bill until, say, Tuesday next, so that I might have the opportunity to hear his reply and to go further into the subject.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) (5.13 p.m.): I thank Mr. Willesee for his remarks and for his approach to this Bill. The honourable member has indicated to the House that he would like an opportunity to further study the Bill. He has intimated that he may put some amendments on the notice paper. I in turn would like an opportunity to study a little more closely the remarks he made on the second reading. So, being in agreement, I think I can reach the point of saying that I will ask the House to take the Committee stage later on. Mr. Willesee suggested that this stage could be taken on Tuesday.

With this in mind I do not think there would be any purpose in my trying to cover the points raised by the honourable member. We will both have an opportunity to examine this matter further between now and Tuesday, and the various points can be discussed during the Committee stage of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILLS (3): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. The City Club (Private) Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. H. K. Watson, read a first time.

2. Vermin Act Amendment Bill.

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

3. Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

STREET PHOTOGRAPHERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2), £23,000,000

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.19 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is the second Supply Bill which as usual comes over from another place at this stage of the Session and this Bill seeks a grant of £23,000,000 to enable continuation of services already in course.

For the period of three months ended the 30th September last expenditure incurred on services financed from the Consolidated Revenue Fund amounted to £23,947,000. Of this amount, £18,306,000 was expended under the authority granted by the earlier Supply Bill passed in this Chamber on the 4th August. The remaining £5,641,000 represent amounts authorised by appropriations under special Acts.

Expenditure during the three months ended the 30th September exceeded the total revenue figure of £21,544,000 by £2,403,000. The Budget is based on a deficit of £823,000 and the financial results of the first quarter do not indicate any variation from the estimated deficit. It is quite usual for the larger amounts of revenue brought to account later in the year to offset the normal deficit accumulation over the early months of the financial year.

General Loan Fund expenditure during the first three months totalled £3,935,000 and the rate of spending will increase as the major works programme builds up.

Of the £23,000,000 now being sought £5,000,000 is in respect of the General Loan Fund with the remaining £18,000,000 to be issued and applied out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

It is not an uncommon occurrence for the Leader of the House, in introducing Supply Bills, to ask the House to agree to a suspension of Standing Orders in order that supply may be granted to the Government of the day and the Bill passed through all stages at any one sitting. This was the case with the first Supply Bill, but on this occasion I have not asked the House for any agreement to suspend Standing Orders.

This Bill has been received in the normal way by message from the Legislative Assembly and it arrived yesterday. We have almost now completed the introduction of the second reading. As far as I am concerned I will be quite satisfied to see it take its normal course. However, may I say to the Leader of the Opposition that I would hope that its progress through the second and third reading stages would not be unnecessarily delayed, because Governments are naturally anxious to complete Supply Bills, which give authority for the spending of the necessary moneys required for the continuation of services.

I would be quite satisfied if we could complete the second reading of this Bill on Tuesday next. This would give members three days in which to talk about a number of various subjects. Many members take advantage of Supply Bills to do this. I would be quite satisfied that everything was in order if the third reading could be completed on Wednesday next. I hope this will be the case, and I ask members for their co-operation in this respect. I commend the Bill to the House.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [5.24 p.m.]: It is very unusual for me to address myself to the second reading of a Bill immediately following its introduction, and I do it only in connection with Bills of which I know the contents and import. I have made it a rule, even if a Bill is on a single piece of paper, not to presume I know a lot about it; and if it is on a subject which requires some comparison with the parent Act, I always adjourn the debate.

However, a Supply Bill is, of course, very different. It is a Bill dealing with the approval of the expenditure of sums of money during the current financial year for which provision has been made; and, indeed, it may include the Governor's warrants for certain expenditure at the time of its introduction.

This Bill has come to us following the suspension of Standing Orders in another place to enable it to pass. That is not unusual, even for the second Supply Bill,

because the second Supply Bill usually reaches us following the general suspension of Standing Orders about this time of the year in both Houses, and particularly in another place. This Bill requires the approval of the expenditure of £18,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Account and from the General Loan Fund, £5,000,000.

I would presume from the remarks of the Minister that he is endeavouring to get this Bill through in a reasonable time, but he is anticipating something that reasonably he must anticipate; that is, that as the Address-in-Reply debate collapsed, several members will be anxious to raise subjects which they were not permitted to raise because of the collapse of that debate; and this is one of the few occasions of the year when members of this Chamber have a chance to deal strictly with financial matters, to deal with subjects that are seriously agitating people in their own districts, to deal with policies of State, to deal with delinquencies of Governments and Ministers, or to deal with anything that comes within their observations in the administration by the Government of the affairs of State. Therefore members can on this occasion if they wish, within limitation, ride their hobby-horses or deal with other subjects of very great importance to them.

Our next chance to do this will be, strictly speaking, on the Loan Bill after the passing of the Loan Estimates; and the only other chance will be the Appropriation Bill. I would say this House is in a very difficult position, in spite of its great authority, in discussions and actions in connection with money Bills. The strictures in the Constitution Act and its amendments give this House no right to amend a money Bill.

We have very little opportunity to discuss the finances of the State, and I have often thought how important it could be to members of this Chamber, in following current trends of State finances, if, concurrently with the introduction of the Budget in the Assembly, Ministers were able—by motion or in some way—to give to the House information as to trends of expenditure and operations of departments. There could be something akin to, but not as wide as, the debate permissible in another place when the Budget is being considered in Committee, as it is now. We miss a lot, I suggest, as members and as a House, because of the lack of opportunity in that regard.

I would illustrate this by saying that when the Appropriation Bill arrives in this Chamber it is the signal for the doors to close. The Bill always gets here in the last hour or so of a session. It certainly gives the right to debate matters affecting anything under the sun, and particularly matters affecting the State; it gives that

right, but I suggest it does not give the opportunity, because at the time the Appropriation Bill is introduced the Assembly is waiting for its return so that both Houses may rise. So our opportunities are restricted.

When the Appropriation Bill arrives here this session, especially if our hard worked Ministers have had a bad week, or an all-night sitting and a strenuous time with their legislation, they—and all of us—will say, "This is nearing the end."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I have even heard you heave a sigh of relief when you were over here.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I agree; but I do strenuously point out how important it is for this House to have the opportunity to enter upon more debate concerning the financial matters affecting the State. We should avail ourselves of every opportunity to debate financial questions; and this Bill provides one of the few opportunities we have.

Ministers, quite understandably, are anxious to get legislation through as peacefully and as quickly as possible. But there are so few opportunities to deal with financial and general questions that I hope those members who have matters to present on behalf of their districts will avail themselves of every chance they have.

I make this suggestion, therefore, for ministerial thought: That it could be good for the State; good for the Government of the State; and good for Parliament and its members if an opportunity to have such a debate as I have mentioned were given to this House concurrently with the Budget debate in another place.

Last evening I made reference to the gentleman who is chairman of the Grants Commission, Mr. P. D. Phillips, Q.C. I referred to him as a strong man in a very important position, and I mentioned the enormous authority that the members of the commission have and the great influence they possess, in their determinations, on the well-being of more than one State.

The report last year of the Commonwealth Grants Commission—its 31st report—sets out in clear language what has happened through the years, not merely in the year under review, in respect of the finances of the claimant States and the standard States.

If members have the time and the opportunity to study, in retrospect, the trends in the methods adopted, and the decisions reached, by the Grants Commission, they will know a lot about how the State functions and how its departments work. Those members will be able to pinpoint the variations in expenditure, in the levying of taxation, and in the burdens placed upon the people, whether they be in connection with water supplies or motor vehicle registrations.

In the report of last year, reference is made to the taxes levied by the claimant States; and, in particular, I refer to license fees and vehicle taxation.

Paragraph 160 states that the commission's calculations show that in 1962-63 if the claimant States had levied taxes at the average rates and with the average exemptions applied in the standard States, Western Australia would have raised £217,000 less and Tasmania £72,000 less than they actually raised.

I deliberately picked out the paragraph dealing with that subject, because members will recall that when a taxing measure was introduced into this Chamber two years ago the Opposition, and some Government members, protested that the Grants Commission had not insisted on the raising of motor vehicle fees. I can recall a Country Party member vigorously supporting the arguments we adduced in favour of the non-necessity for this action.

The Grants Commission, in the paragraph I have just quoted, bore out our contention because that paragraph says that if we in this State had charged the average of the standard States for license fees and the like, Western Australia would have raised £217,000 less than it actually did from that item.

The next paragraph makes it clear that the Grants Commission has no intention whatever of taking into general account Budget corrections for the impact of road finance on State Budgets. In the light of what I have read in the newspapers in respect of what is likely to happen in regard to heavy transport taxation, that is a very pungent paragraph; and, as I understand it, the tax likely to be imposed this year on heavy haulage vehicles will go up by many hundreds per cent.

I have a communication from a heavy haulier in the north in which he suggests that on his calculations—and he is a man who understands figures—one vehicle that he uses will cost him more than £1,500 per annum to keep on the road, if the report of what is intended in regard to motor vehicle taxation is correct.

So I suggest that all members, particularly those who represent districts in which there is no transport other than by motor vehicle—districts in which nothing turns, unless a motor vehicle wheel turns, from the jetty end to the furthest point of the district—should concern themselves with this matter.

Without any sense of anticipating something than can only be anticipated by conjecture, I hope we will, a little later in this session, have ample time to study the effect of what is intended in regard to this subject.

I think the introductory remarks in almost all of the reports of the Grants Commission are very thought-provoking. I shall quote a little from the latest report.

and then I shall finish my remarks with a suggestion which, I hope, will be acceptable to you, Sir, as well as to the Chamber.

The first three paragraphs of the 1964-65 report of the Grants Commission read—

1. Formal applications made to the Commonwealth Government by the States of Western Australian and Tasmania for financial assistance in 1964-65 in pursuance of section 96 of the Constitution were referred to the Commission for report during 1963-64. Submissions in support of these applications were presented and examined at public hearings held in the claimant States, in Canberra and in Melbourne.

2. At the hearings in Melbourne on 13th July, 1964, and at subsequent discussions with the representatives of the claimant States, it was claimed that the following amounts would be required to balance the budgets of those States in 1964-65:—

	£
Western Australia ...	8,645,000
Tasmania ...	7,267,000

3. In its last three Reports, the Commission has adopted a standard based on the budgetary experience of New South Wales and Victoria. The two-State standard has again been adopted for the purpose of this Report. This matter is discussed in Chapter III of this Report.

As members who follow what happens in regard to grants know, because of the amounts that were claimed under the special grants provisions, as distinct from the other statutory payments from the Commonwealth, Western Australia benefited by £8,560,000 last year, and Tasmania by £7,300,000.

The thought I wish to express is this: All of us are affected by the decisions of the Grants Commission appointed under section 96 of the Constitution; but no matter how we may study these reports and wish to keep ourselves up-to-date with the financial trends of this and the other States, it is not always easy to follow how the conclusions have been reached.

The Grants Commission will be in Western Australia for some days in December—I think from the 4th to the 16th December—and I have been wondering whether I will be acting with presumption, both to you and to the Chairman of the Grants Commission, in making this suggestion—and I would hope not—that a letter from you as Leader of this Legislature, as distinct from the Government, might be sent to the Chairman of the Grants Commission asking him, as a privilege and a favour to this Parliament, if he would be prepared, during one of his visits, to address the members of our Legislature on all aspects concerned with the grants which the commission is pleased to recommend that the

Commonwealth make to the States; the methods used; and the analysis of the social services structure which the members of the Grants Commission analyse so completely; and if he would explain to us, as parliamentarians and legislators, many of the things in connection with which we have not very much knowledge ourselves.

I think this would be a great thing for the State and a very important thing for us. Therefore, with great respect, to you, Sir, I suggest that, if you think there is anything in the thought I have expressed, it be followed up by a letter from you to the gentleman concerned, Mr. P. D. Phillips, Q.C. I support the Bill.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Having listened to Mr. Wise's comments on the very important subject of the Grants Commission and what it means to Western Australia, and having heard his suggestion that I, on behalf of this Chamber, should write to the Chairman of the Grants Commission, I assure the honourable member that I will give his suggestion very earnest and mature consideration.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Thank you.

THE HON. G. E. D. BRAND (Lower North) [5.44 p.m.]: I am glad of this opportunity to discuss matters relative to my province, the Lower North Province. I wish, firstly, to say that I agree entirely with Mr. Wise's suggestion to have the Chairman of the Grants Commission lecture us, shall I say, on some things that we should know something about.

When I first made a speech on a different occasion I had to face a group of members of the fair sex, and the first thought that came to my mind was, "At last the awful moment has arrived" and that thought remains with me now.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Were they all fair?

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND: They were beautiful. This is a much different occasion and it has given me much food for thought. I entered these hallowed portals as a more or less innocent lamb, and if members will cast their minds back to the sudden cessation of the Address-in-Reply they will appreciate that I use the word "innocent" in its correct perspective.

This important occasion gives me an opportunity to mention the area in which I have lived all my life; namely, the eastern goldfields, or the Kalgoorlie-Boulder area. As we know, this area is in a most static position at the moment, because, unfortunately, we have not had the good fortune as yet to obtain an increase in the price of gold. As a result of rising costs and other factors the mineowners of Kalgoorlie and Boulder are very short of labour, one of the reasons being that they cannot afford the high wages that are being paid to men in the north. However, I think that the people in that area can

hang on for a few years more and will eventually obtain those things that they desire most.

Quite often the mention of Kalgoorlie brings to mind the wonderful civic and civil work of our very dear friend, Sir Richard Moore, who has been the mayor of that centre for about 26 years, and who was formerly a member of Parliament. To this remarkably efficient gentleman must go the plaudits of all citizens who, in any manner, have been connected with the life on the goldfields. Training under Sir Richard's eagle eye was a good grounding for the task I now have in hand, although he would not permit an overdose of verbosity, being keen always to get the problem in hand to a quick and satisfactory conclusion.

It is of great interest to me to watch the operations of Parliament, and it is expected that I, as a member of this Chamber, will show some improvement and contribute something useful to the debates which will ensue. I would also like to place on record the useful work of the town councils of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and the Shire of Kalgoorlie. The councillors give very freely of their time and talents and, as we know, provide the training ground for future politicians. Although mention has been made of the goldfields other areas represented are Menzies, Leonora, Laverton, and the districts of Meekatharra, Yalgoo and Paynes Find, together with the Assembly electorate of Gascoyne.

When one goes on tour in the Lower North Province, the scene changes from a static one to a moving and exciting one. The Great Northern Highway and the North-West Coastal Highway provide ample evidence of the rapid progress that is being made further north. Convoys of large vehicles are carrying huge loads through to the Exmouth area and to the iron ore centres.

I must also pay a tribute to the people of the north for the wonderful manner in which they have developed the country sometimes inhospitably dry, and at other times flooded and boggy with an odd cyclone thrown in for good measure. I have not yet mentioned the area of Exmouth Gulf and North West Cape. To say the least, the gigantic works that are being carried on in those parts are most exciting. The Administrator (Colonel Murdoch) deserves the highest commendation for the way in which he has applied himself to the establishment of a townsite and other allied projects.

North West Cape and its environs are top-quality tourist interests and any visitor can be assured of plenty of scenery, fishing, sightseeing, etc. However, I would point out that he is required to obtain a permit from the administrator to get a close look at the works currently being carried out. I would also recommend any visitor to Carnarvon to avail himself of the opportunity to visit the

tracking station. To use an odd word, this is a fantastic establishment, and it really opens one's eyes to see the activities that are carried on there.

Any motorist who has travelled through the north, and also those men who drive the big transport vehicles look forward to the time when they will be driving all the way on bitumen. Speaking of these areas reminds me that anyone wishing to see something interesting and to view the beautiful wildflowers growing in these parts, could take a run from Perth to Geraldton and on to Carnarvon, Meekatharra, Wiluna, Leonora, Kalgoorlie, and back to Perth. I would reiterate that the wildflowers in those parts are something of rare beauty and have to be seen to be believed. Therefore, I could recommend this trip to anyone who is thinking of taking a run around the country during the week-end, especially if they are desirous of seeing something beautiful.

In reverting to the comments that I made on the roads that lead to the north, I would like to point out that it is a well-known fact, especially from the point of view of transport operators, that once a vehicle has to be driven along a road that is not sealed one's troubles commence and the operating expenses begin to rise. It is indeed unfortunate that the Government finds it necessary to increase the tax on large semi-trailers, but apparently it is inevitable.

It has been a pleasure to support—although not yet verbally—legislation that has been passed in Parliament, and although some measures have been contentious, the behaviour of members in this House has been a pleasure to behold.

One or two problems which I regard as urgent and essential include the rapidly rising toll of the road, and I look forward to the day when this trend will be reduced instead of increasing daily, as it is at the moment. I sincerely trust that the latest amendments proposed to the Traffic Act will prove to be a great deterrent to traffic offenders. As the drinking of intoxicating liquor is one of the prime causes of deaths and injury on our roads, it makes me wish that the alcoholic content of both beer and spirits could be drastically reduced; because it is a true saying that one does not know who will be next. I do not know how this suggestion will be accepted by some people, but I do know that many persons drink because they like the taste of it. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that the alcoholic content of our liquors could be lowered and thus help to prevent people's lives being endangered.

It has been suggested that cars should be fitted with seat belts when they are manufactured and that governors should be fitted to the motors. I must agree with these suggestions although I consider that a trip to, say, Meekatharra, and to other

parts in the north, as mentioned a short while ago, would become rather boring if one had to drive at a low speed because the engine of one's vehicle was fitted with a governor; but some people would undoubtedly live longer. Of course, a great deal would depend on the speed at which the governor was adjusted.

Another matter I wish to raise—I do not know how it will be received—has reference to the Builders' Registration Act. I have here a letter from a friend of mine who resides in Carnarvon and he recently had a house built in that centre. He made his application through the proper channels, obtained a builder, and signed a contract, which eventually was sublet to another builder who carried out the work. When the house was completed this friend of mine was not very satisfied and he proceeded to say so to the contractor who, in turn, was not very happy and threatened to punch this friend of mine on the nose.

I will read portion of a letter I received in order to give members some idea of what people in the outback have to put up with. We know that the Builders' Registration Act applies only to the metropolitan area, but it is hoped that the activities of builders throughout the whole of the State will eventually be governed by this legislation. Portion of this letter reads as follows:—

Now re the building business.

When I brought the subject up at the last meeting, it was not my wish or intention to put you to any trouble in regard to pulling the builders into gear because of their efforts towards us. My main concern was to illustrate to all present, an anomaly that exists and which, for the benefit of the people in the North-West and other areas outside the metropolitan area, should be looked into.

These builders have been very shady in their operations and as I see it their methods are tantamount to fraud and trickery. I will lay out briefly some of the points which prompt these remarks:—

- (1) Refusal to give us or the Building Society a copy of the Contract.

Their reason is quite apparent, as we found out when our solicitors had to go to them and peruse it. To quote them—"This is something which you should have had legal advice on before signing."

To mention some points in the contract from my memory of our solicitors' letters.

- (a) If owners refuse to pay for any reason, builders have the right to

possess the house and sell to cover their expenses. We did this, hoping it would make builders rectify faults, but you can see what the consequences would have been.

- (b) No maintenance on building. (The Builders' Society told us there was 6 months maintenance period).

Many other items in the contract were of this nature.

- (2) Brochures on their homes and specifications.

They send out a lot of bull about all the extras one is supposed to get which is valued at £700-odd compared to what you don't get in a State house. Then the big joke comes when the house is finished—it's just not there.

Then again the specifications state cast iron porcelain bath and basin and they fit a pressed metal type.

Also three coats of paint and undercoat, you get one and in some places two thin coats.

To top this lot off, when I pointed out some of the faulty work, the builder threatened to punch a hole in my head.

- (3) Work supervision.

When we first saw these people about building they told us they would be up three times to check up on the work during the course of construction. This, of course, would naturally instill into our minds a feeling of confidence in their integrity.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Up from where?

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND: Builders who come up from Perth. The letter continues—

The facts are they only came up when the job was 99.9 per cent. complete, finished it off and said "Here's the keys," then when I refused to accept them they said "If you don't we'll sell it." He then locked the house and said "I'll see you in court."

You will agree that any reputable firm would not carry on in this way. I have made enquiries and have found out, from all over the place, that this is the way he carries on and has apparently been prosecuted on various occasions for breaches of building laws

(see paper cutting enclosed) and to quote him "There's a lot of building inspectors who hate our guts."

That gives members some idea of what people in the outback centres have to put up with, and I hope amending legislation will be introduced in the not-too-distant future to the Builders' Registration Act which will assist these people by having inspections made of any houses that are built in those parts. They do not care if contracts are sublet to Perth builders, but they are most anxious to see houses erected in a proficient and competent manner.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Who carried out that contract to which you referred?

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND: Up where?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said: Who carried out the contract to build the house to which you referred?

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order! Will the honourable member please address the Chair?

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND: I am sorry, Mr. President. I asked some questions about kangaroos some time ago and I have here an item which will probably be of interest to members because it concerns kangaroos in the northern part of this State. The man who had the house built in Carnarvon, and whose letter I have just read to the House runs two freezer units in various parts of the north above Carnarvon. He says that in 12 months he has handled 17,000-odd kangaroos at Minnie Creek, and 12,750 in four months at Yinnietharra, together with a few hundred emus, 50 eagles, numerous foxes, and a few donkeys.

People often say that they would not like to see kangaroos completely exterminated, but I think anyone who has driven through the areas in the north would be glad to see fewer of them and would not care what this man does in an effort to exterminate them.

The amount of time spent on only a few items such as I have mentioned indicates the veritable forest of Bills and other business that is handled by this House. I will therefore be content to say thanks to members for this first, and probably last, free hearing I have been given; but I cannot neglect to pay homage to you, Sir, the Ministers, The Hon. F. J. S. Wise, and members generally for putting this bewildered newcomer on the straight and narrow path.

I would like to thank the officers of the House for their advice and many friendly gestures. I also wish to compliment Mrs. Hutchison, the only lady member here. She has a particular interest in the subject of epilepsy, and it is enlightening to see that she is getting her teeth into the problems arising therefrom. Those in the community who cannot help themselves should be helped, and I congratulate Mrs. Hutchison on her interest in this matter.

Nothing now remains for me to do, except to prove to myself, mainly, that I am worthy of the electors I represent, and that I can be an intelligent contributor to all matters pertaining to the government of our State.

THE HON. C. E. GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [6.1 p.m.]: I am very pleased to be able to speak in the debate on the Bill before us, but before doing so I take the opportunity—which I missed on an earlier occasion—of expressing my appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to other members of this House for the assistance rendered to me since my election to Parliament.

This is not the first time I have spoken in this House, because on a previous occasion I did speak on a subject which was, perhaps, a little more contentious than the Bill now under discussion. I would like to pay a tribute to the officers and staff of Parliament for the courtesy and consideration they have shown me; their efforts have made my chores a great deal lighter.

I now make reference to a matter in which I am very interested, and one from which the electors in my province, in particular, will gain some benefit. I refer to the Youth Council of Western Australia which has been constituted under legislation introduced by the Government in the last session and proclaimed earlier this year. I offer my congratulations to the Government for introducing the legislation, and to the members of this House who supported the Bill for their very constructive comments in the debate. Their remarks will prove to be of great value to those serving on the Youth Council, and I hope the Youth Council members will read the speeches which were made in Parliament last year, because many of the answers to the problems of youth were referred to. Of course, it will be the duty of the Youth Council to sort out the proposals which were put forward by members here, and to put them into effect in correct perspective.

I have had many years of experience in youth work. Although I do not profess to know all the answers to the problems I do know at least this: The use of the leisure time of our youth, from the age of 14 years to 17 years, is a most important factor, and this is the period in their lives during which efforts should be made to educate them to become responsible citizens. From my experience in youth work I found that from the age of 14 years the youth drifted away from the orthodox clubs which they attended from probably the age of eight years, because the accent in these clubs is on physical training and activity. In certain instances the accent on physical activity should be subdued, and substituted by other attractive non-physical activities. I might be entirely wrong, but these are my thoughts. Our way of life makes us less ready to take on physical activities and exercise.

In my youth most of the boys performed physical tasks around the home, such as mowing the lawn and chopping the wood. Today that situation does not apply to the same extent. When a lad of 14 or 15 years of age attends an orthodox club in a district, where the accent is on some form of hard physical activity, he often turns away, because he finds it more pleasant to spend his time in the local milk bar. The result is that he is more prone to get into trouble. I hope the Youth Council will give some thought to youth activities from this modern approach. The days of supplying a large hall so as to overcome the youth problem are over.

The Youth Council has submitted its first report to the Minister. Earlier this session I asked the Minister a question as to whether that report had been examined by him, and if so what action had been taken up to that stage. He said that no action had been taken up till then, and the position was being investigated. I understand the report has now been adopted, and some portions of it have been put into effect. In the report reference is made to the implementation of the first stage of a comprehensive scheme which requires the allocation of some funds by the Treasury. I hope the Minister will see his way clear to providing the required money.

One factor in overcoming the youth problem is to train people to educate our youth. This is one of the biggest problems, because from my experience I found there were many enthusiastic people who were prepared to devote their time on a voluntary basis to looking after the youth, but they were not equipped to undertake the training of the youth in directing them along the straight and narrow path.

I hope the Youth Council will implement some scheme, through the funds supplied by the Government, for training youth leaders. By this means we will be able to have full-time, paid youth leaders in the various districts, and a dedicated person interested in youth work would be able to follow a career as a youth leader. The correct approach to this suggestion is not beyond the realms of possibility, and I hope the Youth Council has it in mind.

If the Youth Council, which has been set up by the Government, is to perform its duties in the way I expect, then the Government should be both courageous and generous in meeting the needs of the council. Delinquents have followed many patterns.

Sitting suspended from 6.11 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Before the suspension I had mentioned that delinquency followed many patterns and I was about to read some interesting statistics on this particular point. I would like to read one or two statistics from this chart which was obtained from the Police Department. It relates to my suggestion that the ages of 14, 15, and 16 years are

the ones when our youth require extra attention from youth leaders. From this chart, I will take breaking and entering.

The ages of the culprits range from seven years to over 17 years; and it is interesting to note that the number of charges for breaking and entering start at eight years of age with six per annum and it gradually increases until we reach 13 years of age with 98; 14 years of age with 139; 15 years of age with 155; and from then on the figure goes down the scale again. So it is quite significant that 13, 14, and 15 years of age are the ages for these particular offences by child delinquents.

We then go on to stealing (unspecified). It starts off at seven years of age with one per annum and with five at eight years of age; and the figures gradually build up to 13 years of age, 168; 14 years of age, 172; 15 years of age, 181; and then the scale drops again. It is quite a pattern. This age group is still the one in which this type of offence is committed by juvenile delinquents.

We then go on to another section; that of unlawfully assuming control of motor vehicles. Here again the pattern is in another way. Whereas prior to 14 years of age there was virtually none—and this would be because of their age—at 14 years of age the figure is 51; 15 years of age, 120; 16 years of age, 123; and then it virtually goes down again to nil. So from these figures it is quite apparent that this 14, 15, and 16 years-of-age group is the one which requires the most attention.

There is another table here which also gives an interesting pattern of child delinquency. This is for the years 1954 to 1963. It shows the percentages of breaking and entering offences committed by juveniles. Whereas in 1954 the percentage of the offences in this category that were committed by juveniles was 27.2—and juveniles are under 18 years of age in this particular table—in 1955 it was 35.6; in 1956 it was 29.1; and then, for some reason or other, in 1957 the percentage of breaking and entering offences committed by juveniles reached the astronomical figure of 70.5; and this has continued since 1957 to 1963. In 1958 the percentage was 71.8; in 1959 it was 71.8; in 1960, 74.7; in 1961, 78.1; in 1962, 77.09; and in 1963, 75.8. This great increase from 29.1 per cent. in 1956 to the 70 per cents. in 1957 is, in my opinion, remarkable, because the figure has never gone down, which means that from 1957 onwards we have failed to give our youth the necessary guidance and instruction they obviously require to take this percentage down to what it was prior to 1957.

I now turn to the unlawful use of motor vehicles. The figures for this offence follow exactly the same pattern from 1954 when 13.8 per cent. of the total

charges laid by the Police Department were against juveniles. The figure stayed between 20 per cent. and 30 per cent. until 1956, and in 1957 it rose to 60 per cent. and has continued in that vein up to the present day. So here again is proof that the 14, 15, and 16 year olds have been either neglected or denied the correct guidance to keep them as law-abiding citizens.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You cannot have wars and get over them in a generation.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Even if there have been wars, we have failed to rectify the situation in 20 years, because the pattern is still there.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: Don't you think it is difficult to get some of them to take an interest at this age?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Of course it is; because the trend in our everyday living has changed since 1956. The needs of our youth have changed, but the facilities for the needs of our youth have not advanced with the changing generations and, in my opinion, we as a Government, now we have established this youth council, should be unsparing in our endeavours to see that the facilities are provided.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We cannot make people better parents though.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: We cannot do so, but that is a different problem in my humble opinion; and I could speak on that subject, too. I do not want to take up the whole evening so I will refrain from being channelled off on to a new subject. However, I would say that from the information contained in the lists I have read, it is understandable that over the last 10 years we have spent £722,500 in Western Australia on detention homes and remand centres for youth who, for some reason or other, have become delinquents.

The Hon. N. McNeill: How much have we spent sponsoring youth activities?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not know; but this figure of £722,500 was given by the Minister in answer to a question which I asked earlier in the session. That is not all of the cost. The total cost, including salaries and incidentals, that we have spent in an endeavour to rectify child delinquency is £1,987,380. I am quite sure we have not spent anything like that amount on supplying an avenue for preventing our youth from getting themselves into the trouble that requires the State to spend this much money after they have wandered from the straight and narrow.

Another instance is the Fremantle gaol, which was originally built to accommodate approximately 300 people. It is, in fact, now accommodating approximately 500, of which 80 per cent. are under 25 years of age. As a consequence, this 80 per cent.

comes within the jurisdiction of the Youth Council set up under the legislation the Government introduced last year. I think this is another point to my argument that we have failed to provide the correct facilities for the leisure time of our youth.

The point about these remand institutions, as I will call them, is that we have not been lacking in finding the money to build them—in fact we have ensured that we have it. At Longmore we have provided the most up-to-date and modern method of re-educating our delinquent youth.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is the standard and that is why the money is being spent. It should be spent.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Of course it should be spent; but the point I am making is that although we are spending tremendous sums of money to house delinquents who have committed crimes, we are not spending anywhere near that amount of money to provide leisure-time facilities so that the young people will not get into trouble in the first place. If that were done we would not require the remand institutions which we will have to continue to build. The need will not cease.

I am of the opinion that no effort should be spared in providing the Youth Council with all the encouragement and finance we can possibly afford so that it can proceed on its given task of preventing child delinquency in this State. I believe that even Longmore, which was opened earlier this year, is full to capacity already. I do not know whether we are to build another similar remand centre next year, but the vicious circle goes on and on.

Members are probably wondering when I am going to get around to the point I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, when I said that this particular provision can benefit the province I represent. I would suggest that many members know that the Y.M.C.A. in Bentley is a wonderful organisation where facilities are provided for our youth. However, that centre is full to capacity and no new members can be accommodated; they have to be knocked back because there are no facilities or leaders to deal with any more youth from the district. The youth are crying out for avenues where they can spend their leisure time. I could elaborate on that point, but I will not.

However, I will mention that for years the Y.M.C.A. operated in South Perth, and only two or three months ago the organisers wrote to the South Perth City Council and said that due to the poor facilities which were provided for the members, they were unable to carry on and regretfully had to close down their operations there.

I contend it is a disastrous state of affairs when an organisation such as the Y.M.C.A. in South Perth has to close its

doors to the youth of the district because facilities cannot be provided for the education of the youth in the use of their spare time. Many other organisations are battling under extreme difficulties in this province to provide an outlet for the youth.

There are many noble men in the district who devote their time to the young people, and they work in halls and so on with absolutely no facilities to attract the youth to them. I think that the youth council could well look to this particular province at an early stage to provide a much needed facility for the youth of this district.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Do the local parents support those groups?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: They do to a point, but that is another story. That is all I wish to say on the Youth Council. I would now like to take the opportunity to mention another very worthy organisation in my province, and I refer to Ngai-a. This organisation is doing a stirring job in looking after the welfare of many infants and mothers of this State.

For the benefit of members I will give a brief outline of the work being done. No doubt, many members will already be aware of this good work. I will outline what is done, and what is hoped to be achieved in the future with some assistance from the Government; which I know will be forthcoming. Firstly, Ngai-a has facilities for accommodating 60 infants up to the age of three years, who are either in the care of the Child Welfare Department, or the Native Welfare Department, or who are being cared for whilst their mothers are ill or in hospital for some reason or another.

I have spoken to the matron on many occasions and she would like to have the children until school age, if accommodation was available. In addition to this, accommodation is provided for six married mothers and babies who are in need of nursing aid. There is also provision for 24 unmarried mothers. These mothers are admitted at various times prior to the birth of their babies subject to the mother's age, health, and the accommodation available at the particular time.

The matron at Ngai-a, at most times, manages to squeeze in more than 24. She does this because she is the sort of person who does not like to turn people away. The demand is there for the facility. The matron has suggested to me that because of the compact and friendly atmosphere which exists at Ngai-a, those in charge do not wish to expand further the facilities at South Perth. They want to keep the atmosphere as it is at the moment and do not wish to become a big institution which would detract from the type of work they are endeavouring to do for the community.

I have spoken to the matron and the committee and they are extremely grateful for the additions which the Government provided this year and which enabled them to increase their capacity at least a little. The committee and the matron are grateful indeed. Because they do not wish to increase the size of the buildings in the present location, an approach was made to the Minister for Health and the Minister for Lands for the provision of more land on which to build a similar hospital, preferably on this side of the river. There are several reasons for erecting it on this side of the river, not the least of which is that there are often cases when a baby needs urgent medical treatment at the children's hospital. At the moment, city traffic has to be negotiated and it is felt that if a new hospital was built on this side of the river that problem would not have to be considered. This is reasonable enough.

After consulting with the Ministers I have mentioned, the committee suggested that perhaps a portion of land near the Lemnos Hospital or the Shenton Park Annexe could be made available for this new proposed hospital. Those two particular localities would be ideally situated for the purpose. Therefore, I hope that an early decision can be reached by the Ministers so that this needed facility can be provided.

It is also very interesting to note that Ngai-a provides the only training school in this State for infant health sisters. It is also able to train young women for mothercraft nursing, although the present capacity is restricted to the training of only 18 persons annually in each category. Notwithstanding this fact, there are many more applications than this number received annually by the committee.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Including applications from the Eastern States.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That is right; and that is all the more reason why we should have another hospital. I am quite sure that the Minister for Health is entirely in agreement with what I am saying, and I am confident he will give his utmost attention to the matter.

I have one or two other matters on which I would like to say a few words at this juncture. Firstly, I would refer to the important regional roads as they are defined in the Stephenson-Hepburn report of 1955 and the Metropolitan Regional Scheme report of 1962.

There are a large number of these particular roads in the plans, some of which are in my province, and one in particular, of which I will make mention tonight, is Manning Road. There is no provision in the scheme for any standard as to how these roads are to be designed or built. There is no provision stating who is going

to pay for them, and I am quite sure it would be completely unjust to expect the local authorities to provide these important regional roads for the use of the public generally of the metropolitan area. I would say, as far as Manning Road is concerned, that it is in a shocking state of repair.

The local authority with which I am connected is most anxious to do something about it, because a large portion of it runs through the South Perth City Council area, and another portion through the area of the Shire of Canning. However, there is no plan laid down as to how the road is to be constructed or who is to pay for it. Nothing is being done about it and every day electors in my province are asking me what is going to be done about Manning Road because their children have to travel to school along this road. Hundreds of them pass along it every day, risking their lives because of the immense amount of through traffic—traffic which has nothing to do with the City of South Perth. More through traffic than any other uses this so-called important regional road.

It is my contention that the Government should accept at least some responsibility for the designing of these roads and should contribute towards the cost of their construction, particularly Manning Road. Now that the new college of technology at the Collier pine plantation has been opened, Manning Road is the only road along which students travel to get to the college and this, of course, has increased the flow of traffic tremendously and is an additional reason why a quick decision should be made by the department regarding what is to be done to assist the local authorities in bringing the road up to a standard that is required for an important regional road.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Is it an important regional road?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: It is supposed to be and in parts it is. Another important aspect in connection with these roads, which are laid down under the scheme, is that there will have to be a large number of resumptions to enable the roads to be built. Goodness only knows who will pay for those resumptions because there is no mention in the scheme as to whose responsibility it will be.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The taxpayers.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I would say that the Government will certainly have to come to the party on this aspect.

I now wish to comment briefly on a regulation introduced about a year ago by the State Electricity Commission and about which I have expressed my feelings on many occasions, as I shall do tonight. Approximately 12 months ago the State Electricity Commission promulgated a regulation under which, if consumers' points of attachment are more than 80

feet from the commission's poles, the consumers have to erect and pay for poles on their own premises to carry the commission's mains. I think this is an absolute imposition on the people.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Hear, hear!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have expressed this view on many occasions previously.

The Hon. E. C. House: We provide miles of our own lines in the country.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That is all right! I dislike this regulation for several reasons. As members know, I am an electrical contractor and in my electorate—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You were.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Well, I was an electrical contractor. In my electorate there are many elderly people who can ill afford to pay the sum of money that is required to erect a pole on their property because, through no fault of theirs, the S.E.C. poles happen to be on the other side of the road.

The most peculiar part about this question is that for years mains have been connected to premises and then, because of the age of the wiring, or winter storms, the mains are blown off and burn out. This sort of thing happens every winter and the people concerned are faced not only with the cost of having to renew the run-out into their houses but also the additional cost, because of the new regulation, of erecting poles in their own front yards. This work has to be done at the consumer's expense and old age pensioners and those on fixed incomes in my electorate, anyway, can ill afford to pay for it.

I think the State Electricity Commission was very harsh when it introduced this regulation and, although the commission argues that it has good reasons for it, none of its reasons has convinced me that it is not an imposition. I could go on giving members illustrations of why I think it is an imposition but I shall not do so.

My experience in the electrical contracting industry, I believe, entitles me to make a final recommendation regarding the Electricity Act as it is at present worded. An enormous amount of electrical installing work in this city is being carried out by unlicensed people, and this is only because prosecutions are difficult owing to the inadequacy of the Act as it stands.

Law abiding electrical contractors who endeavour to do the right thing are frustrated by the Act, but the chap who is not so law abiding can punch holes in it and do electrical work at will with no fear of being charged. There is absolutely no chance of his being convicted for performing work as an unlicensed contractor, and the number of successful prosecutions

against people for doing this sort of work could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

The Hon. E. C. House: What about the insurance on the house?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I would not have a clue! That is the worry of the insurance companies.

The Hon. E. C. House: People cannot insure a house if the work has not been done by a licensed contractor.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: How would the insurance companies know? How does anybody know?

The Hon. E. C. House: That is the point I wanted to know.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: There is absolutely no way of knowing whether or not a licensed electrician has done electrical work; because there are many who are just as competent to do the job as is a licensed electrician. I would not say that all of them who perform this work are not competent, but a tremendous number of them are not and that is the reason why I brought this matter forward—people have not got the protection which the Act was originally designed to give them. At some future date I think the Act should be looked at in this regard. That is all I have to say and I support the second reading of the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. H. R. Robinson.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COASTAL SHIPPING COMMISSION BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [8.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Previously, I asked for a postponement of this order-of-the-day because I wanted to be able to provide the House with the information requested of me by Mr. Wise when he spoke on the second reading and during the Committee stage. He raised two or three points and the first question he asked was whether the State Shipping Service intended to operate as a State shipping service or whether it had in view operations outside of Western Australia and, in fact, outside of Australia.

I am advised it is not contemplated, at least at this stage, that the State Shipping Service will operate outside its present function. Of course, at the moment it is operating around Australia, and, as I explained during the course of the debate, this is being done to make its operations more economical. This was suggested by Captain Williams in his report and there was an opportunity for a better outlet for the produce of the north.

Another question raised was in connection with the stevedoring activities on State ships. I am told that at present the State Shipping Service has commenced stevedoring operations in the south—that is at Fremantle—but that it is intended to limit its operations in this regard to Fremantle and they will not be extended to the north.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Of course, they will have a special terminal at Fremantle.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, and that has already started. Two other points were brought to my notice and one related to the tabling of the 1963 report. Mr. Wise had the 1962 report but he said he did not have the 1963 report. I understand that report is available and will be tabled. Why it has not been tabled up to now I am unable to explain, but it certainly will be made available. The Bill, when it becomes an Act, will provide for the regular tabling of a report, annually, by the commission.

The only other outstanding feature was, I think, raised not only by Mr. Wise, but was also mentioned by Mr. Baxter. This related to the financial ability of the commission to carry on. Financial ability will be given to the commission on a number of counts. First of all, it will be serviced, as it has been in the past, by the General Loan Fund, and the Bill provides for the appropriation of moneys to the commission by Parliament.

There is also provision in the Bill for the commission's own fund raising up to the limitation that is permissible, to wit, £100,000 annually. It is given a special ability to raise funds which, of course, will be dependent upon the permission of the Treasury and also of the Loan Council, in the event of such funds being desired to be raised from time to time by the commission.

I think those are the four main points that arose out of the debates both on the second reading and in the Committee stage, and I undertook to give some information concerning them before the Bill passed through the third reading stage. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 7th October, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [8.18 p.m.]: This Bill highlights the fact that when one departs from fundamental principles one creates all sorts of anomalies, absurdities, and very difficult and extraordinary situations. I think it is

well for us to remember that the fundamental principle of the Workers' Compensation Act is not to provide general accident insurance to individuals at the expense of the community, or at the expense of the individual person. If it were so minded, Parliament could provide for legislation requiring that every person insure himself against accident and pay the requisite premium thereon.

Alternatively, it is open to any individual today to take such a course and to take out such an accident policy with any insurance company. This Act has a very distinct and limited purpose which is, at the expense of his employer, to provide compensation to workers who are insured in or about their employment and to do that without any limitation or diminution of a worker's rights under common law.

Last session, rightly or wrongly, Parliament made a substantial departure from that fundamental principle in extending the cover of a worker not merely to injuries incurred in the course of his employment, but also to injuries arising out of any accident when travelling to his employment, or from his employment.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That has always been there.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: No, it has not.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It should have, anyway.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: It would appear that at least one member of this House has no knowledge of what Parliament did last year, because it was only last year that we put that provision into the Act. In the course of putting that provision into the Act, the Act was amended, in effect, to provide that an employee or a worker would be covered if going to and from his place of work, or to and from a pickup or a place of pickup.

By the insertion of the words "place of pickup" it was then thought that provision would cover waterside workers on their way to their place of employment, or prospective employment, and on their way home. But the very basis of the Act and of its operation is that it is confined to workers within the meaning of the Act. A worker within the meaning of the Act is a person who has an employer in respect of whom there exists the relationship of master and servant.

It so happens that waterside workers are hired daily. Whereas a shop employee in one of our city stores goes home and returns the next day and during the whole of that period he has an employer, it is not so with the waterside worker. The waterside worker presents himself in the morning and is engaged by stevedore A or stevedore B; but he ceases to be employed by that person when knock-off time comes. So we find, notwithstanding the words relating to pickup which were inserted in the Act last year, that a waterside worker is still not covered by the to-and-from clause as it is known.

One of the purposes of this Bill is to overcome that particular position. I think it is covered in the first paragraph of clause 2. This is a pretty good illustration of what happens when one gets away from first principles, because the draftsman has had a pretty good headache, or so it would appear, in using half a page of the Bill to produce the requisite verbiage, so that waterside workers may be covered in the event of their having an accident going to the pickup or coming from the pickup. In essence the half page of verbiage which is before us means that if a waterside worker ceased work tonight and went on a customary strike for a month, two months, or three months—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: When?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: —and then presented himself at the pickup for employment three months hence, and on his way to work that day had an accident, he would be covered for compensation. But the employer who would be responsible to meet that compensation would be the employer who ceased to employ him three months before.

The Hon. J. Dolan: How long is it since there was a case like that?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: That would be the position at any time.

The Hon. J. Dolan: How long is it since they have been away for three months?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: They go on holidays. Some of them may go up north and earn £50 or £60 a week driving a motor truck.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You know they cannot do that.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Some of them go on sick leave, and we know what a man does when he goes on sick leave.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I go to bed.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: It seems to me to be an extraordinary provision that an employer who has ceased to have any contractual relationship with a worker—even though it may be for one week, two weeks, two months, or three months thereafter—should, when an accident occurs, being the company with whom that man was last employed, be responsible for meeting the claims of the accident. That is what the Bill provides; and let it be faced quite frankly that that is really the only practical method by which a waterside worker can be covered on this to-and-from provision.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That would only arise when that employer was a self-insurer.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: No.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would only have practical application when the employer was a self-insurer.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: It has a practical application, because that employer would either have to meet the claim or pay the requisite workers' compensation insurance.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He would pay the insurance whether the man had an accident or not.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes, but the premium would be altered under this provision. I think that automatically follows, because it increases costs. I will concede that if the principle is to apply to the person permanently employed then, inasmuch as waterside workers are—if one might coin a phrase—permanent casuals, one can extend the provision of the Act, because they do present themselves at the same pickup place each morning. Even if their employment is casual it is, in the main, continuous; and, as I say, they are, in that sense, permanent casuals.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is surely better than a casual permanent.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I will leave it to the Minister, with his usual skill in dialectics, to explain the difference between the two phrases.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: One of these days some of you will grin on the other side of your faces.

A member: What was that for?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The point I want to make is this: The whole essence and object of the clause is to cover waterside workers and those engaged in and about the harbour.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. J. Dolan: There is no mention of waterside workers anywhere in the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: But we know it has been introduced for that express purpose.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You only imagine that.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Who told you that?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The way the clause is framed at the moment it is possible that it could unintentionally include the building industry. While the pickup at the wharf is a recognised place, the place of pickup in the building industry is the project of the moment.

A carpenter may ring up a builder and apply for a position. The builder says, "I am building a house at Attadale. Report there to the foreman and he may give you a job." That is the pickup place on that particular occasion. However, a month or two later the same man may apply to the builder for another position

and he may say, "Report to Donnybrook. I am building there. Go down there and see if you can get a job."

If this provision were to apply to the building trade the position would be simply chaotic because many months could elapse between the last place of employment and the last employer and the new place of employment and the new employer. Yet the same principle would apply. The man who was the last employer, even though it was six months previously, would be the one who would be liable for the workers' compensation.

I would like the Minister to have a look at this clause. I have placed a couple of amendments on the notice paper which I think will remove any doubt on the matter; but I would like the Minister to be good enough to study the clause and make it clear that it is confined, as I think it is intended to be confined, to those working in and about the harbour where, as I say, we have the situation of steady, casual labour. That is all I wish to say at the moment.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [8.34 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words on this Bill, which is a very important one and one that has aroused quite a bit of interest and concern, particularly within the industry to which Mr. Watson has just referred; that is, the building industry.

First I must say I am in accord with the purpose of the Bill. It proposes to enable an injured employee to receive compensation without prejudicing his right to institute proceedings under common law, and at the same time to continue to receive the full limit of payment under the Act. It also provides for the increased payment to dependants of injured workers; and I think this is very desirable.

However, I am concerned with the amendment to section 7 because it implies that this provision could cover men seeking employment in the building industry. We can envisage a situation in which a person contacts an employer who instructs him to proceed to a certain site. He could tell the worker to go to such-and-such a project at Fremantle, York, Bunbury, or Albany to interview his foreman in order to ascertain whether a job is available. In the process of proceeding from the point at which he contacted the employer either by phone or personally to the project, he could be injured—and very seriously injured. Under this provision in the Bill the worker's last employer would be responsible for the payment of insurance for compensation.

In my opinion that needs to be tidied up. No doubt the Minister is satisfied in his mind about it, but I am not concerned with the Minister's opinion. I am concerned about the opinion of the person sitting on the bench who is called upon

to interpret what we have written into the law. The following is proposed new subsection (1d):—

(1d) For the purposes of this section, any place at which persons, ordinarily employed in a particular employment, customarily attend, by prior arrangement, for the purpose of being selected and engaged, and at which employers customarily select and engage persons, for that employment is the place of employment of a person who attends there for the purpose of being selected and engaged or who is travelling between that place and his place of residence, in order to attend there, or by reason of having attended there, for that purpose; and such a person, while so attending or travelling, is deemed to be a worker under a contract of service with the employer by whom he was last employed in that particular employment;

I think Mr. Watson pointed out that a considerable period could elapse between the time a person ceased working for one employer and when he was about to commence working for another. Once he approaches a new employer for work, his last employer is responsible under this Bill if he is injured. I say that is entirely wrong and it needs to be clarified, which is the intention of Mr. Watson's amendments. For that reason I hope that when the Bill is in Committee members will see the points which Mr. Watson and I have endeavoured to bring before their notice, and that the Bill will be amended in a manner acceptable to those it is intended to cover. Although the Bill does not contain the persons referred to, the very purpose for its introduction was to cover those workers engaged in waterside activities.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery interjected.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: This amendment was presented to us to cover those people who work in and around the harbour.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Did you have some prior knowledge of this?

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: It is the general opinion, but we do not have to write it particularly into the Bill.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It does not say a word of that in the Bill.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: We do not have to write the very purpose in the Act, but the fact remains we know it was omitted when the provision was dealt with last time. In my opinion it is a worth-while Bill and I have no complaint about it. It should be wholeheartedly supported; but let us make it clear that it does not involve other sections of industry which should not be involved. I support the Bill with the intention of supporting the amendments to be moved in Committee.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan.

NOISE IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY INDUSTRIES

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 22nd September, on the following motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the incidence of industrial noise in primary and secondary industries, to—

- (a) ascertain the causes of and objections to such noise;
- (b) recommend preventative measures to eliminate excessive noise; and
- (c) recommend, if found necessary, methods of compensation where hearing is damaged by noise.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8.42 p.m.]: All members are, I have no doubt, cognisant of the wording of the motion of Mr. Stubbs. When introducing it, Mr. Stubbs was at some pains to explain that he was perfectly genuine in submitting it. From my experience of Mr. Stubbs I felt that assurance was quite unnecessary because I think that we have all been convinced during the time Mr. Stubbs has been here of his good faith because of the work he puts into his speeches and the research he undertakes.

However, I feel constrained to recommend opposition to the motion, and I will try to set forth my reasons for this as well as I am able to. I would like to deal with the motion in the sequence it was submitted by Mr. Stubbs. The first part reads—

- (a) ascertain the causes of and objections to such noise.

This is, as is (b), a matter of fact and a matter in regard to which we can ascertain quite factually what the situation is. We can establish a level which is objectionable, and we can measure by machines the noise which is emitted by any piece of equipment. Therefore, we can say whether it is objectionably noisy. But this sort of work requires technical experience, skill, machinery, and instruments. It is not a matter of opinion; it is a matter of fact whether or not a piece of equipment emits an objectionable noise. We even have to start a little further back than that to determine technically what is in fact an objectionable noise.

Mr. Stubbs pointed out that any noise over an intensity of 90 decibels can be deleterious. It is not quite so simple as that. Modern research has definitely proved that there is a relationship between intensity and frequency. For instance, it is quite conceivable—as a matter of fact it is provable—that one can stand,

without deleterious effect, a low pitched noise of 90 decibels for a far longer period than one can stand a high pitched whine of 90 decibels.

It is also obvious that practically all modern equipment tends to make objectionable noises. For example, when we consider as a prime mover an old-type reciprocating steam engine with its thump thump, we know it can be extremely noisy, even in the range of 90 decibels. But it would not be as objectionable or as harmful as a modern turbine with its continuous high pitched whine if that also were at 90 decibels.

Once we have established a formula for what constitutes an objectionable noise—and this can only be ascertained by exact and scientific examination—then it is a matter of investigation with the use of technical equipment in the hands of technicians to learn whether or not a particular piece of equipment is emitting an objectionable noise; and, as I say, this is a matter of fact.

In my opinion a Select Committee is better occupied with questions that are matters of opinion; matters in which one opinion is argued against another and on which a conclusion must be reached.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What about boilermakers?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: What does the honourable member mean?

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: The noise of the hammers. Boilermakers nearly all go deaf.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will mention boilermakers in a minute. I think it is easily provable, either by examination with instruments, or by empirical means, that the noise suffered by a boilermaker is harmful; because we all know that many boilermakers finish up deaf. Do we, then, need a Select Committee to find that out? Let me discuss that question in its proper sequence.

I think the same sort of argument also applies to the second point raised by Mr. Stubbs; and that is to recommend preventive measures to eliminate excessive noise. Perhaps at this stage I should say that, as Mr. Stubbs has mentioned, in recent years quite a considerable amount of research has been carried out, both overseas and in Australia, and indeed in this State, into noise and its harmful effects; and industry has, of its own volition, carried out a lot of experiments in connection with the prevention of the harmful effects of noise.

Ear plugs have been tried, and ear plugs inserted in the ears will stop the impact of noise immediately on the actual ear drum; but, as any honourable member may find out for himself by putting his fingers in his ears, there is still the conductive capacity of the bone and the surrounding tissue of the ears which will

allow a considerable amount of noise to get through. To overcome this trouble, large ear muffs have been used; and, indeed, they are an essential and required item of clothing for those persons working around jets. But in those situations the necessary discipline can be invoked to ensure that the ear muffs are used.

All these things have proved to be of little value. The workmen find them irksome. One fellow wants to talk to his mate, and he pulls out his ear plug to do so. Another man finds it is very hot and he removes his ear muffs.

The gradual sort of deafness which is brought about by the persistence of noises of too high an intensity or frequency is so gradual that the average person—this applies to most of us—adopts the attitude: it won't happen to me; and it is not until too late that he wishes he had done what he should have done. How many members here have used a grindstone without first putting on a pair of protective glasses? I think most of us have done that and have taken risks of that sort, which are quite unnecessary and indeed are foolish. So it is understandable that these sorts of things do not succeed.

It has been found with regard to equipment in factories that about the only way to achieve success is to isolate the noisiest pieces and surround them with absorbent material. Not long ago I saw the simplest expedient—baled hay—had been used temporarily for this purpose. The people concerned finally put a special sound absorbent wall around the machinery, but for some time they used baled hay which was quite successful.

The methods of preventing noise are fairly well known, and I think they can best be exemplified in the ordinary motorcar. We can purchase motorcars which are literally whisper-quiet. I think we have all seen advertisements for such cars. There are some vehicles in the higher price range which we know to be extremely quiet. But the efficient noise elimination in a motor vehicle, whilst comparatively simple to bring about, is one of the most expensive aspects of vehicle construction. Complete and efficient noise elimination in a motorcar is very expensive; and the same thing applies to tractors, which Mr. Stubbs mentioned. A considerable amount of noise can be eliminated from a tractor by careful and exact engineering.

The Hon. E. C. House: Why do not the manufacturers do that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I will tell the honourable member in a moment. It can be done by completely enclosing the motor with sound absorbent material. But to start with we would need to have very exact engineering with absolute minimum tolerances, and these are very expensive. The complete enclosure of a motor in a sound absorbent jacket, fully ventilated with forced draught fans, which

again are very expensive is costly, and so is a muffler; and a completely efficient muffler is also expensive in power.

I suppose that when most of us were growing up we had motorcars or motorbikes, and I hazard the guess that many members here can vividly recall extracting the baffles from the mufflers in order to get the little extra power out of the motors. The removal of the baffles, of course, means more noise. Silence in motors is expensive both in money and power.

This is a self-evident truth; because the most expensive motorcar in the stock model range is the Rolls Royce, and one of its pre-eminent claims to fame is its utter and complete silence. Silence in motor vehicles is expensive, so we would of necessity expect to pay more for a silent vehicle. But whether or not it is necessary to have almost complete silence in vehicles is a matter which is already known; it is a matter which we can ascertain with exactitude; it is a matter which calls for special techniques and equipment in order to measure the amount of noise. We have to consider the knowledge and theory of the mechanics of the ear and of the ordinary physiology of the human being and what he can stand; and there is the matter of checking each machine and deciding the level at which to stop all noise.

One of the worst forms of noise, and one which, I imagine will probably prove most difficult to handle, is the wheel on the road. This is an extremely difficult matter, as members who have driven in even the most expensive cars must know, because they must have noticed this noise. I do not know how one would eliminate the continuous roar of a city.

The point I wish to make is that items (a) and (b) of the submissions put forward by Mr. Stubbs are matters in respect of which a lot of information has already been collected; and they are matters of fact and not of opinion. It is known very well that noise is a health hazard and that all sorts of steps should be taken to eliminate it; but it is one of those things which it is very difficult to do. It is easy to pass a law to provide that we shall not use a motorcar horn; it is easy, in the calm atmosphere of a legislative chamber, to agree to that, but when one is in a car in a traffic jam, it is equally easy to press on the motor horn and make a lot of noise.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It does not get you anywhere, though.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I agree. I suppose the most ardent supporters of the anti-noise campaign will yell as loud as their neighbours at a football final. That is the nature of man. But we know the situation in regard to these things; and a Select Committee, I submit, would uncover no new evidence.

Item (c) is a completely different matter because it states—

Recommend, if found necessary, methods of compensation where hearing is damaged by noise.

This is matter of opinion and of policy. I will not be arguing whether what I am going to say now is right or wrong, but I will be pointing out what the situation is at present.

The Workers' Compensation Act is designed to recompense for loss of earning capacity. If a person is a miner operating at the face, and there is an accidental explosion, or an explosion of some other sort, which results in damage and part of that damage is loss of hearing in either one or both ears, that is a compensable accident. But if that miner leaves the mine whilst he still has good hearing and takes a job as a boilermaker, and over the years loses his hearing, he would not have a compensable claim. The first is recognised as an accident, but the second is regarded as being one of the hazards of that particular vocation.

I am not arguing as to the virtues of that proposition one way or the other, but the basis of the Workers' Compensation Act is that compensation is granted for loss of earning capacity. The Act takes no cognisance of sociological loss. The fact that a worker loses his hearing could, in fact, make him a better boilermaker. Of necessity it would not rob him of the ability to be a boilermaker and, in fact, one could argue that a deaf boilermaker would be better off working inside a boiler, and that sometimes it would be a heaven sent relief.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Like a deaf parliamentarian.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This is currently the basis of the Workers' Compensation Act in most Australian States. I understand that in one or two States there has been a move to amend the Act to provide for such cases, and I think Mr. Stubbs reported that such an amendment has actually been accepted in at least one State. This is a start, but in this State no such step has yet been taken.

The loss of hearing that is caused in various activities such as riveting and so on, is well known, but I repeat that this is a sociological loss and not an economic loss, because it does not necessarily prevent a worker from earning his living.

Mr. Stubbs is requesting the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate and advise on whether we should change the nature of our workers' compensation legislation. In all fairness, if we were to agree to this motion we should accept the whole range of the sociological effects. For instance, if a person was scarred—which injury may not cause any hardship in so far as the ability of a man to hold down his job is concerned—it may make it a little difficult for him to get married or to be

accepted socially. On the same argument put forward this should be an acceptable risk, but it would represent a change in the nature of the Workers' Compensation Act.

I maintain that the appointment of a Select Committee is not warranted for this reason because it would not reveal any more than is already known by the Medical Department on the loss of hearing of workers engaged in various industries.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: How do you know?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: By the fact that by the time a man has reached 65 his loss of hearing has never been regarded as a matter of concern under the Workers' Compensation Act to date, and, I repeat, has not been regarded of any great concern by any Government. I am not saying this as an argument either in favour or against the humanitarianism of any particular Government; it is a fact of life. I do not know whether it is even accepted in other parts of the world. I relied upon the statements made by Mr. Stubbs because I find that what he says is completely reliable. I ask Mr. Stubbs: Are there one or two States affected?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: There are three States, and a fourth will come into line in the near future.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: This is a comparatively recent development and I think it is probably fair to say that as this question is receiving attention elsewhere it is reasonable to suppose it will receive attention in this State in the future.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Supposing is not good enough in this instance; you should be more definite.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I suppose that the motion moved by Mr. Stubbs has served a valuable purpose in that it has brought this matter forward to the attention of the Government, because I repeat that this would be a policy decision and a matter which would have to be considered at Cabinet level in order to change the nature of the workers' compensation legislation in this direction.

I think Mr. Stubbs will agree that this would be breaking new ground in the Workers' Compensation Act in the sense that compensation would be granted for what is, in effect, a sociological loss rather than an economic loss. One could argue that it may become an economic loss if a man were a boilermaker and wanted to leave that vocation and—to make an absurd comparison—become a telephonist. However, within his chosen vocation, his hearing defect would be regarded more as a sociological loss rather than an economic loss.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: For which he should be paid a high wage.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That may well be; I am not debating that point. That is an entirely different argument altogether. I am using the vocation of a boilermaker as an example, because it is the obvious one. There are other vocations which are not so obvious where insidious and harmful noise is having a deleterious effect on workers in various fields. Mr. Stubbs gave a number of examples, and we all know that in any situation where there is continuous noise most people are inclined to become nervy and irritable. There are few people who can stand continuous noise, and it is unfortunate that modern machinery is getting worse in this respect.

Noise emitting from a modern machine is much worse than that emitting from an old or obsolete piece of machinery, because it operates much faster. I do not know whether any member has heard a piece of modern metal spraying equipment in operation. Through this equipment is fed various alloy wires, and it has a flame which is fanned by an extremely high speed fan. The noise it emits is in the high frequency range which is inaudible to the human ear; it is absolutely beyond the capacity of the human ear to hear the noise, and without the use of muffs this equipment presents a great deal of trouble to any operator. It literally cuts through one like a knife. It is only in comparatively recent years that mechanics have been able to operate such equipment, which builds up to tremendously high revolutions.

Much of our modern machinery operates with a noise on a high frequency level and where a lower density in decibels could be very harmful. This is a fact, but what to do about it is an entirely different matter; because, I repeat, it is an extremely costly business, and whatever one does about it, it is very difficult to obtain co-operation. I hazard a guess that if the farmer who wrote to Mr. Stubbs were supplied with a tractor for which he paid good money and it was covered with protective, noise-absorbent plates around the motor, and had elaborate noise-suppressing plates around the muffler which reduced the noise of the engine, the first time something went wrong with the tractor and he had to spend half an hour removing the protective plates, they would remain where he left them when he completed his repairs to the tractor.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Don't you think Mr. Stubbs is only asking what should be done?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I said, when I commenced this speech, that I never had reason to doubt the intentions of Mr. Stubbs. I am merely telling that honourable member why I think his motion should be defeated, and if at the end of nearly 40 minutes I have been so abstruse that Mrs. Hutchison does not understand what I have been saying, I think I will sit down.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (Lower North) [9.11 p.m.]: All Mr. Stubbs is asking the House to do with his motion is to appoint a Select Committee to investigate further aspects of what is undoubtedly a great problem in industry and in our daily lives. I am sure Mr. Stubbs, and many members of this House, will be disappointed at the attitude which has been adopted by the Minister.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: "Disgusted" is a better word.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: What is wrong with this House appointing a Select Committee, which would incur little expense and which would involve the conscientious members who formed it in a great deal of work? Its appointment should cause no harm or embarrassment to anyone. On the other hand, if it were appointed, the committee could collate information and present a report which, in my view, would prove to be of inestimable value to Parliament.

Mr. Stubbs, and the members he has in mind to form this committee, are prepared to undertake this work voluntarily and perform a task which, in my opinion, is extremely worth while. It is surprising to me, therefore, that the Minister should try to prevent such a laudable effort. I have here a couple of extracts from notes prepared by a Dr. B. B. Letham of the Public Health Department in this State. This is what he had to say recently—

Noise is the most widespread occupational hazard.

He went on to say—

Noise proceeds in its insidious way to impair the hearing of thousands of workers. In some cases they are unaware of the rate at which their hearing is deteriorating.

I do not think a responsible man like Dr. Letham would make such serious statements unless they were true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course they are true; I did not contradict them.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Is it possible to do something about this situation? I do not know, but surely an attempt should be made to alleviate the problem. When we find a man like Mr. Stubbs being prepared to have a go at solving the problem we should encourage him in every way possible.

I agree with the Minister—I know this applies on the goldfields—that industry has undertaken a great deal of research into this question, because the employers realise how serious and far-reaching are the consequences. But the problem has not been solved, and according to Dr. Letham it is as serious as ever. The hearing of thousands of workers is still being impaired.

That is most unfortunate for the poor sufferers. It is a problem which we should attempt to solve, in much the same way as Mr. Griffiths attempted to solve the problem of child delinquency in the very convincing speech which he made.

We should not merely talk about the problem; we should try to do something to alleviate it. Even though we may not achieve wonders, it is good to realise that in Parliament and in the community there are people who are prepared to make the attempt. I think Mr. Stubbs falls into that category very fittingly.

It is very sad for one to lose one's hearing. There once lived a very illustrious man, Ludwig van Beethoven. Just before his death this is what he had to say about his deafness—

O ye men who regard or declare me to be malignant, stubborn or cynical, how unjust are ye towards me. You do not know the secret cause of my seeming so. From childhood onward, my heart and mind prompted me to be kind and tender, and I was ever inclined to accomplish great deeds. But only think that during the last six years I have been in a wretched condition . . . forced to the prospect of lasting infirmity . . . I had soon to retire from the world, to live a solitary life. At times, even, I endeavoured to forget all this, but how harshly was I driven back by the redoubled experience of my bad hearing. Yet it was not possible for me to say to men: 'Speak louder, shout, for I am deaf.' Alas, how could I declare the weakness of a sense which in me ought to be more acute than in others—a sense which formerly I possessed in highest perfection . . . no I cannot do it. Forgive, therefore, if you see me withdraw, when I would willingly mix with you. My misfortune pains me doubly, in that I am certain to be misunderstood. For me there can be no recreation in the society of my fellow creatures, no refined conversation, no interchange of thought. Almost alone . . . I am compelled to live as an exile . . .

Those were the thoughts of an illustrious man who suffered deafness in the last years of his life. I imagine those would be the thoughts of most people who are similarly afflicted.

For those reasons the House should support Mr. Stubbs by enabling a Select Committee to be appointed to delve into the problem. Let us wish the committee well. The Minister seems to be afraid of the final portion of the motion which states—

recommend, if found necessary, methods of compensation where hearing is damaged by noise.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: It is long overdue.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The committee will not be able to grant compensation. I do not know what proposition it will come up with. I gather people become deaf through many causes, not all of which are attributable to the occupational hazard of noise. However, if the committee does come forward with a proposition for compensation, that would not be so terrible. It would only be a recommendation, and Parliament would decide about adopting it or otherwise. We should not try to jump the hurdle at this stage by submitting that as a ground for opposing the motion.

We all know that Mr. Stubbs is a very conscientious person. I, for one, feel sure that if he is given the privilege of being the chairman of the Select Committee, he and his colleagues will come up with a report which, doubtless, will be illuminating and very helpful. It might be the means of doing something about what Dr. Letham and many others regard as a serious hazard in our present way of life.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (North-East Metropolitan) [9.24 p.m.]: I cannot let this debate go without challenging the attitude of the Minister. This problem has a great impact on me, as I have been used to industrial conditions, because I come from the goldfields where the noises of batteries and other machines were usual. I cannot understand his attitude. In this day and age it is amazing to realise how slowly we seem to move.

Here we have before us a motion brought forward by a member dealing with a subject which has not been introduced before. He has proposed the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the cause of noise. Noise is an industrial hazard which is growing from week to week; it is getting worse all the time. I know, because I have two friends who are boilermakers, and they are both quite deaf. Why should not those workers be compensated? Why should not efforts be made to bring knowledge to bear on the problem, by finding some way to alleviate it?

When industry has to pay compensation, it usually finds a way of preventing accidents; but just because no-one has up to date challenged deafness as an industrial hazard, the appointment of a Select Committee should not be opposed. This is probably the first time this question has been brought up in Parliament. The Minister should be ashamed of his action in throwing out the motion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I cannot throw it out. It can only be thrown out by the vote of the House.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The Minister could have persuaded his Government to agree to the appointment of the Select Committee. Surely there is that much progressive thought in the Government of

the day! If this motion is defeated Mr. Stubbs should introduce a similar one each session, until somebody listens to him and until it becomes a public cause.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Who is saying it will be thrown out? Surely we have a free vote?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am going by the tenor of the Minister's speech. If I am mistaken I am glad. When I hear the Minister speak so lightly of deafness—

Point of Order

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: On a point of order, I think the honourable member has made a gross misstatement. I did not speak lightly of deafness. I am very aware of the terrible affliction it is to anyone. There was only one period in my life when I was deaf for three months. I know what it is like. I would request the honourable member to withdraw her remark.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Will the honourable Mrs. Hutchison withdraw her remark?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I withdraw, because I want to say more.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: A conditional withdrawal is hardly fair, especially after the honourable member has made a statement like that.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable Mrs. Hutchison withdraw unconditionally?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Yes.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I do not know why this simple request put forward in the motion by a very conscientious member of this House, who is a forward thinker and a very competent health officer, should be disregarded. I do not know why some members do not listen to him. I think the motion deserves better treatment than it has received. I hope the Minister will reconsider his attitude, and agree to the appointment of a Select Committee.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (Lower Central) [9.28 p.m.]: At this stage I must agree with the Minister. He is not opposed to finding a solution to the serious problem of deafness. Any man who drives a tractor must realise to some extent the problem that exists. I understand that technical men are available at the present time for consultation with regard to industrial noises, and they are working on the problem. These men have much more knowledge in this field than the members of the proposed Select Committee.

My reason for taking this stand arises from one case I have in mind. There is a heavy industry establishment, the owner of which was experiencing considerable friction with his staff. He did not know

the cause until the technical consultants were called in. They put down the cause to the noise factor. Then men were fitted with a type of ear muff, and the owner has not experienced that trouble since.

A couple of my friends who drive tractors also consulted these people, and obtained the necessary equipment to reduce the noise. That is the reason for my support of the Minister's attitude. I understand that technical people, very skilled in this problem, are available. Everyone realises the seriousness of deafness.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Where and who are they?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: They are available. I know because two farming lads in my own district had their hearing tested, and obtained the necessary equipment, which they consider to be marvellous. I do not know how long they will wear the equipment. Perhaps some member of the Opposition might be able to change my view, but at this stage I must support the Minister.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [9.30 p.m.]: I support the motion. One of the things which prompted me to express my support was a remark made by Mr. Syd Thompson. He said there is a number of technical men and experts available. That is just what the Select Committee requires.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Of course it is!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. Thompson knows he recently acted on a Select Committee dealing with a subject which he, as a member of the committee knew little about, but he learned a lot from the experts. What we require is a report on the matters mentioned in the motion.

I feel the Government, through the Minister, is not perhaps facing up to this problem, which is a world-wide one, as well as it should when it opposes the appointment of this Select Committee to inquire into two aspects of primary and industrial noise and then report, if necessary. I feel the approach is wrong and that the Government is, in effect, delaying—perhaps purposely, perhaps not—the urgent necessity to inquire into this problem and then frame legislation.

I admit that at this stage of the session there would be hardly sufficient time for the Select Committee to listen to the experts and the victims, and also prepare a report in time to enable legislation to be framed. But the motion does not only deal with that aspect; it deals with the causes and possible remedies, before the stage is reached where the committee might recommend some compensation to those who suffer the injury. So when we look at the motion and study it we find there is more than reasonable justification for a Select Committee of this nature to be appointed.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Even if the Select Committee only collated the information it would be doing something very useful.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister indicated that this motion had drawn the attention of the Government to this nuisance and impediment. I would hate to think the Government was possibly playing politics with this question and simply delaying it for another session and then, in the meantime, set up something next session and then the following session—the pre-election session—introduce the necessary legislation. We know that things like that have happened. They have happened in my parliamentary experience, and I could quote a couple. There was the Saturday holiday for banks—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Native affairs.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —Introduced by a Labor Government and turned down by the majority in the Legislative Council, but eventually introduced by the present Government and accepted by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Even the cock-eyed to-and-from clause.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes, the to-and-from clause that Mr. Watson has been discussing. It was introduced 18 or 19 times by Labor members and six times by Labor Governments to my knowledge, but was turned down in this House. For what reason? Merely to make a political football of it and for political advantage. This House should be bigger than that. This House should support a motion of this kind which deals with a problem that is world-wide and one that is recognised by the Governments of other States and countries.

This House should bring our laws up to date; or at least bring Parliament up to date with the knowledge that could be collated and presented to it by a Select Committee. For those reasons I am supporting the motion.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [9.35 p.m.]: I intend to support this motion, and perhaps I may bring another sound of noise into this Chamber tonight. I, too, am surprised that the Minister for Health—a Select Committee of this kind should commend itself to his department—has shown opposition to the motion.

I wonder what the Government proposes to do about the incessant noise that citizens have to put up with every day. This motion does not refer only to industrial noises. This State has progressed to a stage where heavy transport traverses the main city blocks and roads 24 hours a day for seven days a week. There are

hundreds of thousands of tons of cargo on the Fremantle wharves which is being delivered by road transport south of the river to the city.

We have the situation where three doctors have had to leave their residences on Canning Highway and sacrifice their properties because they cannot get anything near the value for them. They have had to shift into other areas of the community in order to be in a state of health to attend to their medical duties. I could mention the names of these doctors because they have given me permission to do so, but I do not propose to do that. I could give their names to the Minister or to other members if they so desire. One is a repatriation doctor. Not only does he have to look after his own surgery but he has, quite often, to appear on tribunals.

He has one of the nicest homes on Canning Highway, but because of these heavily-loaded trucks, to which I cannot object because transport is something that is part of our life, he is unable to put up with the incessant noise. I was once told there was no sand to go on to the river but now a quarter of a million yards are being carted by heavy trucks on Saturday and Sundays and all districts are complaining about the noise.

It is impossible to go through the streets without hearing a loudspeaker blaring somewhere. There are many types of noise that affect the general health of the community. Even some of the nurses in the hospitals are complaining that they cannot sleep in the daytime, and this interferes with their duties at night. That is another type of noise that could be investigated.

I agree entirely with what Mr. Strickland had to say, because times out of number some member of the party which I have the honour to serve has proposed legislation in this House. On odd occasions we have been able to get the co-operation of one or two members in opposition to the Labor Party to support us and so get the legislation through; but in times out of number, proposals such as this have been brought before the House and not agreed to. Despite what Mr. Watson said about Labor and the natives, I well remember the number of times we brought Bills before this Chamber to assist the natives of this State.

What has happened? As soon as the Government changed it brought in its own legislation. Good luck to it. I am not worried politically, because the natives will benefit and they are the only ones I am working for. It was the same with the half holiday for bank employees. Look at the number of times that proposal was ridiculed; but look what happened. The Government changed its attitude in one session of Parliament.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Will the honourable member please resume his seat. I have been very patient with members in allowing them to reflect, from time to time, on votes in this House, but this time I am going to ask the honourable member to refrain from casting any reflection on a vote of this Chamber. The honourable member may proceed.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I will abide by your wishes, Sir. I had no intention of casting a reflection on the votes of this House; I was merely saying what was actual fact. If I have offended, I will apologise. I must say again that there are more than industrial noises that could be investigated by this Select Committee.

I know that whenever a private member has business on the notice paper it takes quite a long time for it to come before the House. That is generally arranged by the Minister in charge; and eventually we get to it. This motion has been on the notice paper for a considerable time and has eventually come up for deliberation. I would not attempt in any way to belittle the Minister because of this fact; but now that this motion has come up for discussion, surely it will not be treated in a political manner, as it deals with something that affects the life of every person in this and the other States.

I could mention a number of people not engaged in industry who have become deaf as a result of accidents; and those people are now affected by noise. There are people who are using hearing aids that were of some use to them three, four, or five years ago, but today they cannot wear them because of the continual noise of the metropolis playing havoc with the mechanism of those aids.

So there are many avenues from which we could obtain evidence in order to compile some statistics. As Mr. Wise said, if we did nothing else but compile statistics for later use, perhaps some future Government could make use of them even if not the present Government. I support the proposal for a Select Committee and hope the motion will be carried.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (West) [9.43 p.m.]: I am going to read Mr. Stubbs's motion in which he asks—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the incidence of industrial noise in primary and secondary industries. Surely there is no need to inquire into something about which we know. We hear these noises and we see what causes them. Surely there is no need for experts to come along and advise us in regard to noises, the causes of which we can see. The motion goes on to say—

(a) ascertain the causes of and objections to such noise;

We all know that if a railway train goes up the railway track at 40 or 50 miles an hour it causes a noise. We know what causes that noise and we also know it is objectionable. Why inquire into it?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: You won't get any action unless you do.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The motion continues—

(b) recommend preventative measures to eliminate excessive noise;

The experts in the C.S.I.R.O. have been working on this for years and years, as is the case with private industry. Investigations are also carried out by General Motors Holden, the Ford Motor Company, B.H.P., and other big concerns, so why should we, in Western Australia, collate evidence which those people can bring forward, particularly the C.S.I.R.O., because it is a Commonwealth-wide organisation.

I am in agreement with the Minister because, while Mr. Stubbs is very genuine in wishing to do something for people, in this regard, I do not feel that a Select Committee could discover anything that we do not already know, or could not get by application to the C.S.I.R.O. or one of the other organisations I have mentioned.

Referring to the third recommendation, "recommend, if found necessary, methods of compensation where hearing is damaged by noise," if this has not already been covered under the Workers' Compensation Act, why not do something with the Act? I feel, and I will stand correction here because I do not know the full ramifications of the Act as well as Mr. Stubbs, that there is already compensation being paid where deafness can be proved by a worker in an industry.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: You are wrong there.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: So why go on inquiring into it?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: You are wrong there.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order!

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I would like Mr. Stubbs to explain the position. I think compensation is being paid so I think it is a lot of noise about nothing for members to get up and say this is political, and say this is being done for political purposes. I have had lengthy discussions with my colleagues to see if we could find anything in this to commend our support. I would say, "No," because already, without sending men around the country and bringing men into an inquiry, we have answers—and much better answers than we could get with a Select Committee.

For those reasons I feel it would be a waste of time, not only of the committee which might be set up, but also in bringing along people to give evidence on something we can get the answer to by writing to the

C.S.I.R.O., or General Motors Holden, where there are departments which deal with this sort of noise. For that reason I oppose the motion.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [9.48 p.m.]: In considering the motion moved by Mr. Stubbs, the Minister justly said that Mr. Stubbs brought the motion here in an endeavour to do what he thought should be done; that is, provide compensation for persons whose hearing is affected by industrial noises and noises in primary industry.

I think the decision we have to make on this motion is whether an inquiry is justified at this stage, or not justified. To my knowledge this problem has been mooted and discussed over a number of years as to whether there should be some provision in the Workers' Compensation Act to provide compensation for persons whose hearing is damaged by industrial noise. Even though this has been discussed for a number of years, there has not, to my knowledge, been any forward move in this direction. The Minister told us, when debating this measure to-night, that he has technicians and machines that can measure industrial noise. That may be so, but to what extent are we putting them to use towards carrying out preventive measures? I believe that an inquiry could do something worth while, because the situation is that the effort put into it would be voluntary. There would be nothing mandatory; whereas once we did bring in legislation an inquiry of this nature would have a mandatory set-up.

I visualise that in the future we will have an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act dealing with this particular subject. An application could be made by a number of workers in an industry, or a union representing those workers, and an investigation could be made by technicians as to whether industrial noises could be prevented. If they could not be prevented then the industry concerned would come under the Act and be prescribed as one in which compensation would be paid. I think that could be the answer to this problem but until somebody investigates this matter I do not see that we will make many forward moves.

As I said earlier, this has been discussed and mooted throughout Parliament for a number of years. I feel that a Select Committee could not do any harm, if it did not do any good. After all is said and done, if members from this Chamber are willing to work on a Select Committee to try to do something in this respect—whether they reach success or not—they will do little harm. I point out that if the Government is worried about the cost of a Select Committee, it has little to worry about because the cost would be very small indeed.

I say this because I know from actual fact and from having been on two Select Committees. One of those Select Committees—on which Mr. Ron Thompson and Mr. Syd Thompson were also members—cost the State less than £200. The value the State will gain from that one alone will more than amply compensate for the expenditure. In this particular instance the cost of the work of three members from this Chamber would be less than £200 for incidental expenses. As I said, if they do not come to any decision which is acceptable to the Government, what has been lost? Nothing. But if they do come to a decision and make a recommendation which the Government finds it can accept, I think something will have been done for Western Australia.

For that reason, although I do not agree with all the terms of the motion, I feel that, generally, I support it.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [9.53 p.m.]: I wish to make only one comment. I listened to one speaker who seemed to think that we knew all there was to know about noise. When this motion was put on the notice paper I thought I would find out all that I could so that I would be well informed on the subject. I inquired if there was anything in the library on industrial noise, but there was nothing there. I then went to the magazine room and searched, but found nothing. I then referred the matter to an officer of the House and he said he had nothing of that nature. He said he had been searching for a week to find something for Mr. Stubbs. So it seems that we really have nothing on this subject; and I feel that anything we can get to inform ourselves and, through us, the people, should be obtained. Therefore, I support the motion.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [9.55 p.m.]: I am going to be very brief in my reply because I said most of what I had to say when I moved the motion. I want first of all to thank all the speakers for their contributions to the debate. It did, at least, engender some interest, and there have been quite a few speakers. I would like to clear a point for Mr. Jones, when he referred to the Workers' Compensation Act. Compensation is not paid for damage to hearing; but it is certainly paid when the damage is caused by accident.

Mr. MacKinnon referred to objectionable noises. In that sense I did not mean noise from motor cycle exhausts, or that sort of thing. I simply meant noises from industry which are objectionable; noises which impair hearing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You mean objectionable in a medical sense; impairing health.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes, that is so. If we say objectionable in a particular sense, we can object to someone walking along the street with a radio blaring. When I moved this motion, I said that I had had a lot of experience in goldmines. Men in the goldmining industry are virtually all deaf. The men who have worked underground in intense noise with their ears right over the compressed air machines come off shift and they cannot hear. Over the years, they have gone deaf. There is other machinery in the mines also which creates a lot of noise, and of course that also affects the men. Tradesmen's machinery, farmers' machinery, and such-like, have all helped to cause deafness. Some farmers are really convinced that something should be done; and it was not a single farmer, but the Farmers' Union from Salmon Gums, which wrote to me on the matter.

I went to a lot of trouble to get information on this subject. I have a book from the acoustic laboratories, and a report on noise from England which cost me 13s. plus postage. The latter is the result of a Select Committee by the English Government into noise. That Government thought it worth while to investigate the problem.

When I spoke of preventive measures I mentioned the miners, and I will mention them again. They are a case in point. We have read—and some of the older people will remember—that the goldminers got a pretty rough deal before the advent of workers' compensation. There was a hue and cry to get compensation for the miner.

The matter was brought to Parliament year after year until something was finally done. The position was transformed virtually overnight. Men were required to go to laboratories for tests. Men went into the industry with a clean bill of health, and over the years it was obvious that they had contracted silicosis from working in the mines. That is the sort of thing I am referring to in the third term of my motion which reads as follows—

recommend, if found necessary, methods of compensation where hearing is damaged by noise.

I do not mean to give compensation left, right, and centre or off the cuff. If we can have men tested for hearing before they enter an industry, we would know later if their hearing had become impaired; and, if so, they would rightfully be entitled to compensation.

It would then be up to the industrialists to cut down the noise on the machines. That can be done. I know that in the mines some of the fans made so much noise that one could not hear when standing two chains away. However, rubber bearings overcame that noise. We who travel on the railways can remember the

days when, in Merredin and other places, railway workers used to push trolleys along the platforms and they kicked up a terrific row at night while people were trying to sleep. But those trolleys have rubber tyres now and they make no noise at all.

It is possible to filter out noise and suppress it to a certain degree if people go about doing it in the right way. As I said before, if the industrialists, or companies, will filter out noise and do their best in this direction, and the men will wear the equipment which is provided, such as ear pads or ear muffs, little compensation will be paid. However, if there is an odd industry that does not play the game, and some worker becomes deaf, then he is obviously entitled to compensation.

I am not after compensation for everybody. A worker will have to prove his case, but I do think we should do something about this problem. When I first entered this Chamber in 1962 I dealt with this matter during my speech on the Address-in-Reply. I asked that something be done about it but, so far, nothing has been done. Each year I have asked questions but still nothing has been done. Therefore I think we should pass this motion and appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the problem because a lot of good could come from it. It certainly would not do any harm.

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

Ayes—11

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. T. O. Perry	Hon. J. Dolan
Hon. H. C. Strickland	(Teller)

Noes—15

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. A. R. Jones	(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. G. Hislop

Majority against—4.

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.