shipping fleets in the southern hemisphere and it is expanding it. It also owns, I would suggest, the best airline in the world. It continues to expand its post office facilities; it is now entering the field of television, and is issuing licences to its friends to establish stations for the purpose of producing television programmes.

This is merely local policy, and I could not accept that as being a valid reason for rejecting the expansion of insurance facilities for the benefit of the public of Western Australia. If the Bill is passed it will bring revenue to the State, and it will be kept here and will circulate within the State. Perhaps my assumptions in expecting support for this Bill are a little optimistic. Nevertheless, there is still time for one to change one's mind on such matters. Every one sees the light at some time or other. Every one must reach the point when one realises that it is extremely necessary to have some public facilities and some publicly-owned institutions. I do not agree that all State trading concerns should remain under State ownership, but this State-owned public utility is extremely necessary. The Bill could have great effect—as will the amendment to the Forests Act which we had before us not so very long ago—on those people who desire to effect insurance and to be assured.

I was extremely interested in the remarks made by the hon. Mr. Roche who wanted to know when something was to be done about the Opposition's policy. I am wondering that myself. I am wondering, if ever there is a change of Government in Western Australia, what is to be done with the £3,000,000 worth of State ships that were bought to serve the people of the North-West. Are they to be sold or given away? Are those ships to suffer the same fate as the fleet which was operating previously or, rather what was left of it? Are we to have the railways operating under the chaotic conditions they were in a few years ago? The previous Government, in its six years of office, between 1947 and 1953, spent £60,000,000 in an effort to rehabilitate the railways, but what have we got for that expenditure? All we have is a number of engines that do not run very often.

I still believe that the policy followed by the Government in regard to this State trading concern, and others, is extremely necessary, because it is designed to give the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people. Therefore, I hope the hon. members of this House will support the Bill so that we can extend these benefits to the people who wish to effect insurance generally, or to take out policies of life assurance, or policies to cover school children. During his second reading speech, the hon. Mr. Griffith said that if a Bill were introduced purely to extend the insurance cover for school children he would support it. However, I hope he will change his mind and support the Bill we now have before us.

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

Ayes—10

Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
	(Teller.)

Noes—13

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. L. C. Diver
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. J. Cunningham
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. J. G. Hislop

Majority against—3.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

House adjourned at 5.34 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 9th October, 1958.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS—*continued.*

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

WATER PRICES COMMITTEE.

Availability of Report.

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

(1) Is the departmental water prices committee functioning?

(2) If so, would he make its report available?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The report has not been finalised.

MOORA WATER SUPPLY.

Income and Expenditure.

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

What was the amount of income and expenditure of the Moora water supply for the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

Accrued income: £5,259.

Expenditure, excluding interest and sinking fund charges: £4,617.

MOORE RIVER.

Expenditure to Reduce Flooding.

3. Mr. LEWIS asked the Minister for Works:

What amount will be available this financial year for snagging or training of the Moore River in an endeavour to reduce flooding?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

Provision of £300 has been made for work on the section of the river below Gillingarra.

RETICULATION SCHEMES.

Areas North of Kellerberrin.

4. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Have detailed reticulation schemes for the areas north of Kellerberrin been worked out?

(2) If so, are details for the—

(a) Yorkrakine,

(b) Kodj Kodjin,

(c) North Doodlakine

districts yet available?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

(1) Detailed reticulation schemes are virtually complete, except for some minor details for which field surveys are in progress.

(2) (a) Yes. Public plan exhibited in September and October, 1957.

(b) and (c) Public plan not yet available, but present proposals are available for inspection by interested parties at the Public Works Department offices.

MERREDIN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Take-Over and Transmission Line Extension.

5. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is an extension of the transmission line east of Merredin for the purpose of electrifying further pumping stations in contemplation?

(2) Has a proposal to take over the town electricity supply at Merredin been investigated?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr Tonkin) replied:

(1) An extension of the transmission line east of Merredin will be considered when an increase in the capacity of No. 5 pumping station is called for.

(2) No.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Difference in Costs of Transmission Lines.

6. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Works:

According to replies to questions asked by me, the cost of various transmission lines has been—

To: Meckering, 14 miles, £14,120; Muresk, seven and a half miles, £4,430; Spencers Brook, 70 chains, £504; Grass Valley, four and a half miles, £1,136.

(1) What are the reasons for the substantial differences in the cost of these transmission lines and what is the voltage of each?

(2) Will he confirm that the cost of the extension to Grass Valley is only £250 per mile?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

(1) The reason for the difference in cost of the transmission lines is the difference in the number, material, and size of conductors, and in clearing ground conditions, and crossings of railways, P.M.G. lines, etc.

In the case of Meckering, the hon. member has used the capital cost, including the capital cost of the transmission line from Cunderdin, of providing an electricity supply to Meckering as asked for on the 2nd September, 1958.

The voltage of each line is: Meckering, 22,000 volts; Muresk, 22,000 volts; Spencers Brook, 12,700 volts; Grass Valley, 12,700 volts.

(2) The cost of the transmission line extension to Grass Valley was £250 per mile.

ELECTORAL.

Transfer of Electors on Redistribution.

7. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Justice:

In effecting a redistribution of seats may the commissioners transfer electors from agricultural, mining, and pastoral electoral districts to metropolitan districts (as defined in the Second Schedule of the Electoral Districts Act) or vice versa?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

In effect yes, under and subject to Section 8 of the Electoral Districts Act, 1947-1955.

Nos. 8 and 9. These questions were postponed.

MT. LYELL SUPERPHOSPHATE WORKS.

Discharge of Smoke and Fumes.

10. Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is he aware that Subsection 11 of Section 168 of the Health Act makes reference to:

> any chimney (not being the chimney of a private house) which sends forth smoke in such quantity or of such a nature as to be offensive to the public or injurious or dangerous to health?

(2) Is he also aware that the Mt. Lyell Superphosphate Works at North Fremantle come under this heading on account of the smoke and fumes discharged by the works, which is very offensive to the residents of Mosman Park and North Fremantle?

(3) If so, will he see that the practice is discontinued?

(4) If he is not aware of it, will he have the necessary inquiries made with a view to having the practice stopped?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No recent complaints have reached the Health Department.

(3) and (4) The matter will be investigated.

TRAFFIC.

Affixing Mud Flaps to Vehicles.

11. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Transport:

Will he obtain and table an expert opinion on the desirability or otherwise of making it compulsory to affix mud flaps or some similar device to vehicles in an endeavour to minimise or eliminate the traffic danger arising from the smashing of windscreens on travelling vehicles by stones flung up by other moving vehicles?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

Steps will be taken to obtain an expert opinion.

BUNBURY REGIONAL HOSPITAL.

Sketch Plan and Site.

12. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What was the actual cost of preparing the preliminary sketch plan of a regional hospital in Bunbury?

(2) (a) Can such plans be utilised for the building of a regional hospital on any other site, except the 17½ acres already set aside in Bunbury for a regional hospital?

(b) If not, what would be the cost of effecting alterations to the sketch plan to conform to the requirements of a new site?

(3) Why is it now necessary for representatives from various departments concerned to select a site for the purpose of a regional hospital in Bunbury?

(4) If the present area of approximately 17½ acres is not suitable,

(a) why is this so;

(b) what does the Government now intend to do with this land?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1) £7,621 12s. 0d.

(2) (a) No. The plans would need to be redrawn irrespective of the site.

(b) Not known.

(3) and (4) An area larger than 17½ acres is desirable. No decision can be made concerning the use of the existing site until investigations are completed and the hospital site is determined.

BUNBURY HIGH SCHOOL.

Students, Classrooms, and Teachers.

13. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Education:

How many—

(a) students;

(b) classrooms;

(c) teachers;

are at present at the Bunbury High School?

Mr. W. HEGNEY replied:

(a) 756.

(b) 24.

(c) 37.

FISHERIES.

Legal Definition of "Fisherman."

14. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

What is the legal definition of "professional fisherman" as applied to crayfishermen?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Kelly) replied:

The Fisheries Act does not contain a definition of "professional fisherman". It does, however, define a "fisherman" as any person licensed under the Act to catch fish.

VERMIN RATES.

Amount Collected by Local Authorities.

15. Sir ROSS McLARTY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Would he give the total amount of vermin rates collected by local authorities throughout the State for the financial years 1956-57, and 1957-58?

Mr. MOIR replied:

1956-57—£58,531 12s. 1d.

1957-58—It will be some time before this information is available to the Local Government Department.

OATS.

Acreages Sown, and Expected Yield.

16. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What acreages of oats are known to be sown for harvesting in the 1958 and 1959 seasons in the following areas:—

(a) Albany to Tambellup areas;

(b) Dumbleyung, Woodanilling and surrounding areas?

(2) What is the expected yield from the respective areas for 1958 and 1959 seasons?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Kelly) replied:

(1) The 1958 crop was planted in May-June of this year and will be harvested in November-December. It is estimated that the following acreages are in crop with oats:—

(a)	Albany	1,370	
	Broomehill	30,378	
	Cranbrook	14,577	
	Denmark	264	
	Gnowangerup	72,107	
	Katanning	31,163	
	Nyabing-Pingrup	41,786	
	Kojonup	41,200	
	Plantagenet	16,447	
	Tambellup	30,040	
	Total		279,332
(b)	Dumbleyung	55,611	
	Lake Grace	68,957	
	Wagin	45,117	
	West Arthur	26,280	
	Woodanilling	20,133	
	Total		216,098
	Southern Agricultural Division:		495,430

Farmers' intentions with regard to areas to be harvested for grain or used for other purposes are not known. Neither are their plans for their 1959 sowings.

(2) As farmers' intentions regarding harvesting for grain are not known, it is not possible to assess the expected yield.

No. 17. This question was postponed.

STATE BUILDING SUPPLIES.

Membership of Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants of W.A.

18. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

(1) Is the State Building Supplies still a member of the Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants of W.A.?

(2) When, and on whose recommendation, did the State Building Supplies become a member of this organisation?

(3) Did such action have ministerial approval?

Mr. BRADY replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants was known as Associated Timber Industries of W.A. when first founded in January, 1948. State Saw Mills was a foundation member. The first formal application for membership following the adoption of a constitution in 1950, was made by the Hon. David Brand on the 20th May, 1950, on the recommendation of the General Manager, Mr. S. D. Gomme. By direction of the Hon. G. P. Wild, State Saw Mills resigned as a member of the association with resignation effective on the 30th June, 1950. State Saw Mills rejoined by application on the 20th October, 1952, signed by the Hon. G. P. Wild on the recommendation of the General Manager, Mr. S. D. Gomme.

ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL.

Beds Available in 1957 and 1958.

19. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Health:

How many beds were available at the Royal Perth Hospital at the 30th June—

(a) 1957;

(b) 1958?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(a) 501, plus Shenton Park Annexe 120 —total 621.

(b) 552, plus Shenton Park Annexe 120 —total 672.

Staff and Salaries.

19A. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) How many—

(a) permanent medical staff;

(b) nurses and probationers;

(c) office staff;

(d) all other employees,

were on the staff of Royal Perth Hospital at the 30th June—

(a) 1957;

(b) 1958?

(2) What were the total salaries paid to—

(a) permanent medical staff;

(b) nurses and probationers;

(c) office staff;

(d) all other employees,

for each of the years mentioned?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1)

	1957.	1958.
(a) Permanent medical staff	63	69
(b) Nurses and probationers	743	843
(c) Office staff	174	196
(d) All other employees	671	734

(2)

	£	£
(a) Permanent medical staff	78,974	93,391
(b) Nurses and probationers	285,460	336,364
(c) Office staff	107,272	122,536
(d) All other employees	506,924	524,561

Maintenance Cost and Revenue.

19B. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) What was the total maintenance cost of the Royal Perth Hospital for the years ended the 30th June, 1957 and 1958.

(2) What was the revenue received by the hospital for the years ended the 30th June, 1957 and 1958, and what was the Government subsidy for each of the years mentioned?

Mr. NULSEN replied:

(1) The 30th June, 1957—£1,548,451.
The 30th June, 1958—£1,644,238.

(2)

	1956-57. £	1957-58. £
Total revenue	1,516,339	1,642,524
Government subsidy	1,044,385	1,183,503

WATER RATES.

Deputy Premier's Statement to Press.

20. Mr. COURT asked the Deputy Premier:

(1) Was he correctly reported in "The West Australian" on the 14th May, 1958, as follows:—

> No Increase in Water Rates.
>
> The State Cabinet decided at its meeting yesterday not to increase water rates in the metropolitan area. Deputy Premier Tonkin said that after lengthy consideration the Cabinet decided that the financial position was sound enough not to necessitate an increase. ?

(2) If so, how does he account for the very steep increases in water rates that are being experienced in approximately 17 metropolitan districts at the present time?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

(1) In striking the rate for 1958-1959, Cabinet's decision was that there would be no increase in the water rate, sewerage rate, or main drainage rate in the £ on the annual value.

(2) The increases in question were not consequent upon the striking of the annual rate, but upon review of valuations in districts which were last reviewed in 1952-1953, 1953-1954 in order to maintain equitable ratings.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK.

Method of Construction.

21. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has a decision been made by Cabinet whether the Perth building for the Rural & Industries Bank is to be built by day labour or by tender?

(2) If not, will a decision be made before the end of October?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Tonkin) replied:

I have not been supplied with the answers to this question. Therefore it could be postponed. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I could say that a decision has not been made, but it should be made by the end of the month.

IMMIGRATION.

Deputy Premier's Statement.

22. Mr. BRAND asked the Premier:

Did the Deputy Premier correctly reflect the Government's view in the issue of the "Daily News" of Monday, the 6th October, 1958, when he was reported as having said in the course of a speech at a civic reception to delegates to the Master Builders' Federation Federal Convention that "The State wanted more people to come here—there was plenty of good land and room for more"?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

Yes.

Net Intake for Western Australia Since 1953.

22A. Mr. BRAND asked the Premier:

Will he state what the net overseas migration to Western Australia was for each year since 1953, expressed both in actual figures and as a percentage of total net migration to Australia as a whole in comparison with each of the other States of the Commonwealth?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

NET OVERSEAS MIGRATION.

(EXCESS OF ARRIVALS OVER DEPARTURES—LONG TERM AND PERMANENT MOVEMENT.)

State (*a*)	1953		1954		1955		1956		1957	
	Persons	%	Persons	%	Persons	%	Persons	%	Persons	%
New South Wales	7,435	17·3	12,516	18·3	27,035	28·4	20,460	23·8	20,268	26·1
Victoria	23,463	54·8	42,749	62·2	48,208	50·5	45,673	53·0	39,299	50·7
Queensland	2,235	5·2	2,125	3·1	3,607	3·8	4,472	5·2	5,189	6·7
South Australia	1,810	4·2	2,991	4·4	5,512	5·8	7,976	9·3	7,244	9·3
Western Australia	7,158	16·7	7,951	11·6	9,424	9·9	6,279	7·3	4,107	5·3
Tasmania	558	1·3	177	0·3	713	0·9	724	0·8	956	1·2
Northern Territory	(*b*) 6	....	41	0·1	159	0·2	68	0·1	29	....
Australian Capital Territory	230	0·5	15	....	659	0·7	458	0·5	530	0·7
Australia	42,883	100·0	68,565	100·0	95,317	100·0	86,105	100·0	77,622	100·0

(*a*) State of *intended* permanent residence, i.e., for one year or more. (*b*) Excess of departures over arrivals.

(COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF CENSUS AND STATISTICS, WESTERN AUSTRALIAN OFFICE, PERTH.)

FRIDAY NIGHT TRADING.

Amending Legislation.

23. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) Is he aware that wholesale grocery firms are now operating on Friday evenings?

(2) Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Factories and Shops Act in order to bring about the cessation of these activities?

Mr. W. HEGNEY replied:

(1) Yes. Some wholesale grocery firms are opening on certain evenings, and the matter is being investigated by the Factories and Shops Department.

(2) This is receiving consideration.

W. G. AND A. WILDER.

Decision on Appeal.

24. Mr. WILD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

When can a decision be expected in connection with an appeal on behalf of W. G. and A. Wilder of Canning Vale made on the 16th June, 1958?

Mr. MOIR replied:

It is anticipated that a decision will be made next week.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

Availability.

1. Mr. BRAND asked the Premier:

Further to my question of yesterday in reference to the presentation of the Auditor-General's report to which the Premier replied that he would lay it on the Table of the House when it was ready—and no doubt he will—I was after a little more information than that and was wondering whether he could indicate when the report will be available?

The SPEAKER: Order! Might I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that when the report is submitted, it will be laid on the Table of the House by the Speaker, and not by the Premier.

Mr. Hawke: Thank you!

Mr. BRAND: Would the Premier, please, through you, Mr. Speaker, answer my question?

Mr. Hawke: Which part of it?

Mr. BRAND: The Auditor-General's report—as we know the report when it comes here—

Mr. Hawke: What is the question?

Mr. BRAND: When can we anticipate the presentation of the report?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

It is open to any hon. member to anticipate whatever he likes. However, I will have inquiries made for the purpose of obtaining an approximate date on which copies of the report will be made available to the hon. Mr. Speaker.

CLOSER SETTLEMENT LEGISLATION.

Possibility of Introduction.

2. Mr. HEARMAN asked the Premier:

In view of the interjections of the Minister for Forests last evening during the debate on land settlement, namely—

> "If you were dinkum you would introduce a closer settlement Bill and that would make plenty of land available" and
>
> "You have a very short memory as to what your Government did when we as an Opposition tried to introduce such legislation,"

is it to be inferred that a closer settlement Bill is consistent with Government policy and likely to be introduced?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

Fortunately I am not responsible for any inference which any hon. member draws in connection with any interjection made by any hon. member in this House.

WATER RATES.

Deputy Premier's Statement to Press.

3. Mr. COURT asked the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

Arising from the answer given to question No. 20 on today's notice paper, would he be good enough to refer the answer to question No. 1 back to the Minister for Water Supplies, as he has not answered the question that appeared on the notice paper; namely, whether he was correctly reported in "The West Australian" of the 14th May? I think the Premier will concede that he has dealt with another subject altogether: the question of water rates in the £, as distinct from the incidence of water rates arising from valuations.

Mr. HAWKE replied:

I will go into conference with the Minister in regard to this point.

BUNBURY HIGH SCHOOL.

Students and Classrooms.

4. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Education:

Further to my question No. 13 on today's notice paper, will he reconcile the fact that on the 1st August, 1957, he advised me that there were 622 students at the Bunbury High School and 26 classrooms, with the fact that today he has advised that there are 756 students and only 25 classrooms? Why the difference in the number of classrooms?

Mr. W. Hegney replied:

I thought the hon. member for Bunbury might have assisted me in this matter; but it is apparent that he wants to do nothing, while expecting the Minister to do the lot.

Mr. Court: Break it down!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: A question was asked, and I recollect it very well—I think we all do—on the 16th August, 1957, and the reply was given. If the hon. member for Bunbury, who lives in the Bunbury electorate, thought the reply incorrect, surely, as a public-spirited man, he should have advised me accordingly; but he did not.

Mr. Roberts: Rot!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Utter rot!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: You are not Minister for Education yet.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think it is a great pity.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Now the hon. member for Bunbury has asked another question. I have not been in my office this morning; and, even had I been there, I would have taken the director's figures, as I would have no grounds on which to challenge them. I gave the answer in all good faith, and immediately the hon. member for Bunbury wanted to know the reason for the difference. If any mistake has been made, I will be the first to rectify it and will make any reasonable explanation; and, if necessary, apologise. I think the least the hon. member for Bunbury could do, if he knows the answer to the question is wrong, is to let me know in what particular. So I ask him now, without notice: In what way was the answer wrong?

Demolition of Classrooms.

5. Mr. ROBERTS: Could the Minister tell me if any classrooms at the Bunbury High School have been demolished since the 1st August, 1957?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The hon. member for Bunbury ought to know that.

Mr. Roberts: I am asking the Minister.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: If the hon. member for Bunbury puts the question on the notice paper he will receive another correct answer; or, if the answer is not correct, he will be given the reason.

STATE BUILDING SUPPLIES.

Withdrawal from Associated Sawmillers and Timber Merchants of W.A.

6. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

In view of the answer given to question No. 18 on today's notice paper and the matter made available to hon. members in the sixth interim report of the Royal Commissioner inquiring into the railways—of recent date—would he give consideration to now withdrawing from this association of timber millers?

Mr. BRADY replied:

If the hon. member will put his question on the notice paper I will give him a reply at the next sitting; but, in the meantime, in case he is worrying about this association fixing prices, I would point out that that is not one of the prerogatives of the association.

TOTALISATOR DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Treasurer—Northam) [2.37] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Totalisator Duty Act. Under the present law 13½ per cent. of the total amount invested in various classes of totalisator machines is deducted; and from the 13½ per cent. the Government receives 7½ per cent., while the metropolitan racing clubs receive the balance, which is 6 per cent. Representations were made fairly recently to the Minister for Police, by the W.A. Trotting Association in particular—and I think also by the W.A.T.C.—that the share of the trotting and racing clubs in the metropolitan area, in regard to investments on totalisators which deal with jackpot and quinella betting, should be increased.

Cabinet subsequently gave consideration to this specific request and it was agreed that the Government would increase the clubs' share from 6 per cent. to 10 per cent., which will mean, when the Bill becomes law, that of the 13½ per cent. the clubs will receive 10 per cent., and the Government 3½ per cent. of all moneys invested on totalisators which handle quinella and jackpot betting.

The Bill is quite apart from what could be a further piece of legislation to deal with what I understand is to be a general request for greater financial assistance, which will be made to the Government, if it has not already been made. However, this matter, which is dealt with in the Bill, stands on its own. It will give to the metropolitan trotting and racing clubs a larger share of the total deduction which is made by the Government from investments made in this class of totalisator. For the benefit and information of country members, I would point out that country racing and trotting clubs already receive 10 per cent. of the total deductions made by the Government from investments on totalisators. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. D. Brand, debate adjourned.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. W. HEGNEY (Minister for Labour—Mt. Hawthorn) [2.42] in moving the second reading said: By now, hon. members will be well acquainted with the provisions of this Bill because many of the proposed amendments contained in it have been submitted to Parliament on previous occasions. I do not propose to enter into a detailed explanation of every amendment now, but in Committee there will be ample opportunity given to hon. members to consider each clause. The main provisions of this measure are to provide retrospectivity in the second schedule payments and to reintroduce the provision that was brought before Parliament last year; namely, to include semi-subcontractors—if I may use that term, because it refers principally to those in the building industry—in the insurance cover whilst travelling to and from work.

This is about the eighth or ninth occasion that this provision has been submitted to Parliament, and it has been defeated in another place just as many times. Those what I might call the "to and from" or journeying provisions are in operation in all the other States of the Commonwealth with the exception of South Australia, and their insertion in our legislation is well overdue.

Another provision sought to be inserted in the Act is to give the option to a worker to claim against a negligent employer for damages and compensation; but he would not be able to recover, of course, both the amount of damages and compensation. In the section sought to be amended by another clause, it is now provided that where an injury to a worker is caused through the wilful or serious misconduct of that worker, any claim for compensation by him shall be disallowed.

The amendment proposes that if a serious injury results from a worker's negligence or misconduct, that worker shall be entitled to claim for compensation. Also, if death results from his misconduct or negligence, it is proposed that the widow or the worker's dependants shall not be penalised by being denied compensation for the worker's death.

There is one important matter that we hope will be agreed to by both Chambers on this occasion. It has relation particularly to the mining industry because it concerns industrial diseases. Under the Act at present any claim for compensation made by a worker who has contracted an industrial disease must be made within three years of his leaving employment. The amendment proposes to remove that three-year limitation because in the past it has been found that many workers, after leaving industry, have contracted silicosis and pneumoconiosis long after the three-year period has elapsed. Cases have been known of men who have worked in the mining industry for many years, and then have been deprived of their compensation because they have contracted silicosis long after the three-year limitation period.

It is proposed to increase the maximum payments made under the second schedule from £2,400 to £3,000. It is also proposed to increase the amount now allowed under the legislation for permanent and total incapacity from £2,750 to £3,000. It is hoped that there will be no objection to these amendments. I feel that every hon. member in this Chamber has had brought to his notice cases similar to that which I am now about to mention. The amendment concerning these workers proposes to lift the ceiling on the amounts provided under the Act for hospital and medical expenses. As is known, the maximum amount allowed for medical expenses is £100; and for hospital expenses, £150.

There are many cases of workers who have met with serious injuries which have meant that they have been in hospital for a very long period; and as a result, their hospital and medical expenses have well exceeded the maximum amounts allowed under the Act at present. Under the law a worker is legally bound to pay the balance between the amounts of £100 and £150 respectively and the total amounts of those expenses. I reiterate in all seriousness that any employee in industry who meets with an accident in the course of his or her employment, and who is incapacitated for a long period as a result of an injury, should not be bound to pay, to any extent, any hospital or medical expenses.

Victoria is a case in point where this amendment applies. The suggestion contained in our amendment is that the worker will be entitled to all reasonable medical expenses incurred as a result of hospitalisation and medical attention. If considerable sums are to be paid out in any particular case, then the worker will in no way be liable. If there is a difference of opinion as to whether the amount is reasonable or not, it will be a matter between the hospital, or doctor, and the employer; and, of course, the insurer will act for the employer.

There is a provision in the Bill that in any case where there is a difference of opinion as to what are reasonable expenses, the Workers' Compensation Board will have the authority to make a full inquiry and determine what those reasonable expenses are.

The next amendment has been asked for on different occasions by the Boilermakers' Union; and it has relation, I think, to the Third Schedule. It is hoped to include a provision for compensation for occupational deafness—commonly referred to in certain quarters as boilermakers' deafness.

Another amendment which we consider is overdue for adoption refers to workers who are incapacitated through injury in the course of their employment; and who, after a period of incapacity, receive a certificate from their medical adviser saying they are fit for light work. Very often arguments immediately arise between the insurer—acting on behalf of the employer—and the worker, as to whether any further compensation is payable. In some cases workers have been deprived of a continuation of weekly payments, even though they have a certificate indicating they are fit for light work; and even though the certificate is produced to the insurer.

It all depends on the nature of the man's occupation. In the case of a tally clerk, or a bookmaker carrying out duties of a light nature, if a doctor certifies that he is fit for light duties, presumably he will say that he is fit for his ordinary work. But a man who is a tradesman, or a tradesman's labourer, or one performing

laborious work and manual labour, is in another category altogether. If he is certified fit for light work, it is obvious the doctor does not think he is fit to carry out his ordinary work.

Why should such a man be penalised in the payments of his weekly compensation? There is no justification for it at all. Where a worker is certified as fit for light work, and the employer does not provide or obtain light work for the employee, then he should be entitled to receive weekly payments until such time as he is certified fit for his ordinary duties, or until suitable light work is found for him.

The other amendment of importance is the deletion of two words; namely, "by accident." The provision of the Act states that a worker is entitled to compensation where, in the course of his employment, he incurs injury by accident. It is proposed to delete the words "by accident." That will entitle any worker, handicapped by a gradual process, say, through the nature of his employment, to receive compensation. But, of course, medical evidence would have to be produced that his handicap arose through the nature of his occupation, and that it was of gradual onset over a period of years, and did not happen suddenly.

That provision obtains in another State, and it is considered that it should be introduced here. I did not indicate earlier that although we propose to increase the maximum under the Second Schedule from £2,400 to £3,000, it is proposed to raise all the other amounts pro rata; that is, for the loss of joints—a finger, a leg, and so forth. Hon. members who take a personal interest in workers' compensation will see that if they view previous amendments, these follow to a large extent the same pattern; because arguments are the same today as they were when we introduced these provisions over a period of many years.

We certainly have slight improvements in workers' compensation; but I think the time has arrived when matters of this nature should never be opposed. I do not wish to reiterate to any great extent the journeying provision, and those relating to the increase of lump sums. After all, what is £3,000? That is all we are asking. But in certain cases the Workers' Compensation Board should be entitled to grant amounts over £3,000. That will be in special cases. An amendment of £3,000 is not very great for a man who is permanently and totally incapacitated, and who has a wife and family to look after. The basic wage is £700, and this represents barely four years' wages at the rate of the basic wage.

Mr. Court: The worker still has redress at common law.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is so; but we are now dealing with workers' compensation. As I have said, some people would feel that £3,000 is a lot of money; but is it a large amount if a man is unable to work? Let us consider a tradesman who receives a margin of £200 over the basic wage. The amount will represent three years' salary, and he will then have to apply for social services. We feel that £3,000 is not a large amount. As a matter of fact it is in the Act now; and it is provided for the widow and dependants where a worker's death ensues as a result of injury. But if a worker lives, and is permanently and totally incapacitated, and is still responsible for looking after his wife and children, he receives a maximum amount of £2,750.

This is so in spite of the fact that there is one more person to maintain and a further mouth to feed. The inconsistency of it can be readily seen. We make no apology for this provision that in certain cases the Workers' Compensation Board shall be entitled to increase the amount, having regard to all the circumstances. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Court, debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3).

Second Reading.

THE HON. E. NULSEN (Minister for Justice—Eyre) [3.0] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill to which I am quite sure hon. members on the other side will agree, because I know they believe in compulsory voting.

Mr. Court: We will not commit ourselves until we hear what you have to say.

Mr. NULSEN: This Bill simply makes provision for compulsory voting by the electors in provinces of the Legislative Council in the same way as compulsory voting is required for the Legislative Assembly elections.

I do not think there is anything further to explain, because the contents of the Bill are very clear. We only want to put the Legislative Council, so far as compulsory voting is concerned, on the same basis as the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Bovell: You will have to get Bills already introduced passed for this Bill to be effective.

Mr. NULSEN: There may be something in what the hon. member has said. If it is at all possible, I think it is only fair that voting for the Legislative Council should be on the same basis as for the Legislative Assembly. Why should the electors for another place not be compelled to vote when that is the position in the case of the Legislative Assembly?

Mr. May: In the Senate, too.

Mr. Cornell: They are not compulsorily enrolled in the Legislative Council.

Mr. NULSEN: No; but there is no reason why they should not be.

Mr. Bovell: If the Bill is passed—

The SPEAKER: Who is explaining this Bill?

Mr. NULSEN: This Bill will put the Legislative Council on exactly the same basis as the Legislative Assembly, in that voting for both Houses will be compulsory.

Mr. Court: It appears as though it is aimed at the Suburban Province electors.

Mr. Jamieson: It might be aimed at the Central Province.

Mr. Court: I have recollections about what the Premier said on the day after the elections.

Mr. NULSEN: There is no reason why voting for another place should not, as soon as possible, be put on all fours with that for the Legislative Assembly. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Bovell, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—MESSAGES.

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

1, Workers' Compensation Act Amendment.

2, Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

MR. OWEN (Darling Range) [3.5]: I do not intend to delay the passage of this Bill, and will speak for only a few minutes. It is very similar to the measure introduced in 1954, and is on all fours with that which was before this Chamber in 1957. In fact, I think it is identical with that Bill as it left this Chamber to go to another place last year.

It is a pity that the Bill could not have been introduced into this Chamber in the form in which we understand it was almost agreed upon by a conference of managers last year. If that had been done, there would have been every chance of its having a speedy passage through both Houses so that it could be put on our statute book in a very short time.

We know that local authorities are anxious that there should be such a measure on the statute book, because the present Act is redolent of the horse and buggy days, and there is an urgent need for it to be modernised and streamlined in certain parts.

Members on this side of the House strenuously opposed certain portions of the Bill last year; but we know that the Government's brutal majority—or shall I say the way in which the Government's majority was brutally and ruthlessly exercised—made it impossible for us to have incorporated in the Bill any of the more important amendments we desired.

Mr. Nulsen: I think it would have been nicer for you to say it was policy conflicting with policy.

Mr. OWEN: The Minister may put it that way; but it was a fact that the Bill was then and is now unacceptable to hon. members on this side of the House.

Mr. May: Why didn't you say that first?

Mr. OWEN: In view of the urgency of having this Bill sent to another place, we feel it is not desirable to debate it at length. It would normally revert to a Committee Bill and would be fought clause by clause in the Committee stage. For my own part, I merely wish to register my opposition to some parts, particularly the clauses dealing with adult franchise and the election of chairman and president; although there are a few other points with which I am not in agreement.

I do not propose to debate the Bill at length in the Committee stage; and I trust that it will reach another place, and after being knocked into shape, if necessary, will be agreed upon by a conference so that it will be acceptable to both sides of the House. I support the second reading.

MR. CROMMELIN (Claremont) [3.10]: I wish to add my protest against the contentious clauses in the Bill. Today we heard the Premier, when replying to some questions asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, speak of increased water rating, and explain that the increase pertained to valuations. I mention this because, under the present system of voting for representation on a council, only those who pay rates may vote.

The main one who bears the rates is, in all cases, the householder. If water rates are increased, he must pay them; and if his local authority rates are increased, once again he has to bear the brunt. To suggest that everyone who lives in a municipality should have the right to vote is not, in my opinion, fair, because the vast majority of such people make a contribution in actual cash to the expenses that have to be met by the different municipalities.

Another point that one could argue is that the local authority might desire to raise a loan for the purpose of improving the roads, or building a kindergarten, and so on. If everyone had the right to vote, then each one of those people would have the right to petition the council to call a meeting to protest against the loan being

raised and spent in the manner desired by the authority. It would be entirely wrong for a group of, say, 20 people who lived in boarding houses or hotels, to record their vote to such an extent that they prevented the authority from carrying out necessary improvements.

I know it can be said that there is not much likelihood of this occurring, but if the law provides for it, such people as I have referred to have the right to avail themselves of the law. Therefore, on that aspect I oppose the adult franchise provision.

The system of rating is another great bone of contention. As the law stands today, the rating can be on the basis of the annual value or on the basis of the unimproved capital value. In the vast majority of cases in the metropolitan area, the rating is based on the annual value. Generally one hears very few complaints from the ratepayers—except, possibly, from some of the larger ratepayers such as hotelkeepers who at times appeal, and on occasions, perhaps, achieve some small success.

As hon. members know, if the local authorities were forced to adopt the unimproved or taxation values, as has been shown by the North Fremantle Municipality, ridiculous results could eventuate. An old couple who had been living in a small house on a small block of land for many years, might find that their rates had jumped 200 or 300 per cent. That is not right. The opposite could occur in the case of large factory buildings erected on newly-developed land. Under the suggested system, they would pay far less in rates than at present.

I can sympathise with hon. members of the Country Party in their objection to the amendment which provides that the president of a so-called shire council must be elected by the ratepayers, the same as is a mayor in the metropolitan area. I imagine that in most country districts it would be a foregone conclusion that the man living in the town—if there was more than one nomination for the position of president—would command many more votes than, for instance, a farmer. Consequently, at times we could have representation which would not be agreeable to the large farming community. The road boards have, up to now, had the privilege of electing their own president, and I see no reason to agree with the amendment in the Bill.

The amendment in regard to Government auditors is just another attempt to force the local authorities to accept a Government auditor in place of some man or firm who, possibly, has been employed for many years and who has given entire satisfaction. So, I repeat, I object to the clauses I have mentioned. I support the second reading.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Harvey) [3.18]: While supporting the second reading of the Bill, I offer opposition to the clauses which we regard as contentious; and the first is the provision which seeks to permit adult franchise in local authority elections. The electorate I represent is one that could be used to show how farcical the position under adult franchise could be.

A few years ago, when a similar Bill was debated here, I brought to the notice of the Government the fact that in the road board district of Harvey, a great deal of public work had been carried on by a large number of men at different times.

I think the hon. member for Canning will back me up in what I am about to say. At one time at Harvey, there were 1,500 men on a particular job. It is easy to see that if a large number of men are in a district for 12 months or two years, they could have their names placed on the electoral roll; or, as the Bill provides, if the secretary of the local authority thought they should have the right to vote, he could have their names put on the roll, in which event they would have a noticeable influence on the road board elections. The road board could quite easily be swamped with non-ratepayers, men who would have no interest in the district, from a civic point of view.

In the case I mentioned before, where there is a big public works project taking place, and the men are camped in the area, they would certainly have no reason to take any particular interest in the civic affairs of the town; but, under this Bill, they would be entitled to vote. Their votes, naturally, would be no reflection of the desires of the people of the district; and yet the road board could comprise mainly non-ratepayers, and those people would be levying rates and spending the money of the ratepayers.

That is one of the most objectionable features of this Bill, and to my mind there is no commonsense in the proposal. If the Government desires to do something for local authorities, and to improve the efficiency of local government, it will not achieve that by this method. It indicates to me that the Government does not desire to improve the efficiency of local government, but merely wishes to implement its Labour Party policy at the expense of local government, because there is no doubt that that could be the result.

At present a large number of men are in camp at the Wellington Weir, doing construction work there. That is in the Harvey Road Board district; and these men have been there for 12 months or more, and are likely to be there for another two years. They are living under canvas; but under the provisions of this Bill, they would be entitled to vote at the road board election.

Mr. Nulsen: Why not? I gave you a full explanation of that previously. The ordinary person makes a greater contribution than does the ratepayer. That is a fact.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: They make no contribution at all.

Mr. Nulsen: That is indisputable.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: Yes: that they do not make any contribution at all; nor are they interested.

Mr. Nulsen: They do make a contribution.

Mr. Hawke: Do local business people refuse to take their money?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not the point.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: That is a most roundabout way of contributing to local government finance. They are much more likely to contribute to the coffers of the Taxation Department by that roundabout method. But it indicates that the clause in the Bill is well out of touch with reality.

The election of the chairman of a road board or municipality, according to the Bill, must be by public vote, and not by selection from among the members of the board, as in the present system. In my view it should be optional, and the people of the district concerned should be allowed to decide how the chairman shall be elected. In some country districts it would be far more suitable for the chairman to be elected from among board members, because in some instances there would be no candidate for the chairmanship. In such an instance, if the matter was left in the hands of the board members themselves, they would soon select the most suitable from among their number to take the chair.

On the other hand, there would probably be other districts where it would be acceptable for the chairman to be elected by the ratepayers as a whole. Therefore, if we could write into this measure an optional clause as regards the election of chairman, I think it would be much more suitable than the present clause in the Bill.

Then we come to the question of valuations. The Bill states that valuations must be those of the Taxation Department. But there is a lot of dissension regarding taxation valuations; and the department, in arriving at its valuations, takes into consideration sales of land in the particular areas. If there is a great demand for land in a particular area, the value of that land is boosted and inflated.

In many cases when a property changes hands it is bought by an adjoining owner who will always outbid, or endeavour to outbid, a person desiring to settle in the district, because of the proximity of that land to his own farming set-up. The land is of greater value to him than it is to someone else, but the economic earning capacity of the land has not been increased because of the fictitious value placed upon it. That is one reason—and there are many others, too—why the value of land has been inflated over the years. That inflated value has no relationship to the economic earning capacity of the land, or its true unimproved capital value.

Many local authorities are not happy about being rated on Taxation Department valuations. Then comes the question of how the land should be rated; whether on the unimproved capital value or the annual rental value. In my opinion, the wisest thing to do is to allow the local authority itself to decide what form of rating it desires. If it is rural land I think the unimproved capital value basis would be best; but if it is town land or urban land, I think it should be rated on the annual rental value basis.

Mr. Nulsen: Land in the Nedlands electorate is rated on the unimproved capital value basis.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: It may be. But in the Nedlands electorate the local authority concerned has decided that that is the fairest means, and the most suitable one for its district. That supports my belief that the question should be optional; because, judging by the correspondence we have received, and from what we know of many districts, it is obvious that the basis which might be suitable in one district would not be suitable in another. Therefore I strongly advocate that local authorities be given the option regarding the selection of a rating method.

It is not my wish to delay this measure; because, like other hon. members, I am keen to see it make some progress through Parliament. But I wanted to bring to the notice of the Government the fact that we are strongly opposed to these contentious clauses, and it is regrettable that the Bill has been introduced with those clauses still in it. Because of the comments that have been made in the past, there is no doubt that local authorities throughout Western Australia are hostile to those provisions. If it is the desire of the Government to assist local authorities with a view to improving their efficiency, there is only one thing for the Government to do, and that is to remove the contentious clauses from the Bill.

THE HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [3.30]: I do not intend to cover the ground regarding the contentious clauses in the Bill. It is the same story as that told last session. It is my opinion that if we are to pass this Bill this year, or within the immediate future, it will have to be transmitted to the Legislative Council as soon as possible.

Since the original move was made to consolidate the local government law affecting road boards and municipalities in

Western Australia, quite a number of years have gone by—in fact, six or seven. A Royal Commission has inquired into this matter, and a number of attempts have been made in Parliament to pass a Bill; but each time there was a breakdown, particularly in relation to clauses affecting adult franchise, rating, election of mayors or chairmen, and—to some extent—the appointment of auditors.

I do not know if there is not a growing indifference on the part of local authorities in this State to the passing of this Bill. There seems to be some doubt whether something worth-while will be achieved if it ultimately becomes law. There is a growing feeling among local authorities—among which one or two road boards in my district are included—of preference for a modern up-to-date law governing road boards, as distinct from one governing municipalities. Following all the argument, which so far has achieved nothing, it would appear to me that when we finally pass a Bill under which local government would work in this State, it should represent up-to-date thinking and the last word in local government.

A recent conference of local government representatives in Perth indicated a very keen interest in the comments of one, Mr. Gifford, who is an authority on local government law. He was brought over here specially to discuss some of the controversial issues facing local authorities in the State. As a result of his visit, he was requested to peruse the Bill in the form in which it is now placed before us, and to give his comments to local government associations here. A copy of his findings and recommendation on the various clauses in the Bill has been presented to the Government and to the Leader of the Country Party, who represents the viewpoint of the Opposition on this matter. The latter has passed on his copy to me.

Mr. Nulsen: I have not yet seen a copy of it.

Mr. BRAND: I realise the difficulties which face the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government. I know he would be very anxious to peruse this document to obtain knowledge of up-to-date thinking on this matter by an expert, before asking this House to pass the Bill through in its present form.

Mr. Nulsen: If we are to pass this Bill this year, any amendments can be dealt with in the Legislative Council.

Mr. BRAND: It is not the desire of the Opposition to hold up the passage of the Bill in this House. We can only reiterate what has already been said in support of and in opposition to its contents. It would appear to me there has been no change in the attitude of local government in opposing the clauses affecting adult franchise, rating, etc. In fact, there has been a stiffening of opposition. I feel there has been an awakening to the need for the Opposition to do something to prevent the Bill going through in this form. Anyone who attended the conference of local government representatives at any time, or for any time, will agree that is so.

Mr. Nulsen: These points were not obstacles to the Bill going through last year. We compromised at the conference.

Mr. BRAND: I do not know what the Minister is getting at. I know that when the representatives of local government met recently in Perth, they seemed to be more and more decided that if there was to be this local government law, it must not include provisions which enforce adult franchise in respect of elections; it must retain the right for local authorities to choose their own system of rating, and give local authorities the right to choose their mayors or chairmen. They considered that local authorities should not have forced on them a system decided upon by the Minister.

Mr. Moir: Isn't the mayor elected by the ratepayers now?

Mr. BRAND: The mayor is elected in municipal councils. I also mentioned road boards.

Mr. Moir: You said "mayors and chairmen".

Mr. BRAND: I believe there should be a freedom of choice in that respect. If the municipalities care to continue with their system of electing mayors, well and good; but they should be given the right to choose their own system. That recommendation has been made by Mr. Gifford. He went further than we have suggested and said although municipalities and road boards should be free to adopt whatever system they wish—

Mr. Heal: The opposition to adult franchise did not prevent the Bill going through last year.

Mr. BRAND: I do not care to go into a discussion on that matter now. It could be thrashed out in another place. I might say to the hon. member that had the Minister for Local Government stated in another place to the members there that he was prepared to accept adult franchise under any condition at all, the Bill would now have become law. He preferred to wait until the conference of managers during which the Bill was tossed out on what the Minister has called a minor point. If it was so minor, would it not be preferable for us to pass the Bill, and for the Minister to introduce a minor amendment this year and so make any adjustment necessary?

Mr. Nulsen: The Bill was not lost on that point at all.

Mr. BRAND: The Bill was lost on a minor point according to the Minister. In fact, it was lost on adult franchise, and the Minister well knows that its defeat was indirectly associated with adult franchise, and for that reason he tossed it out. It is high time that the Government and the department representing local government had another look at the whole thing and ascertained whether they are not giving to the State, after all this time—as the hon. member for Pilbara has stated—a consolidated local government law rather than a modern up-to-date law affecting the affairs of local government in this State.

I believe we want the latter. However, we are prepared to co-operate after having made our views quite clear in respect of the main points of opposition evident in this House last time the Bill was before us. Having said that, I support the second reading of the Bill and trust the Minister will leave the Committee stage until the Leader of the Country Party is present.

On motion by the Hon. E. Nulsen (Minister for Health), debate adjourned.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (POSTPONEMENT OF 1958 ELECTIONS) BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. E. NULSEN (Minister for Justice—Eyre) [3.43]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. BRAND: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that I would be in order in speaking on the Bill?

The SPEAKER: I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the second reading has been agreed to. This Bill originated in the Legislative Council and reached this House last night. I do not think the Minister for Justice was in the House at the time, so the Premier moved that the Bill be read a first time and that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting. This afternoon I called the Order of the Day, and the Minister for Justice moved that the Bill be read a second time. As no debate ensued, I had no alternative but to put the question, which was carried; and the Bill was accordingly read a second time. The Minister is now in the position of being able to move that I leave the Chair and that the House resolve into a committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the Bill.

In Committee.

Mr. Sewell in the Chair; the Hon. E. Nulsen (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—put and passed.

Clause 2—Postponement of Elections:

Mr. BRAND: The situation is something rather new to me; but if the Government wants this small Bill delayed all the afternoon, it is going the right way about it. I think the Minister might have mentioned to the House that he had intended to explain the second reading of this Bill. Surely the Opposition, or any hon. member who sits behind the Minister, is entitled to an explanation of a Bill at the second reading; and if by omission, error, or forgetfulness, the Minister does not make such explanation, I think he should at least apologise.

Mr. Nulsen: You have not given me the opportunity.

Mr. BRAND: The opportunity has gone by—apparently for all of us; and it would appear that some comment is necessary from the Minister, even if it is only to explain the clauses in the Bill. I believe that under Standing Orders—and I am sure the hon. member for Fremantle will bear me out—the Minister should not make a second reading speech at the Committee stage of a Bill. However, it is hoped, as no-one knows what the Bill is all about, that the Minister will explain the principal clauses in it before we go any further.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

Mr. NULSEN: I was surprised to hear all the hubbub a few minutes ago. The Bill has been in the wooden drawers of hon. members opposite for a day; and in any event there is not much in it. Surely, having had it in their drawers for a day, they should have a vivid conception of what is contained in the Bill! I know my friends opposite have read the Bill; and realising that they are all very intelligent, I am sure that Clause 2 explains itself.

Owing to the Federal elections being held on the fourth Saturday in November, it was necessary to put the municipal council elections forward one week. This is only a temporary measure; and, looking at members opposite and seeing that they have had the Bill before them for a whole day I think that, on reflection, they will agree that they have had time to examine it.

Mr. Brand: The Premier did not understand it sufficiently to introduce it last night, and he left it for you.

Mr. Hawke: Last night was private members' night.

Mr. NULSEN: I was not here last night, and I only received the Bill when I came here today; but at all events it is very clear.

Mr. Brand: It is very clear, now that it has been explained.

Mr. NULSEN: If the Leader of the Opposition thinks it necessary for me to apologise, I will be happy to do so, as I would not like to upset my friends opposite, knowing that it is their wish to help us whenever possible. I am endeavouring to be helpful, so as to get this session finished early enough to allow us all to do some electioneering for the forthcoming Federal election.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse) [4.10]: Yes, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: We are dealing with Order of the Day No. 6.

Mr. BOVELL: I thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Speaker. I was running a little bit late, as I expected some debate to continue in the controversy which was raging when I left the Chamber.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister was very conciliatory.

Mr. BOVELL: This is legislation which has seen the light of day in this House on a number of occasions—

Mr. Nulsen: But it has always gone on into the darkness.

Mr. BOVELL: A similar Bill has been introduced by the present Government on a number of occasions; but Parliament, in its wisdom, has always rejected the provisions of the legislation as being undesirable in relation to our bicameral system of legislative authority. The principles of the Bill, as I see them, are not desirable, as they seek to allow all persons over the age of 21 years to vote at Legislative Council elections, with compulsory enrolment, and to permit candidates to contest elections for the Legislative Council on reaching the age of 21 years, as against the existing law, which requires candidates to be 30 or more years of age.

The Legislative Council was the sole legislative authority in Western Australia from 1830 to 1890, when the bicameral system was inaugurated in this State by the establishment of this Legislative Assembly. Since 1890, as hon. members are aware, the bicameral system of government in this State has continued; and I believe it has continued to the benefit of all people in this State.

The property qualifications for voting in Legislative Council elections are necessary to a minor degree, as it is considered that they are necessary—I am firmly convinced that they are necessary—for the good government of Western Australia. The property qualifications encourage people to own something, to rent something for which they are responsible, or to show some concrete evidence of their interest in Western Australia, by assuming certain responsibilities.

Mr. Nulsen: Wouldn't that apply to acquiring knowledge, also?

Mr. BOVELL: Yes; and I think that when people acquire knowledge, the first thing they do is to realise that it is their bounden duty to have some stake in the country and some responsibility towards it. I believe that the owning of something in a State makes us more responsible and more aware of our obligations to the State. If we have no sheet anchor, as it were, we are apt to become fly-by-nights and pick up our traps and proceed elsewhere; but if we have responsibilities in regard to property, or caring for other people's property for which we are paying rent, that is in the best interests of the State. I believe, also, that such people should have a voice in the government of the country, and it is the Legislative Council that gives them such a voice.

Mr. Nulsen: You say that the minority should dominate the majority?

Mr. BOVELL: That is not so—

Mr. Nulsen: That is so!

Mr. BOVELL: —but minorities, as well as majorities, should have some voice in the government of the country. Unfortunately, under our parliamentary system, and especially as far as this Assembly is concerned, I have found that a minority can make a great deal of noise and advance reasonable suggestions to no avail, because everything I asked the Minister for Agriculture to agree to last night was just wiped off. Before the hon. member for Wembley Beaches and the Minister for Justice interjected, I was about to explain that the qualifications for franchise in the Legislative Council are so wide that I am firmly convinced that no person in Western Australia need be denied that franchise. Here are some of the qualifications that are necessary for a person to exercise his franchise in the Legislative Council—

> A freeholder who has legal or equitable estate in possession situated in the electoral province of the clear value of £50.
>
> A leasholder, while within the Province, occupying any dwelling house of £17 clear annual value.

Mr. Jamieson: That represents a lot of words, but they do not make much sense to the majority of the people.

Mr. BOVELL: Continuing with these qualifications—

> A leaseholder who has leasehold estate in possession and situated within the Province of the clear annual value of £17.
>
> A Crown leaseholder who holds a lease or licence to depasture, occupy, cultivate or mine upon Crown land within the Province of annual rental of at least £10.
>
> A person whose name is on the electoral list of any municipality or road board in respect of property within the Province on an annual ratable value of not less than £17.

To me, it would appear that those qualifications are all-embracing. If any person has a genuine desire to vote in the Legislative Council elections, those qualifications are so wide that the person concerned could quite easily become enrolled for the Legislative Council.

It must be recognised that whilst voting is compulsory for the Legislative Assembly, so also is enrolment; and earlier in today's sitting the Minister introduced a Bill which, if passed, will make voting compulsory not only for the Legislative Assembly, but also for the Legislative Council elections. However, I believe that voting for the Legislative Council should be optional. There should be no compulsion whatsoever in regard to the enrolment or voting for the Legislative Council. In our bicameral system, one House has universal franchise and voting and enrolment are compulsory. However, the voting and enrolment for the House which forms the other side of our system is optional.

The SPEAKER: The merits of that proposition come under the other Bill.

Mr. BOVELL: That is so, Mr. Speaker. I was merely referring to the compulsory enrolment for the Legislative Council which is provided in this Bill. Despite the propaganda of the Government over recent years, the Legislative Council is essentially a House of review; and it must be kept that way, because of the influence it exercises on the legislation which is brought before it. The Legislative Council has always been composed of a majority of hon. members who represent, in effect, the policy of the Liberal and Country Parties.

Mr. Nulsen: Is that the reason why you do not want a change?

Mr. BOVELL: Not at all! If the people wanted a change they would have taken some action to bring it about during the years that the bicameral system has been in operation.

Mr. Hawke: How could the people do that?

Mr. BOVELL: I have already stated that if a person has a genuine desire to be placed on the Legislative Council roll, the qualifications necessary to enable him to obtain the franchise are all-embracing.

Mr. Nulsen: The minority is really the majority.

Mr. BOVELL: The minority is not really the majority. The bicameral system of Government is one which must have—in State politics anyhow—some differences in regard to enrolment and election.

Mr. Marshall: Why should there be?

Mr. BOVELL: I am not going to repeat what I have already said, for the benefit of the hon. member for Wembley Beaches. He is entitled to his point of view, but I am endeavouring to state mine and he will have the right to speak on this measure when I resume my seat and at any future time if he so desires.

Before the interjections which came from several hon. members on the other side of the House, I was saying that the majority of the hon. members in the Legislative Council were made up of those who belonged to the Liberal and Country Parties. From 1924 to 1958, the Government of the day, with the exception of nine years, has been of the opposite political colour. Therefore, I feel that the legislation that has been passed in the period from 1924 to 1958 by review in the Legislative Council has been passed in the best interests of Western Australia. I am quite convinced of that.

Mr. Nulsen: Naturally you would be.

Mr. BOVELL: It is the influence of the Legislative Council and the co-ordination between the two Chambers that has eventually produced a measure acceptable to the Government, perhaps not always with good grace. However, in the ultimate, the measures that have become law have proved to have been in the best interests of Western Australia. I am confident that the Legislative Council should continue as part of our bicameral system of Government.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister made a long statement in support of his own ideas on the abolition of the Legislative Council. However, I repeat that in Western Australia the bicameral system of Government has proved that it works so well in the interests of the people that no change should be agreed to.

The other provision in the Bill seeks to make any candidate for election to the Legislative Council eligible at 21 years instead of 30 years. In my opinion it is advisable that a person of the more mature age of 30 should be eligible to become a member of a House of review. I consider

that the existing system of the election of candidates and the qualifications of electors for the Legislative Council are satisfactory and I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Mr. Norton, debate adjourned.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse) [4.28]: This measure is complementary to the Electoral Acts Amendment Bill which I have just been discussing; and if that Bill is passed, it will become necessary to amend the Constitution Acts Amendment Act; because if it were not amended, the previous Bill, if passed, would have no real effect. I am not going to repeat my reasons for supporting the continuance of the existing conditions relating to the Legislative Council. This measure, like the one we have just been discussing, is quite unnecessary, and I oppose the second reading.

Mr. NORTON: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Potter
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Toms
Mr. Lapham	Mr. May
Mr. Marshall	*(Teller.)*

Noes—14

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. I. Manning *(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Mann
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Watts
Mr. Evans	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Andrew	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hall	Mr. W. Manning
Mr. Lawrence	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Sleeman	Mr. Perkins

Majority for—7.

Motion thus passed; debate adjourned.

CANCER COUNCIL OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October.

MR. CROMMELIN (Claremont) [4.34]: The object of this Bill is to create a cancer committee with several purposes. The first of these will be to endeavour to carry out further research into the causes of cancer; to endeavour to cure cancer; and, in due time, to appoint boards when institutes are built for the purpose of treatment of all cancer cases.

I should say that, up to date, from what one reads in the papers, and hears over the radio, very little success has been achieved in any place in the world in the search for a simple cure for this disease. So it will be obvious to everyone that still greater amounts of money, energy and research into the causes of this disease must be maintained—and, indeed, accelerated—in an endeavour to find a solution to the problem.

In this State, in addition to the new cases, which number 1,000 each year, there are also a further 200 people who return for treatment which they may have had one, two, or more years previously. The disease having recurred, it is necessary for them to be re-treated. Members will appreciate that this is a very serious state of affairs. As I have indicated, 1,200 people have to be treated in this State each year.

After a conference in Canberra in 1955 at a Commonwealth level, it was suggested that an anti-cancer council be formed in each State throughout Australia, with the object of gaining information for the prevention and cure of this disease. Such a body was duly constituted in this State; and, since that time, it has been carrying on. It had the rights of a charitable institution; and, as such, conducted an appeal for funds for the installation of machines. Up to date it has raised a little over £100,000. It has been a very successful appeal and a very important one. The object of the Bill before the House is to make this Anti-Cancer Council a body corporate, with power to carry on the work, and with power to establish and maintain cancer institutes.

Part 2 of the Bill deals with the constitution of the council, which is to be composed of 16 people. It appears there will be, on the first section, ten who will be selected from the honorary staffs of hospitals and institutions. Accepting advice from officials of the British Medical Association—on whom I called, and by whom I was asked to suggest to the Minister that he accept an amendment providing the exact composition of these first ten—I ask him to give consideration

to one of the two members nominated by the honorary staff of the Royal Perth Hospital, being a radio-therapist.

It is appreciated that this particular medical man is the one who actually handles the machine when treating patients. The B.M.A.'s idea was that possibly the ten to be nominated could miss out by not having one of these particular types on the council. A further suggestion was that, of the two members to be nominated by the Faculty of Medicine from the University, one should be a pathologist. The idea behind that was that possibly the members of the council might find they did not have a pathologist on the council; and the B.M.A. feels that such a nomination would be an excellent idea.

To continue with the selection of the board: I notice the Minister will appoint two officers from the Department of Health. He will also appoint two other members; and two others will be elected at the first meeting of the council. I wonder if the Minister will agree to give an indication whether it is his idea that one or two of the members he has the right to nominate could be a layman, so that on such an organisation as this we would get the type of fellow who could talk simpler language to the public, and explain some of the things to be done. On the other hand, he might be a man who could be of assistance as an organiser in relation to the raising of funds, which will be very necessary to get this body into high gear.

Part 3 of the Bill sets out the duties and functions of this council, and really suggests that, when the body is formed, it shall stimulate research to the best of its ability, raise funds, and provide and maintain institutes. Having reached a decision that an institute is necessary, it is then required to select a board to run the institute, and to send the selected names of the men who are to be on the board to the Minister for his approval. Seven people are to serve on these boards, which are to be corporate bodies; and the institution is to be attached to the hospital at the same time.

In an endeavour to find out whether a firm decision had been made as to where the new linear accelerator—which I understand has been ordered—is to be situated, I asked the Minister certain questions yesterday. I was advised that it will be situated near the Hollywood Chest Hospital, with a small number of beds available in proximity to the machine.

As we are so close to forming a new committee, I wonder whether it would be a better idea to give that committee an opportunity to consider where it should go. From what little I know of this matter, there seems to be some difference of opinion amongst members of the Anti-Cancer Council, as it is now constituted, as to whether they are doing the best thing, not only for the Government but for the public and the operators of these x-ray machines, in locating the accelerator near the Chest Hospital.

The point I am trying to make is that all the normal types of x-ray machines are available at the Royal Perth Hospital. The Minister has indicated that there is possibly no room to locate the new linear accelerator in the same place, but I have been advised that there is room for this machine on the 4½ acres on the other side of the road. It is fairly obvious that if we are able to establish it at the Royal Perth Hospital, and keep it there for five or six years, there will be a great deal of saving in staff and the need for a second building to house this machine will be obviated.

If it were placed near to the machines already being used, it would not be necessary for outpatients to be transported to Hollywood. But, more important than that, the staff using the machines at Royal Perth Hospital would be able to use the linear accelerator; whereas, if it were located at Hollywood, a duplication of that staff would be necessary.

I have been advised that the extra cost involved—I should say the approximate cost—will be in the vicinity of £5,000 per annum; but if it is installed at the Hollywood site, the annual cost will in all probability amount to £15,000 for staff, etc. Therefore, £10,000 per year can be saved over the next four or five years if the linear accelerator is located at the Royal Perth Hospital. Even at the end of that period, if the accelerator had to be moved to Hollywood to the new general hospital, the amount of money saved over the five-year period would more than pay the cost of its removal; and a considerable amount of money would be saved now by installing it at Royal Perth Hospital. A firm decision on the situation of the machine should be deferred and left for the consideration of this new committee when it is constituted.

The fifth part of the Bill is mainly concerned with finance. The new cancer committee, when it becomes a legally-constituted body, will take over the existing funds that are to the credit of the Anti-Cancer Council. These funds are the result of a public appeal made a year or so ago, and they will be available to the new body to pay for and install the new machine and commence any cancer institutes which that body might recommend to the Minister.

I might mention in passing that it is a good thing to know we have in prospect a new general hospital at Hollywood, because it is fairly evident that the Royal Perth Hospital is becoming somewhat overtaxed. I still consider that the Minister

should defer making a firm decision on the situation of the linear accelerator until this body is organised and is a going concern. Knowing full well the objects of the Bill, and what this new committee hopes to achieve, I support the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Marshall, debate adjourned.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October.

MR. ROBERTS (Bunbury) [4.56]: Under the Commonwealth Constitution, the Federal Government has the power to legislate in regard to weights and measures. In the report of the Commonwealth Royal Commission on the Constitution in 1930, evidence was given to the commission urging that the Commonwealth Government should exercise its constitutional powers in order that a uniform system of weights and measures might be provided throughout the length and breadth of Australia.

As the Minister told us in his second reading speech on this Bill, to amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1915-1941, Commonwealth and State Ministers met in 1939 and reference was made to a resolution agreed to at a similar conference in 1936 to the effect that if the Federal Government enacted legislation covering the establishment and maintenance of Commonwealth standards of weights and measures, the States would fully co-operate in regard to the adoption of such standards throughout Australia.

To implement this undertaking by the States, the Commonwealth brought down a Bill—namely, the Weights and Measures (National Standards) Bill, 1948—which, after passing through the various stages, became an Act on the statute book of the Commonwealth, thus enabling the ultimate implementation of a set of uniform standards of weights and measures throughout the States.

Each Australian State, as the Minister pointed out, has in the past established its own standards of weights and measures; and in many instances the standards set out are not uniform State by State. The Minister has now brought this Bill down so that this State can implement the resolution agreed to by the Commonwealth and State Ministers in 1936, and again in 1939.

To us as Australians, it is ludicrous that there should not be uniformity of weights and measures throughout the length and breadth of our great country; because Governments, commerce, industry, and science are vitally concerned in weights and measurement covering all manner of things such as area, volume, mass, length and so on. The C.S.I.R.O. has for many years now established within its wide ramifications a National Standards Laboratory which, with its scientific staff and facilities provided, can maintain the required standards of weights and measures, thereby enabling the States to calibrate their existing standards of weights and measures against the Commonwealth standards which ultimately will result in one set of standards for the States. This has been needed for a long time.

The existing administration of weights and measures by the States will function as at present. I take it that when this Bill is proclaimed, Section 9 of the principal Act will be repealed, as that section provides that specimens of weights and measures of the standard of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland shall be the standard of weights and measures of Western Australia.

In the Minister's second reading speech he said that when the Bill is proclaimed, action will be taken for Part II of the Weights and Measures Act to cease to have effect. I think the Minister made a slight error there as I feel he was referring to Section 9 of the Principal Act. As hon. members will notice, later on in the Bill there are amendments to Section 11 in Part II of the Act. I take it that the Minister will correct that error which has crept in to his second reading speech.

When the Minister first presented this Bill I thought it might possibly have reference to the sale of packaged articles of 14-oz. net weight. Articles of this weight were the subject of certain action some months ago, and I trust that the Minister will look into this matter and rectify the position and bring the sale of 14-oz. packets in this State into line with what I understand is established practice in other States of Australia.

According to the regulations made under the Weights and Measures Act, and dated the 27th May, 1957, Part VI covers standardisation of packages of certain goods and mentions in Section 2 that no person shall sell retail, goods enclosed in a package in any other quantity than 1-oz., 2-oz., 4-oz., 8-oz., 12-oz., 1-lb., 1½-lb. and so on. I feel that that particular regulation is rather ludicrous; because, as the Minister well knows—I do not want him for one moment to think I am pressing for additional sales of English fish in this State—the sale of goods packed in a 14-oz. package is only right and reasonable in any commodity, so long as that package is clearly defined. We can sell 12-oz. packets and 2-oz. packets. Put these together and the result is a 14-oz. packet. Therefore I feel that the particular regulation should be looked into and the irregularity rectified.

Mr. Norton: Would you suggest the weights be more clearly marked on packages?

Mr. ROBERTS: In many cases the weights are clearly marked, although I grant that in others they are not. Anyone who has had experience in the retail sale of packages that have to be kept under refrigeration, will realise that in some instances it is difficult to keep the net weight clearly defined on the packages. But surely the general public are educated enough to realise the difference between a 14-oz. packet and a 16-oz. packet. What is the difference between selling a 12-oz. packet and a 14-oz. packet, when it is all boiled down? I hope the Minister will give consideration to the regulation.

Getting back to the Bill, it is my opinion that, from the national point of view, nothing but good can result from it. I am confident that, as time goes on, each and every State in Australia will pass legislation of a similar nature so that the provisions of the Commonwealth national standards organisation will become uniform throughout Australia. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Sewell in the Chair; the Hon. J. J. Brady (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—put and passed.

Clause 2—Commencement:

Mr. ROBERTS: I thought the Minister would make some comment on the statement I made in connection with Part II. I feel that an error has occurred here, and I would like his views on the matter. I would also like to hear what he has to say about 14-oz. packets.

Mr. BRADY: In regard to Part II, I understand that it is possible the sections referred to by the hon. member will need to be retained in the Act for some time, because the Commonwealth Government may not deal with all the standards that we deal with in Western Australia. But certain standards of weight and measurement will be laid down, and they will be uniform throughout the Commonwealth. So it is possible that Part II may not have to be completely repealed.

I have taken more than a passing interest in the matter of 14-oz. packages because this question can have an effect on people who are packaging goods in Western Australia. We have been asked to alter our regulations to allow the sale of 14-oz. packets of fish, and so on. But, before we do this, we will look at the overall position. At the moment, officers of the department are getting information from various people who are packaging goods in Western Australia. If it is felt that these regulations should be amended to permit of 14-oz. packets being sold, that will be done, but if it is felt that such a move would be detrimental to the people in Western Australia, it will not be encouraged.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 8, Title—put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sewell in the Chair; the Hon. J. J. Brady (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council's amendment is as follows:—

> Clause 3, page 2, line 8—Add after the word "(Incorporated)" the passage "or The Eastern Goldfields Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Inc.) or any other society incorporated under the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act, 1895-1957, and which has for its aims and objects the prevention of cruelty to animals."

Mr. BRADY: I have considered the amendment, and I can see no objection to accepting it. I understand that for some years now there has been, on the Eastern Goldfields, a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. It is rumoured that there is also one at Albany. It is unreasonable that they should be excluded from the legislation. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTS: Since we last considered the Bill, I have received a letter from the secretary of a conference of Goldfields local governing bodies, and they are definitely in accord with the amendment. I therefore support the motion.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.