

Bales of wool forwarded to agents for sale at auctions are usually marked in such a manner that they can be readily identified. However, when wool is sold to private buyers the bales are not necessarily marked in this manner, or at all. This presents difficulties in the detection of stolen wool or wool that has been sold illegally. Also, marking of bales of wool will assist their recovery should they become detached from a consignment when in transit, such as falling off a truck or some such conveyance. This amendment has the support of the Farmers' Union and all others concerned in the wool industry.

The other matter that is contained in this Bill is an amendment designed to extend, for a further two years until the 31st of December, 1965, legislation that was passed by Parliament last year, amending the Agriculture Products Act. The legislation, at the request of the Western Australian Fruit Growers' Association, enabled a committee known as the Apple Sales Advisory Committee to be set up. This committee was to determine the size and quality of specified varieties of apples which should be sold on the local market. This measure was designed to control the sale of apples so that inferior fruit would not be marketed.

As was clearly stated last year, the amendment provided that it should operate only until the 31st December, 1963. This was in order to give the committee a trial period of operations; also the experience gained would provide factual information for use when deciding whether or not a marketing scheme is necessary.

During this past year, in spite of a heavy crop in 1962, returns to growers for good quality fruit have been much better than in previous years. It is for this reason the Western Australian Fruit Growers' Association has requested that the operations of the Apple Sales Advisory Committee be continued for a further two years, until the 31st December, 1965.

In order to comply with the request of the people concerned in the fruit-growing industry, I commend this Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Kelly.

House adjourned at 10.2 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 14th November, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	2785
BILLS—	
Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill—2r.	2766
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Criminal Code Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Dentists Act Amendment Bill—2r.	2785
Factories and Shops Bill—	
Com.	2769
Recom.	2780
Further Recom.	2783
Government Railways Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Bill—Assent	2785
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill—Intro. ; 1r.	2765
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Offenders Probation and Parole Bill—Assent	2785
Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Police Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2788
Com. ; Report ; 3r.	2790
Prisons Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Sale of Human Blood Bill—Assent	2785
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
Vermin Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2785
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Alcoa Refinery—Effects of Fumes and Analysis of Air	2763
Bituminisation of Roads—	
Albany-Denmark	2765
Lake Grace-Pingrup and Lake Grace-Kullin	2765
Bridges—Condition at Frankland and Kent Rivers	2765
Factories and Shops Inspectors—	
Course of Instruction	2763
Recognition of Successful Candidates	2764
Tabling of Examination Papers	2764
Health Inspectors—	
Course of Instruction	2763
Recognition of Successful Candidates	2763
Tabling of Examination Papers	2763
Liquor and Cigarettes—Price in Australian Coastal Waters	2763
Midland Abattoir : Rebates on Cattle Slaughtering Charges—	
Factors Taken into Consideration	2764
Sliding Scale	2764
Pneumoconiosis Committee—Submission of Report	2765

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**HEALTH INSPECTORS***Course of Instruction*

1. The Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the period of study and training required for those seeking the qualification of a health inspector?
- (2) (a) What are the subjects which are studied; and
(b) how many hours of instruction are devoted to each subject?
- (3) How many hours are spent in practical instruction during the course?
- (4) Who or what body establishes the course of study?
- (5) Who or what body sets the examination paper and examines the candidates?
- (6) Who delivers the lectures to the candidates or students?

Tabling of Examination Papers

- (7) Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House a recent set of examination papers?

Recognition of Successful Candidates

- (8) What form of recognition is granted to the successful candidate?
- (9) Is the qualification recognised in the Eastern States or abroad?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) There are five certificates of qualification in health inspection each of which requires one year's study. Most local authorities require at least two certificates.
- (2) (a) and (b). The syllabus of study is tabled.
- (3) General certificate—200 hours. Meat and food certificate—2 months' practical training.
- (4) The Royal Society of Health, London.
- (5) Western Australian Examination Board of the Royal Society of Health.
- (6) A panel of lecturers drawn from officers of the Public Health Department and the Department of Primary Industry.
- (7) Last year's examination papers are submitted.
- (8) A diploma as Public Health Inspector.
- (9) It is recognised in Australia and New Zealand and some other Commonwealth countries.

The papers were tabled.

LIQUOR AND CIGARETTES*Price in Australian Coastal Waters*

2. The Hon. C. R. ABBEY asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it a fact that, when overseas passenger ships reach Australian coastal waters, the price of liquor and cigarettes is increased 100 per cent. to passengers and crew?
- (2) If so, is it done to prevent competition with coastal shipping?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) This is not a matter which comes under the control of the State Government and inquiries would have to be made from the appropriate Commonwealth department.

ALCOA REFINERY*Effects of Fumes and Analysis of Air*

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

In view of continuing complaints of residents of Naval Base relative to the operations of the Alcoa Refinery—

- (a) Will the Minister have further investigations made of the effects of fumes from the works on the health of these people?
- (b) If necessary, in order to allay their uneasiness, will he have samples of the air, particularly near the residence of Mr. A. Pearson, taken and analysed?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The matter will be kept under observation.
- (2) If any indication arises that there are atmospheric contaminants inimical to health, samples will be taken.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS INSPECTORS*Course of Instruction*

4. The Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What is the period of study and training required for those seeking the qualification of an inspector under the Factories and Shops Act, 1963?
- (2) (a) What are the subjects which are studied; and
(b) how many hours of instruction are devoted to each subject?
- (3) How many hours are spent on practical instruction during the course?

- (4) Who or what body establishes the course of study?
- (5) Who or what body sets the examination paper and examines the candidates?
- (6) Who delivers the lectures to the candidates or students?

Tabling of Examination Papers

- (7) Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House a recent set of examination papers?

Recognition of Successful Candidates

- (8) What form of recognition is granted to the successful candidate?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) There is no fixed period of study and training.

- (2) (a) (i) Industrial hygiene based on the textbook, *Health in Industry*, by Donald Hunter, M.D., F.R.C.P.

- (ii) Sanitary engineering based on the textbook, *Australian Sanitary Engineering Practice*, by Randerson, but excluding chapters 12 and 13.

- (iii) Factories and Shops Act.

- (iv) Industrial Arbitration Act.

- (v) English Expression II.

- (b) In a short revision course arranged this year for the first time because of the high failure rate in past years, to assist persons studying for the examination, eight hours were devoted to the Factories and Shops Act; eight hours to practical sanitation; ten hours to industrial hygiene; and ten hours to the Industrial Arbitration Act. English Expression II is covered by a full year's course at the Perth Technical College.

- (3) Nil.

- (4) The Department of Labour.

- (5) Examiners approved by the Minister for Labour. In the last examination these were the Acting

Chief Inspector of Factories for the Factories and Shops Act and Sanitary Engineering subjects; the Physician, Department of Public Health, for Industrial Hygiene; and the Senior Industrial Officer of the Department of Labour for the Industrial Arbitration Act.

- (6) The examiners referred to in the answer to No. (5) lectured in the short revision course.

- (7) Yes. A set of examination papers will be tabled later.

- (8) A certificate is issued to candidates who pass the required subjects.

MIDLAND ABATTOIR: REBATES ON CATTLE SLAUGHTERING CHARGES

Factors Taken into Consideration

5. The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What are the factors which are taken into consideration by the Midland Junction Abattoir Board when deciding to grant rebates on cattle slaughtering charges?

Sliding Scale

- (2) What is the sliding scale of rebates which is applied?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) On the recommendation of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board regulation 19 under the Abattoir Act was approved on the 17th October, 1961, to provide rebates on a sliding scale in relation to throughput as an incentive to operators in order to retain and, if possible, increase the existing reduced cattle kill rather than raise the treatment charges.

- (2) The sliding scale is shown in regulation 19A of the Abattoirs Act. Where the aggregate slaughtering charges on cattle payable by any operator on cattle slaughtered within the financial year—

exceeds	£1,000	but does not exceed	£2,000	a rebate of	1%	of such aggregate amount.
"	£2,000	"	"	£3,000	"	2% " " "
"	£3,000	"	"	£4,000	"	3% " " "
"	£4,000	"	"	£5,000	"	4% " " "
"	£5,000	"	"	£6,000	"	5% " " "
"	£6,000	"	"	£7,000	"	6% " " "
"	£7,000	"	"	£8,000	"	7% " " "
"	£8,000	"	"	£9,000	"	8% " " "
"	£9,000	"	"	£10,000	"	9% " " "
"	£10,000	"	"	"	10%	" " "

Such rebate—

- (a) to be calculated and credited as soon as practicable after the close of each financial year;
- (b) to be allowed on a *pro rata* basis to an operator who commences or ceases operations within a financial year.

PNEUMOCONIOSIS COMMITTEE

Submission of Report

6. The Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the committee, which was appointed to institute an inquiry into the diagnosis of pneumoconiosis and into the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912, for the compensation of workers afflicted with pneumoconiosis and its effects, made progress?
- (2) When does the Minister expect to receive the report of the committee?
- (3) Does he expect to receive it during the current session?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The chairman of the committee advises that the report should be completed within one month.
- (3) Doubtful. When I say doubtful I do not think it will be possible, in view of the expected date of the receipt of the report, to bring down legislation this session. I understand the committee has done a great deal of work, and has examined, as I previously said in answer to the question, a considerable number of witnesses. The report is one that is taking time to prepare, but the chairman says he hopes to have it in my hands within three weeks or a month. Progress is undoubtedly being made.

BITUMINISATION OF ROADS

Lake Grace-Pingrup and Lake Grace-Kulin

7A. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What is the Main Roads Department's programme of work in regard to the bituminising of the
 - (a) Lake Grace-Pingrup; and
 - (b) Lake Grace-Kulin road sections?

Albany-Denmark

- (2) In view of the state of various sections of the Albany-Denmark Road, could any indication be given as to when they will receive attention?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) (a) Lake Grace-Pingrup Road: On the current year's programme the department has provided for the following bituminous works—

(i) Shire of Lake Grace:	
Construct and prime with bitumen, two miles	£10,000
Bituminous surfacing, two miles	£3,400
	<hr/> £13,400

(ii) Shire of Nyabing-Pingrup:	
Recondition, gravel, and prime with bitumen, four miles	£12,500

- (b) Lake Grace-Kulin Road: No funds have been provided for bituminising this road.

- (2) The condition of this road is being watched, and regular maintenance is being carried out.

BRIDGES

Condition at Frankland and Kent Rivers

7B. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:

Does the Main Roads Department consider that any attention is necessary to—

- (a) the Frankland River Bridge at Nornalup; and
- (b) the Kent River Bridge?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (a) and (b) Regular inspections are being made of both these structures. No attention is required at present.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. N. E. Baxter, and read a first time.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 13th November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (Central) (2.43 p.m.): This Bill although only a small measure, has very wide implications. I would feel that it is perhaps necessary to have a very close look at the whole ramifications of abattoirs management, the introduction of new abattoirs, and their effect on our export trade. I think members are well aware of the importance of our export trade in meat and the concern being felt by the producers in the U.S.A. at the possible lowering of prices to their own meat producers.

It is, of course, highly unlikely that the export of beef from Australia will have any marked effect on the home producers in the United States, because they produce and market a very different type of beef from that which we export. I have in recent years taken particular note of the type of meat we export to America and of the standards that are used in the preparation of that meat. I have taken the opportunity of inspecting the abattoir at Midland Junction very closely with that purpose in mind; and, recently, the abattoir in the north at Wyndham. I would say the standards are reasonably high, particularly at Midland Junction where, of course, Mr. Rowland, the manager, under the instruction of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board, introduced modern methods of handling export packs of meat; and, as far as I know, these are of a highly satisfactory standard and acceptable to the American market.

At Midland Junction there have been many introductions of new types of handling of meat; and all, I think, are up to world standard or, in some cases, better, and we have to give Mr. Rowland, as manager, full credit in these matters. He is a man with a vast experience in abattoir matters. I personally know he has done an extremely good job, and I think that is recognised by the Government. I am sure it is.

My examination of the intentions of this Bill leads me to believe that the measure is not, as has been stated by some people, aimed at Mr. Rowland. The Farmers' Union has advised me, on my personal inquiry, that it fully supports this move, as it feels we have reached a stage in our history as producers of meat at which both these jobs are of paramount importance. I would sincerely express the

hope the Government will be able to retain Mr. Rowland's experience and guidance as controller of abattoirs in this State, because it becomes very obvious that in the near future with the demands of export markets, both American and Japanese, and even European, a very high standard will need to be attained.

We need the best advice we can obtain in connection with our exports; and without doubt we can obtain it from Mr. Rowland. So I would say to the Minister in charge that I hope he will make strenuous efforts to retain the services of Mr. Rowland in that capacity in order that the industry can take advantage of his guidance.

The function of the manager of the Midland Junction Abattoir is also extremely important; and this has been carried out very effectively in the past by Mr. Rowland. As meat producers we must thank the members of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board and Mr. Rowland for the efficiency with which our stock and meat have been handled, and for their efficiency in keeping the killing charges at a minimum figure. It has been mentioned that because in 1962 the abattoir made a loss of about £8,000 the board decided it would adopt an incentive system, which meant that the wholesale butchers operating in the Midland Junction sale-yards would receive an incentive if they had a larger kill than they were putting through beforehand. If they put through more stock for killing than formerly, they received a reduction in the killing charge per head.

In the next year this brought about a profit—a considerable profit—and the abattoir board and the manager and staff are to be congratulated for bringing about that state of affairs, despite the competition of other works, and very efficient works, particularly in the south-west, which, being right at the source of things, are able to buy their cattle and handle them at a very reasonable rate. In fact, I believe they are able to offer their meat in the metropolitan area at a slightly lower rate per pound. But still, with the incentive system introduced at the Midland Junction Abattoir, we find it more than holds its own; and that is an extremely good thing.

New additions have been made at Midland Junction from time to time, and these have all led to efficiency in the handling of stock, so far as the producers, the buyers, and the agents who handle the stock are concerned. That is a very good thing.

I do ask myself, however, if we will not reach saturation point at Midland Junction. When I say saturation point, I mean in regard to the area from which stock will be drawn. It becomes obvious that with the move in Narrogin to establish an

abattoir there, provided the abattoir is modern—and no doubt it will be—and gives reasonable service to the producer and the buyer, we will see a situation where a certain amount of the meat that is killed at Midland Junction will, perhaps, be channelled to Narrogin; and possibly to other points throughout the State.

The establishment of an abattoir at Narrogin, and maybe other centres, could be in line with the report that was put forward by Mr. Rowland two or three years ago—I forget the exact time—in which he recommended that decentralisation of abattoirs should take place in Western Australia as it has taken place in many other countries of the world.

There is no doubt that the most efficient method is to deal with stock at the point of production, and we would then have only to cart the finished product to the market. There is no doubt about that; but it becomes a matter of economics; that is, whether the demand is big enough and whether the stock is available. The report by Mr. Rowland is an extremely interesting one, and one that could well have more notice taken of it. It deals with a subject that needs a great deal of planning.

Private abattoirs—if that is the system we are going to have; and I think it is the best—could receive Government assistance and encouragement to become established. At the present time there is a great widening and introduction of secondary industry in this State, and it is as well to keep a balance in these things. If the Government could encourage the introduction of abattoirs by financing them to a degree and giving all the technical assistance needed—and there is no doubt that a knowledgeable controller could certainly do that—we would see considerable progress.

With the very great expansion of our agricultural industry taking place, and still to take place, we have to expect that we will have a great deal of expansion in the handling of meat. It is high time that we introduced a system of overall authority or control of abattoirs by a board or commission. It is not sufficient to have a controller advising the Government, but rather a board or commission with experience; and we could undoubtedly obtain men of experience in this State. We have obtained them for the Midland Junction Abattoir Board. It is essential that within the next year we should establish an overall authority to control abattoirs in this State.

It would perhaps not be unwise if that authority had borrowing powers to assist with the establishment of abattoirs or the extension of existing State abattoirs. There is no question that abattoirs in the north will have to be modernised and improved; and we should have an overall

authority representative of producers, exporters, consumers, and the Government, that would take a very close look at these affairs. It could well mean the stable establishment of the industry in this State. I am sure the producers will rise to the occasion if given an incentive and proper handling of their products.

Goodness knows what lies ahead from the point of view of exports if we tackle this problem properly. Great changes have been envisaged for the Australian Meat Board, and there is the possibility that it may have marketing placed within the ambit of its activities. I hope that comes about; but I see no reason why a State board should not be charged with the responsibilities of assisting and promoting sales to markets that are at present undeveloped, and of having overall control of abattoirs in this State. It would be a forward move and would be of great benefit to producers.

We have recently noticed in the Press that the Japanese market is one that could well be tackled. It is one that has already taken small quantities of Australian meat, and it is one that we in Western Australia should take particular note of and help to develop for the good of our producers and exporters. I hope we will make strenuous efforts to do so.

The Department of Industrial Development is willing to assist in all of these matters. It is helping to encourage our exports; and we have seen trade ships in the past, and will see trade ships in the near future. These are sources by which we can encourage this vital market to develop. I suppose the sheep producers of this State have a great deal to thank the export trade to Singapore and the Near East for, because of the way those markets take away from our home market the heavy wethers that are most suitable for the export trade.

These are the things that we should look at in an effort to encourage the development of our export trade. A little help in these things, as I have found, can, and does, go a long way. I took the opportunity of attending the meeting of exporters when they discussed the results of the trade ship *Chandpara*; and an interesting meeting it was, too. It showed that with co-ordination and help, the interest of the exporters could be encouraged to their benefit and the benefit of the State. I conclude my remarks on that note; and I support the measure.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [3 p.m.]: I wish to ask some questions concerning some of the provisions in the Bill so that when the Minister is replying to the debate he will be able to give the answers and supply the information I am seeking. Before asking the questions I am wondering whether I have interpreted correctly Mr. Abbey's remarks when he

said that the Midland Junction Abattoir was doing a wonderful job, and then shortly afterwards said that any replanning or reconstruction of other abattoirs should be under private control. In view of his latter remark, I was wondering whether he considered the Midland Junction Abattoir was not performing excellent work, because in my opinion it is a most worth-while organisation. I know it has certain weaknesses, and with that in mind I want to ask some questions.

The reason why I have studied the Bill is that Robb Jetty is in the province which Mr. Dolan, Mr. Ron Thompson, and I represent. All three of us have been concerned for some time because under the management of the abattoir at Midland Junction, the thought has been expressed that Robb Jetty, before many years pass, will revert to a cool storage depot. Has the Government any thoughts along those lines in regard to the future of Robb Jetty? If it has—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The answer is "No."

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: —I would ask the Government to reconsider its decision because of the economic impact it would have on the City of Fremantle.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The answer is "No."

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am pleased to hear that answer to my question. I also want to know whether the rebate system which we have heard about, and read about in *The West Australian*, has caused the Midland Junction Abattoir to show a loss of £7,290. I understand that the rebates paid out in the same year amounted to £8,502. What has been the effect of the rebate system? Why was it introduced? Was it to attract further customers to do their killing at the Midland Junction Abattoir? I suggest that that is the reason. Tied with that question, the main question I want to ask is: Could the Midland Junction Abattoir kill and handle any greater numbers of stock than it is at the moment without the building of additional works and further facilities at a cost of several thousands of pounds?

Reverting to the first question I asked, I do not believe the rebate system was introduced purely for that reason. I believe it was introduced to prevent the killing of stock at Harvey or at any other subsidiary killing works in the State. It has always been recognised that whenever a member of Parliament goes out on the hustings he speaks of, and encourages, decentralisation. The quantity of stock slaughtered at the Harvey killing works has a definite effect on the number of stock slaughtered at Midland Junction; and this would also apply to the killing performed at Robb Jetty.

Having read the Minister's statement in *The West Australian* that Mr. Rowland would have the choice of two appointments to be created under this Bill, I suggest that he will want to remain as manager of the

Midland Junction Abattoir and that another person will be appointed as controller of abattoirs throughout the State. If Mr. Rowland is to have a choice, I believe that his work as manager of the Midland Junction Abattoir may even improve further the administration; but, having held the position of controller as well, he is placed in rather an invidious position inasmuch as the board is trying to effect improvements in the workings at the Midland Junction Abattoir, and he is trying to do something to improve the standard of abattoirs throughout the State. To date, of course, his energy and his ability have been divided between the two projects.

I believe the idea of appointing another man to control the abattoirs in general is very sound. With population increasing in all parts of the world, people have to be fed; and those butchers who are killing meat for export, although independent operators, will still have to tie their operations in somewhere with the Midland Junction Abattoir, the Harvey Abattoir, or Robb Jetty, because not all of the State kill will be up to export standard and some will have to be placed on the local consumer market. Therefore, if ever there were a position where the private butcher and the Government abattoir should work in co-operation and harmony, this is it.

The other question which I will ask and which intrigues me a little is: What are to be the salaries paid to the two new officers? If the Government desires to increase the salaries of civil servants, a memoranda is circulated among the different departments to enable the officers to make their claims; but I know the Manager of the Midland Junction Abattoir could tell the Public Service Commissioner that the fixing of their salaries is none of his business, and that they could make their own decisions on their salaries and conditions. I have reason to believe that that may happen.

I also feel that concerning the new position of controller, the appointee should be completely unfettered and unbiased so that he will be able to carry out the duties of his position from a State and national point of view and not from the point of view of considering only certain sections of the State, such as the pastoral, grazing, north-west, or southern areas. He will be a person who will be able to place before the Government a completely unbiased report, and make unbiased decisions. In the past the reports from the Midland Junction Abattoir may not have been unbiased, on account of loyalty to the Midland Junction Abattoir.

Will the proposed change make for better relationship between the management and the workers at the Midland Junction Abattoir? There seems to be something wrong there, because of the continual trouble with the employees in this sphere, who cannot be replaced by

men taken off the street as these men are tradesmen. However, at Robb Jetty there is not the same amount of industrial trouble.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: There is a reason for it.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The trouble which has occurred at Midland Junction Abattoir was caused by the difficulty in getting the management and the workers to co-operate. The only troubles that have occurred at Robb Jetty have resulted from troubles originating at the Midland Junction Abattoir.

For instance, if the Butchers' Union has had industrial trouble at the Midland Junction Abattoir, and the dispute has had a bearing on the union, it has dragged in the workers at Robb Jetty. One member of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board has my commendation. In my talks with him he has indicated that many things could be done to improve the industrial relationship. When the new system proposed in the Bill is put into effect, I hope the management will not have to worry about other abattoirs, and will be able to create a much better relationship between the management and the workers at the Midland Junction Abattoir. This abattoir is vital to Western Australia to provide meat for the people, and for the export market; we cannot afford to have stoppages of work. The workers there seem to experience difficulty in coming to agreement with the management.

I do not know the manager, Mr. Rowland, and I have never met him. I am not attacking him; I am only pointing out the difficulties there. I hope that when this Bill is passed some consideration will be given to improving the relationship between the management and the workers.

The State Shipping Service has added the vessel *Kangaroo* to its fleet and provision has been made on that vessel to enable it to transport chilled dressed beef from the northern part of the State. In the past, ships from the State Shipping Service have not been able to bring down here one more head of cattle more than they did bring, due to the lack of shipping space. Under the new system a large quantity of beef will be dressed and chilled in the north-west, and then brought down to the market here. Such a move should receive support.

When the suggestion to adopt such a system was first made, it was pointed out that the work of killing the beasts would be taken away from the workers down here; but that argument was discounted, because the State ships could not bring one additional head of cattle than they were already bringing. Now the State ships are not only bringing live cattle to the southern part of the State, but also chilled beef. I ask the Minister to accept

my contribution to this debate in the spirit in which it is made; I have made my contribution in all sincerity, and have only been seeking information.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. H. C. Strickland.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS BILL

In Committee, etc.

Resumed from the 13th November. The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 96 had been agreed to.

Clause 97: Wages and time book to be kept in shop—

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

Page 77, lines 1 to 25—Delete all the words from and including the word "a" down to and including the word "correct" and substitute the words "records and notices in accordance with section thirty-three of this Act."

On reading through the Bill I found what appeared to be a drafting error, because the provision in clause 97 is the same in substance as that in clause 33. In rearranging the general outline of the Bill the duplication was overlooked. The logical move would be to delete clause 97, but if that were done some complications would be created. It would mean the renumbering of the clauses and cross references; therefore I have moved for the clause to be amended.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have no objection to the amendment, although there are some words in this clause which differ from those in clause 33. It is suggested that the wages and time book kept in warehouses and shops should include the particulars provided for in clause 33. Clause 97 is being retained in its amended form to ensure that occupiers of shops and warehouses understand that they have to keep wages and time books similar to those kept in factories.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 98 to 106 put and passed.

Clause 107: Conflict with this Act—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I had some amendments to this clause on a previous notice paper, but, on the advice of the draftsman, the ones on today's notice paper are in an altered form. I move an amendment—

Page 86, line 21—Insert after the word "Act" the words "that relate to the safety or welfare of employees".

If the Committee agrees with this amendment, the situation under this clause will be clearer, particularly if we delete the references to the Local Government Act and the Health Act. I believe this will please Mr. Stubbs.

Amendment put and passed.

The clause was further amended, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), as follows:—

Page 86, lines 23 and 24—Delete the passage “the Local Government Act, 1960, or the Health Act, 1911,” and substitute the words “any other Act”.

Page 86, line 25—Delete the words “those Acts” and substitute the words “that other Act”.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 108 to 121 put and passed.

Postponed clause 5: Interpretation—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 6—Delete the word “four” and substitute the word “two”.

If this amendment were passed it would coincide with an amendment, moved by the Minister, which was made on the following page of the Bill. I realise that “four” is included in the parent Act, but that was done 40 years ago when machinery and methods were not of the same modern standard they are today. In the interests of safety, when two people are employed, including the owner or occupier, an establishment should be classed as a factory.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot see the purpose of this amendment. What is wrong with “four or more”?

The Hon. R. Thompson: We have modern methods today. I also intend to delete the same word on the next page, and I think the Minister will agree that that particular provision definitely needs tidying up.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have already moved an amendment to that particular provision and it was successful; but this is a little different. I cannot see the basis of the honourable member's objection to “four,” modern practices or otherwise. I believe it is perfectly all right as it is, and I hope the honourable member will not persist with his amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We are defining in this clause what shall constitute a factory. My object is to have an establishment defined as a factory if there are two people employed in it. In this way it would come under the provisions of the Bill. It could then be inspected for welfare and safety purposes.

One-man and two-man factories do not have the safety margins that bigger establishments have and it is perhaps more

necessary for small factories to be policed than large factories. In small factories we find makeshift, faulty, and primitive gear; or there might be a small factory with highly technical machinery producing a great volume of work.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Would not that come under a machinery inspector?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It would still be a factory. My amendment will tidy up the position by providing that a factory is an establishment where there are two or more people employed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you had a family partnership of three people, what would be the position under your amendment?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It would be a factory.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why limit it to such an extent?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It does not matter whether they are partners or not.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If they are employing one or more employees, it is a factory.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If they are not employing anybody, it is not a factory.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The clause uses the words “employed or engaged.” What does “engaged” mean?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: “Employed” means “engaged.” The honourable member bases his argument on changed circumstances since the Act was originally passed. If I could see any reason for his argument I would be happy to be convinced, but quite frankly I cannot. If a man and his wife and one member of a family operated an establishment, we would have a partnership of three, and if they employed one person, there would be a conflict if this provision included the word “two.”

The Hon. R. Thompson: No more than with four, as it is at present.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot follow the reason for the change. Why not bring it down to one?

The Hon. R. Thompson: In your amendment you refer to one person.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; and the Committee agreed to it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I agreed to it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: When an establishment becomes a factory, it could have highly technical machinery in it; and if there were two people working there it could come within the meaning of the legislation. Such a factory could turn out hundreds of pounds worth of manufactured goods a year.

The other point I raise is that a small factory could be a dilapidated one. My amendment is in line with the Minister's amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What would be the position under your amendment if there were a registered partnership of three people?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The establishment would become a factory. It would not matter if there were no employees there.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Are we not dealing with the definition of "factory" and not whether people are shareholders or individual persons? Are we not concerned with something that comes under the Chief Inspector of Factories?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We are dealing more with the question of people.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I cannot see that. Bakehouses and so on are mentioned in the clause. How can a factory be a person?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not say that.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister said we were dealing with persons. What we are dealing with is the actual fulcrum from which the regulation of factories shall take effect. A friend of mine has a printing factory in Cottesloe, and only two people are employed there, but he has 15 machines in the shop. Do not say that that place should not come under the control of the Chief Inspector of Factories as well as the Chief Inspector of Machinery!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: There is no doubt about the desirability of the word being changed. Subclause (2) clearly expresses what is meant by a factory; and it does not in any way intrude on the part that is now being debated. It goes on to explain the subdivisions of a factory and that an occupier occupying a part of a factory, so designated, may, because of his operations within the part, have that part called a factory.

Surely in these days with all the progress towards automation, with one man looking after one, two, or more machines, that previously required three men to operate them, it is necessary to place a lower limit on the number of operatives or people who constitute the personnel within a factory. I strongly support the amendment.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: I oppose any interference with the clause, because I think four is a reasonable number. I would be loth to see any interference with the smaller unit, which is usually a family unit. If given an opportunity to settle down and make their way in the world, those people usually become, large employers of labour. I think the clause should be left as it is.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The whole intention of the Bill is to regulate and protect the well-being and interests of persons employed in factories. Surely it is the intention to cover all people who are employed or engaged in making or preparing articles for trade or sale for the purposes of gain.

Up to now, the definition of "factory" was confined to a place where four people were engaged, and we can assume that that included most factories. But, as Mr. Wise pointed out, nowadays one or two men can carry out the operations which formerly had to be carried out by a far greater number. We can envisage very small places, where only a couple of men are engaged, actually being factories. I do not suppose there would be many of them, but I think it is our intention to bring them into line with all the others.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In the amendment which I moved, and which the Committee accepted the other night, a new provision was inserted which reads as follows:—

(h) any premises in which one or more persons are engaged, directly or indirectly in any handicraft, or in preparing or manufacturing goods for sale or trade as paid employees for the purpose of the trade or business of their employer;

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What clause was that?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Clause 5, page 6. It was a new paragraph (h). If the Committee agrees to the amendment to alter four to two, my understanding of the situation is that two people working together—two women for instance—at home—

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That is what I had in mind, knitting baby socks.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —would become a factory. Two women might decide to go into the business of cleaning golf clubs at home. Under this amendment they would become a factory, and I think it is stretching things too far to make that provision apply.

Apparently no harm has come from having the word "four" in the legislation; and if the amendment is agreed to any partnership of two or more would be a factory when, in fact, there is no real necessity for them to be classed as a factory.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: You say that with new paragraph (h), on page 6, where one person is employed it will be a factory.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It will then be a factory. If there were 100 partners and one man was employed, that would be a factory. It would be a factory anyway, because there are more than four;

but that is drawing the long bow. If there were three partners and one person employed that would be a factory because one person was employed.

I think the honourable member's amendment is intended to mean well, but it could cause hardship to some sections of the community. I think it is going a bit further than we should go.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I agreed with the Minister's amendment the other night because it tidied up the position, and I do not want to see conditions which prevail in Japan and Italy in Australia. My amendment will bring new paragraph (h) into conformity with the definition of "factory."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: With the insertion of paragraph (h) the Bill returned to the position that obtained under the original Act.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I realise that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Original Acts have been out of balance before, and I consider this one will be out of balance if we state "four" in one, and "two" in another. The Minister's amendment allows one person who is employed or engaged to qualify. There could be the owner of the property and one person engaged.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That's right.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That makes two.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Will that not be confusing? Someone may read what a factory means and find himself confused.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Read on. It says that notwithstanding what has been said it includes (a), (b), (c) and (d).

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That's right.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We are dealing with small people; with small factories. They might think they have to be registered, because there are under four people. The people concerned might think that they are within the definition of the word "factory," but they do not read on to (h).

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You're saying that because they do not read on they do not have to be registered.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It puts it out of balance.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What if they stopped at clause 1? They would not know what they were.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: According to Mr. Thompson's argument, if one goes over 35 miles an hour one is guilty of speeding, but if one does not read on to see what the penalty is one is not guilty.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is going from the sublime to the ridiculous.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not only a case of notwithstanding paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d), but also (e), (f), (g), and the paragraph (h) I have put in. I try to be reasonable, but I can see no reason in this.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There is another aspect I would like to deal with which refers to any clay pit, sand pit, gravel pit, or quarry. In the vast majority of quarries only one or two men are employed. I ask members to consider how many fatalities have occurred in quarries where there has been no control, and as a result of their not being a factory. I cannot understand the department—in view of what has happened in the case of quarries in the past—altering the figure to two.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have these one and two-men quarries anyone else working with them?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: They are employees in most cases; and the quarries are owned by limestone companies. It is not economical to employ more than two men.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If there is one employee it is a factory. You admitted that by putting in paragraph (h).

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: They are not registered as factories. Will they be policed with a view to ensuring their registration?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am told that in every case registrations are followed up and prosecutions ensue where the people concerned are not registered.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I cannot understand why the number is fixed at four. On our recent visit to the Alcoa works we inspected a quarry and found two men were employed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That would be a factory.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Why is "four" written in the Act?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: To cover partnerships. There may be four brothers, or two brothers working in partnership.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In referring to a clay pit, gravel pit, sand pit or quarry, the provision says "in or on which four or more persons including the occupier." Is not that confusing?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The wording is the same as the definition of "factory."

Amendment put and negatived.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move an amendment—

Page 9—Delete the interpretation "the Secretary for Labour" in lines 30 to 35.

The reason for this is that a further amendment will remove the Secretary for Labour as chairman of the board and make provision for the Chief Inspector of Factories to hold that position. I think there are well-founded reasons why this should be done. At present, the Secretary for Labour has a multiplicity of duties and with regard to all of them he has to give leadership. I would say he has a full-time job and should not be burdened with two extra positions. This would not be fair to him in his own job.

The Minister has told us that the new measure is for the welfare and the safety conditions of employees, and will cover the whole of the State of Western Australia. Therefore it will be necessary for this board, if it does its job properly, to visit the majority of factories in Western Australia. So can we in all reasonableness ask the Secretary for Labour to carry out that function in conjunction with his other jobs? Provision is also made so that he can appoint his deputy to this position; and if his deputy were appointed, he would not know where he was going from time to time, because he might be sent to the north-west if there happened to be any factories in that area.

The Chief Inspector of Factories is the person who should be the chairman of this board because he is a trained man. In the other States of Australia the Secretary for Labour is not the chairman of the board. The chairman is the Chief Inspector of Factories.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This Bill does a number of things including the setting up of a board and a committee, the factory welfare board, and the retail trade advisory committee. It is the purpose of the Bill to appoint the Secretary for Labour as the chairman of both. Therefore, it is necessary to have in the Bill the interpretation of "Secretary for Labour." The argument put forward by Mr. Thompson that the Secretary for Labour will not know what he is doing, that he will be too busy to carry out this function, and that the position should be held by somebody else, does not stand up to examination, for the reason that the Secretary for Labour is the permanent head of the Department of Labour. In another part of the Bill provision is made for somebody else to take the place of the Secretary for Labour when the Secretary for Labour is not available. That would be the Assistant Secretary for Labour.

Throughout the Government service there is a head of every department. The under-secretary of a department performs many functions. The Under-Secretary for Public Health has other titles, but I do

not know what they are. It is desired that the Secretary for Labour, who is the permanent head of the department, should be the chairman of the board and the committee, and provision is made for somebody else to take the chair if he is not available. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Time and again I have heard the Minister tell us in this Chamber that something he is putting forward is in conformity with what is done in the other States. We had argument when he told us this in respect of the Companies Act Amendment Bill this session.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Companies Act is a uniform Australia-wide Act.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That may not be quite true now, but it was the position. In every other State in Australia we find that the experienced man—the Chief Inspector of Factories—is chairman of the factory welfare board. There is a reason for this, which is obvious if one looks at the composition of the board. The other members may not have any other specialist knowledge whatsoever. They will be laymen who know nothing about industry. It could be the secretary of a union, but he need not have any specialist knowledge in respect of welfare—and he certainly would have no training.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are only guessing.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not. The honourable member will be lucky to find any secretary of a trade union with specialist training.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is possible.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: But highly improbable.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Will the honourable member please address the Chair?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is possible that the employers' representative will be in the same category as that of the union representative.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are only guessing.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: And so are you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: So are you, but I am prepared to admit it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think Western Australia can be very proud of its factories and shops inspectors in the past, because there has been no serious upset or argument between employee and employer in connection with the actions of the factories and shops inspectors. I think what is proposed under this measure tends to rubbish the Chief Inspector of Factories.

I do not know the man and have never met him. This is a slight on the Chief Inspector of Factories and his officers who are coming up through the ranks. Therefore I am going to insist on my amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry the debate has taken on this atmosphere. There is no slight on the Chief Inspector of Factories. The functions of the Chief Inspector of Factories are clearly set down under this Bill.

The Hon. R. Thompson: He is relegated.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This Bill does something which has not been done previously. It will set up a factory welfare board and a retail trade advisory committee. It is only right that the head of the department should be the chairman and in his absence, the next in charge. The Chief Inspector of Factories will still have his part to play and will no doubt be consulted on many things, if not on everything, when this boards sits. The honourable member is far from the point.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Tell me who is chairman of the Queensland, New South Wales, and Victorian boards.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Will the honourable member tell me which States have welfare boards?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I could not tell the honourable member.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is the Chief Inspector of Factories.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In this case we think the head of the department—the Secretary for Labour—is the person who should be chairman of the board and the committee.

Amendment put and negatived.

Postponed clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 4.14 to 4.33 p.m.

Postponed clause 11 put and passed.

Postponed clause 14: Inspection subject to Secretary for Labour—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move an amendment—

Page 15, line 29—Insert after the word "applies" the words "including those of an industrial inspector appointed under the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912-1952".

When I spoke on the Bill initially, I pointed out that it is designed to take away from the factories and shops inspector the powers with which he is now clothed under the Act. When an inspector sees a breach of industrial conditions or awards in any industrial establishment or factory, it is necessary that he should be able to exercise the powers he has at

present. I will not wait for any explanation from the Minister to the Committee on why this provision in the Act is to be removed, because I will tell the Committee who instructed the Government that it had to be removed.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who did?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: When a factories and shops inspector took action against the firm of Rowleys Limited, there was a hue and cry that the inspector did not have the power to take such action, but the court's decision proved otherwise, and that firm was duly prosecuted because it had breached Western Australian awards and working conditions. Another person who was so prosecuted was one, Caratti.

I maintain that the Bill seems to remove this provision from the Act to permit employers to wreck labour conditions as provided under the principal Act.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Who told us to do this?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The people whom the honourable member represents and not the working class people, because they want this safeguard to remain in the Act. By the factories and shops inspectors having this power to take action when any breach of working conditions occurs, the workers consider they have some protection. My amendment will ensure that the parent Act remains as it is, and will permit the factories and shops inspector to continue with any prosecution he considers should be made without any reference to the Secretary for Labour.

This Act will intermingle with the controversial Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act. As the Minister said, industrial inspectors will be appointed under the latter Act. The Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill may not become law, and we cannot anticipate legislation. If the power is taken away from the inspectors, and the Bill I referred to is not passed, then there would not be anyone to institute proceedings for breaches of the Industrial Arbitration Act, particularly in respect of safety and health.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The Secretary for Labour mentioned in this clause could be replaced by the Chief Inspector without in any way infringing the administration of the department or hindering the Act. Under the education set-up the Director of Education has deputies under him—the Director of Secondary Education, and the Director of Primary Education; but the Minister for Education administers the Act.

If this Committee agrees to the clause without amendment, the Chief Inspector will lose whatever power he possesses in relation to the other inspectors. They should all come directly under his charge and supervision, and each inspector should perform the duties imposed upon him by the relevant Act. However, they should all

come under the direction of the Chief Inspector. If this power is taken away from him, his position will be untenable. The Secretary for Labour will exercise the overall supervision, but all inspectors should be subject to the Chief Inspector.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Section 106 of the Industrial Arbitration Act provides that every inspector appointed under the Factories and Shops Act shall be an industrial inspector for the whole State, and that every inspector of mines appointed under the Mines Regulation Act, or the Coal Mines Regulation Act shall be an industrial inspector. To pursue the argument of Mr. Ron Thompson, let us assume the legislation he mentioned is not passed; then every inspector appointed under the provisions of this Bill will be an industrial inspector under the Industrial Arbitration Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Will he have power to prosecute?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The inspectors under the Factories and Shops Act are concerned with safety, health, and welfare.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not with working conditions.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The individual inspectors will be appointed under the Industrial Arbitration Act, or under the provisions of the Bill relating to that Act now before Parliament. Amendments will also have to be made to the other Acts under which individual inspectors are appointed.

A person committing a breach of the Act will not be free from prosecution merely because individual inspectors are appointed under the Industrial Arbitration Act rather than the Factories and Shops Act.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Who will have the power to prosecute?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The power of prosecution will lie under the two respective Acts.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If this inspector was aware of a serious breach which warranted prosecution, he would not be able to take any action.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He would be able to take action under the provisions of this Bill. The appointment of inspectors will be made under the Industrial Arbitration Act, as amended, if necessary; but until that takes place they will be appointed under the Factories and Shops Act.

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

Ayes—12

Hon. D. P. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Keenan	Hon. W. P. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. H. C. Strickland	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery

(Teller)

Noes—14

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	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

(Teller)

Pair

Aye

No

Hon. G. Bennetts

Hon. A. R. Jones

Majority against—2.

Amendment thus negatived.

Postponed clause put and passed.

Postponed clause 46: Powers and duties of Board—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move an amendment—

Page 37, line 16—Insert after the word “to” the words “that industry including”.

This is only a tidying up amendment and does not materially affect the provision in the clause.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Contrary to what the honourable member thinks, this amendment may cause damage. If the words “that industry including” were inserted, the board could be denied the right to make recommendations in respect of a factory. At the moment the power is pretty wide. However, if the honourable member's amendment were accepted, I feel it would restrict the power rather than widen it, and I am sure Mr. Thompson would not like that to occur. I think he should have another look at it in the light of that suggestion.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: My reason for the amendment is that there are, throughout Australia, factory safety councils and organisations. If my amendment were carried, uniformity would result in industries carrying out a like type of manufacture or work.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But don't you think there is a possibility that it may be restrictive in respect of the fact that it could mean sections of a factory only and not include all the other sections of a factory?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, I do not think so.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Consider the diversifications of a big factory where it has a number of industries. I am only trying to be helpful.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: So am I. I am not trying to upset the clause or to take away any measures in it. Perhaps the Minister may have something in what he says.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is my advice on your amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Postponed clause put and passed.

Postponed clause 59: Holidays in factories—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I said the other night I would take the opportunity of having the clause reframed in order that it might be clearer than at present. I have done just that, and I move an amendment—

Page 45, lines 21 to 29—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute the following:—

- (a) a whole holiday on every public holiday and a half holiday on any day that is proclaimed to be a half holiday for the district or locality wherein the factory is situated, but when a Christmas Day or New Year's Day falls on a Saturday or a Sunday then such holiday shall be observed on the next succeeding Monday, and when Boxing Day falls on a Sunday or a Monday, such holiday shall be observed on the next succeeding Tuesday.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: In the light of the amendment adopted by the Committee, I will not proceed with my amendment.

Postponed clause, as amended, put and passed.

Postponed clause 64: Notice of accidents in factories—

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I move an amendment—

Page 52, line 7—Insert after the word "accident" the words "and give a copy of such notice to the Secretary of the appropriate Industrial Union of Workers."

The object of my amendment is to ensure that the occupier of a factory shall, when issuing notice of an accident to the Chief Inspector, also give notice to the secretary of the appropriate union.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The other night I said that I had been informed that approximately 40,000 accidents, other than fatal accidents, occur annually in various parts of the State.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: In a little over 4,000 factories.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so. The honourable member made that point the other night, and I concede the point. The Government is prepared to go some of the way in this matter. I cannot agree to Mr. Heenan's amendment which would make it obligatory for notification to be given of every accident, fatal or otherwise.

Under my proposed amendment the obligation will be upon the Chief Inspector to send notification to the union in the

case of a fatal accident. In the case of a non-fatal accident he may do so. There would probably be many instances where he would, in fact, be prepared to do so.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yes; but have you an amendment which will take the place of Mr. Heenan's?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I have just referred to it.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That relates to the Chief Inspector visiting the factory.

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

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: That does not apply to the occupier of the factory.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, I know it does not. We are putting the obligation on the Chief Inspector rather than on the occupier of the factory, because the occupier may find it difficult to ascertain the union to which the employee concerned belongs, whereas the Chief Inspector would be in a far better position to ascertain that information, if he does not already possess it. The department is prepared to help by putting the obligation on the Chief Inspector.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That does not go anywhere near the distance that Mr. Heenan's amendment does.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. Mr. Heenan's amendment makes it obligatory on the occupier of the factory to send to the union to which the man belongs, in the case of an accident, a duplicate of the particulars of the accident.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is what we think would be very difficult to do.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is what you do not want to do.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. It is thought the department can go some way in this direction by making it an obligation on the Chief Inspector of Factories, in the case of paragraph (a), and he may do it in the case of paragraph (b).

The Hon. R. Thompson: But your amendment was on the notice paper before we discussed Mr. Heenan's amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have another amendment which is not on the notice paper.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Tell us about it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is to insert in line 17 these words, "and the Chief Inspector shall thereupon notify the secretary of the appropriate industrial union of workers of that accident."

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: How would he know?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He is probably in a better position to find out than anybody else. The department thinks it would be more difficult for the factory occupier to find out. I refer members to clause 65. The Minister may, in certain circumstances, direct that an inquiry shall be held.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The clause you are dealing with now refers to death.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It refers to a fatal accident, and to that extent he may do it; but it is not an obligation upon him to do it.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The proposals now made by the Minister do not go as far as I would like, but they at least meet my proposition to a considerable extent. They are an improvement on matters as they stand. When there are accidents, speed is essential. The sooner the Chief Inspector is notified the better. It is essential that he be notified as soon as possible so that he can get on to the job. He does not notify the union secretary until he himself has been notified; so the union secretary will be a bit late unless everyone moves promptly.

In the case of an accident in the street, it is necessary for the police to be on the job quickly because the witnesses melt away in all directions; and, a day or two later, they are difficult to be traced; and if they can be traced, many of them do not want to have anything to do with the matter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That would not apply in a factory.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It would not apply to the same extent, of course, but the point I am making is that speed is essential. With that end in view, I would like to move that in line 5—

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Order! The honourable member already has an amendment in line 7 before the Chair. If he wants to go back to line 5 he will have to ask leave to withdraw his amendment.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I was not going to move my amendment in line 7.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): The amendment is before the Chair. The honourable member can ask leave to withdraw it.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I formally ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I move an amendment—

Page 52, line 5—Insert after the word "shall" the words "as soon as it is possible for him to do so".

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I would like to see the word "reasonably" included before the word "possible".

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That would break it down. He is not to have any excuses.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have no objection to the amendment. If the Committee agrees, I shall insert after the word "occupier" in line 18 the words "the Chief Inspector shall thereupon notify the union of workers of that accident." That will go a long way towards helping, and then I will get to my other amendment which I will move a little later.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am not agreeable to the amendment. I do not know to what extent we are going to further load the occupiers of small factories. A person running one has a lot of extra-neous work to do. I suppose it is the ambition of every member of a trade union and every skilled artisan to run his own establishment. It was my ambition, and I achieved it. When a man runs his own business then his troubles start. He has statistical returns to lodge and he becomes a tax collector for the Federal Government. Now he is to be an unpaid worker for the trade union movement. The owner-worker of a factory has a terrific job.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The obligation is already in the Act.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, but it was not included previously. Now we are putting it back into the Act. It is time we gave these people some consideration. The average employer is considerate to his men.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am trying to meet the situation to some extent.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Obviously this provision must have been thoroughly considered previously, and it was written into the Act in a satisfactory method.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is humanitarian.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, I realise that. I do not know how much further we can go. A man running a small factory becomes closely associated with his employees.

The Hon. R. Thompson: In regard to a previous provision, if a man got killed in a quarry, or seriously hurt, should not the Chief Inspector be notified forthwith?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, of course, the Chief Inspector should be notified forthwith, and he would be. But this proposition is that something must be done immediately, or within a reasonable time. The owner of a small business faces all sorts of problems as to the interpretation of "the shortest possible time," or "a reasonable time." The occupier could be out chasing orders and he might not be back for a week. If the job has not been done in the meantime he is liable; and he has enough things to worry about now. I am not happy about putting anything further on to him.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to prolong the debate, but I wish to make it clear that the occupier of the factory will not have to do this; the Chief Inspector will have to do it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It says, "The occupier shall."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Under the existing Act the occupier has certain things to do when an accident occurs, but there is no obligation to notify the union. The department will accept the obligation to notify the union where it is a fatal accident, and it may do it where it is other than a fatal accident. So nothing extra is being put on the small occupier. The department is agreeing to assist in a situation which I can understand, but it does not want to accept total responsibility for every accident.

I am sure Dr. Hislop would agree it is difficult to say what is a serious accident. What is not serious today can become serious tomorrow. A man might kick his toe today and think nothing of it, and a few days later tetanus may set in. That is the sort of thing that can happen.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I would point out to members that we are dealing with an amendment moved by Mr. Heenan. We seem to be getting a little away from it.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If the honourable member looks at the clause he will find that in one place, a few lines above where it is proposed to add the words contained in the amendment, the words "as soon as practicable" are used.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: "Practicable" would be the better word.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the one word should be used in both places.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting the word "possible" and substituting the word "practicable."

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: I agree to that.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I take it from the explanations that have been given, and in view of what I have foreshadowed, that although Mr. Heenan has an amendment on the notice paper before mine, he will not move it.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: That is so.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 52, line 17—Insert after the word "occupier" the words "and the Chief Inspector shall thereupon notify the Secretary of the appropriate Industrial Union of Workers of that accident."

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 52, line 24—Insert after the word "section" the passage "that relates to an accident of the kind referred to in paragraph (a) of that subsection and may if the notice relates to an accident of the kind referred to in paragraph (b) of that subsection."

This means that in the case of paragraph (a), where the accident is fatal and there was formerly no obligation whatever to notify, the occupier will now notify the inspector who will in turn notify the secretary of the union to which the man belongs. In the case of paragraph (b) he may do the same thing. There may be cases when he would do it; in cases of minor injuries he may not. He will not be under an obligation to notify in the case of (b). This goes a considerable distance along the way.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: We are concerned about notifying the union when there is a fatal accident, but nowhere in the Bill, or in the present Act, is there a provision to say that somebody shall accept the responsibility to tell the bereaved widow or the family about the fatal accident. I think we should approach this matter with a degree of human kindness.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: It is a most difficult thing to notify relatives that someone in the family has been killed; and very often the job is left to the police. However, very often the police shelve the responsibility by getting a minister of religion who knows the family very well to accept the job. When we are getting down to something of a private or compassionate nature, such as this is, I think it would be wrong to try to cover the position by a regulation or a section of an Act.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I appreciate what Mr. Dolan had to say. The mining industry is one in which there are a lot of hazards and many accidents occur. Nearly always the police take the responsibility, and they get a minister of religion to notify the family. I think the position is well looked after now without putting anything in the Act.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to prolong this, but I have just been told of an accident that occurred in Albany fairly recently. The department was notified at 4 p.m. by the police, who usually seem to be the first people to be advised. In fact many of our Statutes require that the police shall be notified. The next morning the department despatched a man to Albany, and he could not get on to the premises when he arrived there that

afternoon; but the next morning an investigation was made and the union was advised that morning.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Those things do happen in practice.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. The department does these things as speedily as it can. We must be callous to a point with this machinery of notification of accidents, but I agree with Dr. Hislop that sometimes it looks to be too callous.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I have done it quite a few times myself.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not an enviable task, but we could not write anything into the Bill, even though I am in sympathy with what Dr. Hislop had to say.

Postponed clause, as amended, put and passed.

Postponed clause 65: Power of Minister to direct inquiry—

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I move an amendment—

Page 53, line 10—Insert after the word "inspector" the words "and the Secretary of the appropriate Industrial Union of Workers."

Clause 65 provides that where there is a fatal accident or where an employee is injured for more than one day, the Minister may order an inquiry before a magistrate and two other persons. Where there is a death there is invariably a coroner's inquiry, and the Bill provides that any inspector may attend at any one of these inquiries. My amendment seeks to permit the secretary of the appropriate industrial union of workers to attend such an inquiry before a magistrate, which might be ordered by the Minister. I think that is fair. The secretary of the union can, with the coroner's consent, attend a coroner's inquiry, but it would seem that he cannot attend the other inquiry before the magistrate which might be ordered by the Minister.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think we discussed this principle last year when we amended the Scaffolding Act, and the opinion was put forward that the union secretary should be able to attend a coroner's inquiry in that matter. I think Mr. Heenan will agree that under the Coroners Act the function of the coroner is to determine the cause of death and nothing more. He does not say so-and-so died, and so-and-so is responsible. He only determines the cause of death.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: He can commit people for trial.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He can commit them for trial by the court; he does not try them. The Bill provides that an inspector in an official capacity can attend a coroner's inquiry. It is not for this Act to determine who shall attend a coroner's inquiry. The Minister can initiate

an inquiry before a stipendiary magistrate in which case it would not be a fatal accident.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: I think you might be right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: A fatal accident is the function of the coroner, and accordingly I cannot accept the amendment. It is for the coroner to say whom he is going to have in his court.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The clause refers to the case of a fatal accident or a man who is injured for a day or longer, in which event the Minister initiates an inquiry before a magistrate. In the case of a fatal accident, I think it could be an inquiry quite apart from the coroner's inquiry; but for other reasons the Minister might initiate an inquiry before a magistrate, and that is the inquiry at which I think it is reasonable for the union secretary to attend in the interests of the widow or the dependants of the man who has been killed. A man who is seriously injured should also be represented by someone who can safeguard his interests. I am not greatly concerned about the union secretary attending the coroner's inquiry.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think I can accept the amendment. The Minister may direct an inquiry and appoint a magistrate and two other persons who may be specialists of one kind or another. In the case of a coroner's inquiry it should rest with the coroner.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I attach no significance to the coroner's inquiry.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: But you are persisting with the amendment, and that would mean that the union secretary would attend a coroner's inquiry.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I do not think he can automatically attend, because there is a separate Coroners Act. I am not very concerned about the coroner's inquiry because more often than not the coroner gives permission for the union secretary to attend.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Under the amendment, the secretary of the appropriate industrial union of workers will be permitted to attend any inquiry held under this provision, whether it be a coroner's inquiry or any other, and he will be permitted to examine and cross-examine witnesses at the inquiry. I cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I do not think it is necessary to refer to the coroner's inquiry in this legislation. One cannot automatically attend a coroner's inquiry; one must get the leave of the coroner who, as I have said, more often than not grants such leave, as has happened so often in Kalgoolie. My contention is that the union secretary should sit in at the inquiry before a magistrate which might be initiated by the Minister.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I suggest to the Minister that he could overcome that objection about the coroner's inquiry, by inserting a comma after the word "section", deleting the word "or", inserting the words "but not", and then inserting another comma after the word "inquiry".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Subclause (4) says that any inspector may attend any coroner's inquiry. I appreciate the word "may" is used and that he would be there on the invitation of the coroner. I understand the inspector is invariably there.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: All it means is this: It gives him permission under the Act to be at the inquiry.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think that at all.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: It does not automatically give him the right to sit on the inquiry.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think the coroner, on reading this, would interpret the will of Parliament; and the will of Parliament is that he may invite the man to be there. We play with the words "may" and "shall" all the time. "Shall" is an obligation and "may" is not. There is no doubt in my mind that if the word here were "shall" that would be a direction. The word in this case is "may", and for a long time the coroner has interpreted the will of Parliament in the case of an inspector under the Factories and Shops Act. He may be there; and the coroner, I am told, invariably has him there. Furthermore, he has the right to examine and cross-examine.

If we say the same thing of a secretary of an industrial union of workers, surely the interpretation is going to be exactly the same. It will be the interpreted wish of Parliament that the man shall be there and be able to do exactly the same sort of things as the inspector—examine and cross-examine; and that is not the purpose of this clause at all. I oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes—12

Hon. D. P. Dellar	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. J. D. Teahan

(Teller)

Noes—13

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. R. Jones

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Postponed clause put and passed.

First schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.7 to 7.48 p.m.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [7.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of clause 16.

Clause 83 was added to the motion, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Hutchison.

Question put and passed.

In Committee, etc.

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 16: General powers of Inspector—

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Committee will realise that I have already spoken on this clause. It was the wording of paragraph (i) on page 17 that puzzled me. I realised that the commissioner would never do such a thing as is indicated by the wording, because he would be just as jealous of his professional standing as I am. Therefore I move an amendment—

Page 17, lines 27 to 34—Delete paragraph (i) and substitute the following:—

(i) if an inspector holds a certificate from the Commissioner certifying that the inspector is qualified under the Health Act, 1911, to exercise the powers conferred by that Act, he may in relation to any factory, shop or warehouse exercise all the powers of the inspector appointed under that Act;

I understand that this is now an acceptable amendment, and it will mean—as I think the original wording intended it should mean—that if a factory inspector also holds a qualification under the Health Act he could act in a dual capacity as required under this Act.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Are there any copies of the amendment?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Some copies have been distributed, but the Leader of the Opposition can have my copy if he so desires.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have no objection to the amendment, because it qualifies the word "competent" to the extent of using the word "qualified" instead of "competent." I do not think the Committee has any cause for concern or needs to object to the amendment. On the other

hand, if the Committee is not satisfied with it, I suggest, that in view of the fact that it has not been placed on the notice paper, we should not proceed. I leave the decision with the Committee.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I think we should raise some protest concerning the circumstances of the moving of this amendment. We have always observed a rule in this Chamber that if amendments are not on the notice paper, copies of them should be circulated among members. In this instance many members on this side of the Chamber have not been supplied with a copy of the amendment and have no idea of what it seeks to do. If we introduce rules we should stand by them, and I think it is a poor show for an amendment such as this to be moved at the eleventh hour, and I protest strongly against it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I appreciate Mr. Willesee's point of view. I repeat that the amendment is acceptable to me. May I suggest that consideration of the Committee's report be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House and the third reading be not proceeded with tonight. If between now and next Tuesday the amendment is still considered to be unsatisfactory, I suggest that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of considering this clause. To this extent I will co-operate to the fullest.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There is no express reason why the Bill should be rushed through tonight or tomorrow.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We are not rushing it through.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I wish the Minister would allow me to continue with my remarks before interrupting. I was about to say that I would suggest the Minister report progress and ask for leave to sit again to consider this amendment. As Mr. Willesee has said, we on this side of the Chamber have always requested that we at least be supplied with copies of any amendments if they do not appear on the notice paper, but on this occasion we have not been supplied with a copy of Dr. Hislop's amendment. The Committee has just resumed after being suspended for tea, and now this amendment is rushed upon us, is merely read out, the Minister says it is acceptable to him, and the question is put. In the circumstances, I think progress should be reported.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: At this stage of the session, in each of the last few years I have been here, many amendments have been introduced while we have been discussing clauses of Bills. I have seen members write amendments and hand them to the Clerk. In this instance I think there is much ado about nothing. The amendment is not vital. It merely

seeks to substitute one word for another without altering the intention of the clause. As the Minister has said, should there be anything that is not intended included in this amendment, we will have every opportunity to discuss it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: One of our amendments was not vital, but you still voted against it.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I see no reason why we should not proceed with the amendment in exactly the same manner as we have proceeded in other years in dealing with other amendments. I admit it is unfortunate that members on the other side of the Chamber were not supplied with copies of the amendment.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: It is all very well to be placatory about such matters when it suits the person who is being placatory. However, there is a principle involved in this issue; and on my side of the Chamber we do not delay legislation. But whether it be a simple amendment, or one of great import, we are entitled to have a copy of it to know what it is all about. Mr. Mattiske may have had an opportunity to study it—

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Surely you can grasp it.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I can grasp as much as the honourable member, except that I cannot ski on one slipper. So I think, on principle, we should, in this instance, do what we have done time and again in the past. On numerous occasions I have placed amendments on the notice paper and have asked that they be held up to enable them to be studied. Dr. Hislop is one of the oldest members in this House, and he should have adhered to this principle more than others. In this case the Minister, Dr. Hislop, and Mr. Mattiske apparently knew all about it, but we did not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am inclined to agree with Mr. Willesee. This clause was considered at some length the other evening, and Dr. Hislop has now brought forward an amendment. If we do not agree with it we can vote against it; but it would not matter if we voted against it, because it would not alter the situation at all. I am prepared to vote against it.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This afternoon I was presented with a copy of the amendment, and I presumed it had been circulated to members. I did not know that only two copies were available. Although it is a small amendment, it is rather vital to those holding professional posts. If the Committee decides to consider it at a later stage I am agreeable to its being postponed.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): If the Minister is agreeable, Dr. Hislop could ask leave to withdraw the amendment, and the Bill could be recommitted.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is a better way than that. I do not want to foist any amendment on the Committee without a full opportunity being given to members to consider it. I was not aware some members had not seen it. If there is not very much doubt on the amendment, it should be allowed to go through. I could hold up the matter until the report stage. However, I am agreeable to the postponement of the clause for further consideration.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I agree that this is much ado about nothing. The debates on lengthy Bills, and those containing important principles, frequently reach the stage when amendments are seen to be desirable on the spur of the moment, and then amendments are moved off the cuff. In this case we are not necessarily departing from the general principle. Just in case there are matters on which we may be sharply at variance, it is only right that an opportunity should be given for reviewing the amendment. We keep to the practice, as much as possible, of having amendments placed on the notice paper. The wording of this amendment will improve the situation to a degree, so that it will not be a matter of guessing whether a person was competent to perform a certain task. It will ensure that he was qualified to perform the task. It is on that basis the amendment is submitted.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 83: Retail Trade Advisory Committee—

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I move an amendment—

Page 60, lines 19 to 20—Delete all words from and including the word "upon" down to and including the word "Minister" and substitute the words "from a panel of two names submitted to the Minister from the Australian Consumers Association".

This is slightly different from the amendment appearing in my name on the notice paper, because there was some confusion, and the organisation mentioned was not able to take on the job. For that reason the Australian Consumers Association has been substituted for the Women's Service Guild. The Australian Consumers Association is a very worthy organisation. It is non-political and non-profitmaking. One of its functions is to test the value of goods offered to the public, and it would be quite competent to appoint a representative to the committee. In that organisation are women with university degrees.

This organisation represents a very wide cross-section of the public, and there are some 50,000 members. Anyone representing that organisation on the advisory committee would be of the highest integrity.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The proposal to alter the constitution of the retail trade advisory committee is not acceptable. This committee has to attend to many functions, including those enumerated in clause 84. It has to look into the types of businesses carried on in shops, and the types of goods sold.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The Australian Consumers Association represents the purchasers of goods.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This is a last-minute thought to change the constitution of the advisory committee, and I hope members will not agree to the amendment.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: This amendment does not seek to alter the constitution of the retail trade advisory committee. It is stated in the provision that this member shall represent the purchasers of goods from shops, and if any organisation is worthy of such representation it is the Australian Consumers Association.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have a list of the functions which the advisory committee has to perform, and this is far beyond the knowledge of any member of the organisation proposed by the honourable member. The functions are to look into—

the business carried on by shops,
the type of goods sold,
trading hours,
number of persons employed,
investigation and report on health,
safety, and welfare of employees,
review provisions of the Act and the regulations,
grant permits,
revoke permits,
trading hours of small shops, chemists' shops, garages and petrol stations,
the making of regulations.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are making a good case for the representative of the Trades and Labor Council to be on that committee. Who would be a fit and proper person to carry out those functions?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Bill sets out the composition of the committee.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It does not specify who the representative will be.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The provision states that he shall be a person willing to act as a member appointed, upon the written nomination of the Minister, to represent the purchasers of goods from shops.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is all that the amendment is suggesting.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This amendment is suggesting more than that.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am going to disagree with the Minister. This is to be a representative of purchasers of

goods from shops. Surely the Minister is not going to tell me that everyone on the board has to know about every function the board is going to undertake!

The Bill provides that one of the members shall be the person who, for the time being, holds the office of Secretary for Labour, and he shall be the chairman.

Another one shall be a person willing to act as a member, appointed upon the joint written nomination of certain bodies, the first being the Retail Traders' Association of Western Australia (Inc.). This particular body might know something about what the consumers want. The second is The Retail Grocers' and Storekeepers' Association, and the third is the Perth Chamber of Commerce—which could not care less about what the consumers want—which is to represent the occupiers of shops.

Another member shall be one who is willing to act as a member to represent the purchasers of goods from shops. Surely the Minister is not trying to say that a person who is representing the consumers has to have the same ideas and knowledge that the other members have! I should say that a member of the Australian Consumers Association would be a suitable representative. This body is composed of ethical men of high degree. These people test goods for quality; and who would know better than they what the consumers want? Yet the Minister says he cannot accept the amendment. I want a better explanation than the one he has given. The Minister should put first things first, because this is one of the worst things I have seen done.

The A.C.A. is an ethical body. It is a wholly independent, non-political, non-profitmaking organisation formed in 1959. It buys goods from retail shops, just like any other consumer, and tests them for quality and value. The results are given in A.C.A.'s magazine *Choice*, which is available only to members. There is no advertising in this publication, and there can be no connection between A.C.A. and any commercial interests. Membership is by calendar year.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: It is a private concern.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: It is a public concern.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Who is the chairman?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Professor Thorpe, of the Sydney University. There is a branch in each State.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Is Brigadier Elliott chairman in Western Australia?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Yes.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: Who organised it here in Western Australia?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The committee.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: I understood you did.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I had the thought first, but I did not organise it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It is a credit to you, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to labour this question, but I must point out that under paragraph (c) the Minister can appoint whoever he wishes to appoint.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Someone who is willing to act.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I am sure he will endeavour to obtain the services of a person most fitted for the work. I am wondering how Mrs. Hutchison is going to square off with the Women's Service Guild—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: She can answer that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —because the Women's Service Guild was supposed to have a representative, but now it is to be an A.C.A. representative.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I can make a simple explanation in reply to the Minister's remark. I misunderstood the situation at first. In the meantime I have contacted the Women's Service Guild and it is in perfect agreement with me. I rang the president and she knows all about it, so there is no friction or anything like that.

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

Ayes—11

Hon. D. P. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willseese
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. H. C. Strickland	(Teller)

Noes—13

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. J. G. Hialop	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. J. M. Thomson

Majority against—2.

Amendment thus negated.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported, without further amendment.

Further Recommittal

Bill again recommitted, on motion by The Hon. J. G. Hislop, for the further consideration of clause 16.

In Committee, etc.

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; Mr. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 16: General powers of Inspector—

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I move an amendment—

Page 17, lines 24 and 25—Delete the words "Secretary for Labour" and substitute the words "Chief Inspector".

My reasons are the same as those I stated when speaking on clause 14. Again, I think the Chief Inspector of Factories is being slighted. I think that when proceedings are being taken the first person to whom a complaint should be made is the Chief Inspector, and the Secretary for Labour need not come into the matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We find ourselves in a rather extraordinary position. We have gone through the Bill, clause by clause, and have had certain recommitments, and agreed to a certain process so that we could come back to clause 16, and now we find another surprise. I feel it is in order, but surely this point was argued for a long time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Not on this clause.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will repeat, we have argued the principle of the Secretary for Labour, as permanent head of the department, being the administrative head under this Bill. I see no reason why he should not be the authority to authorise prosecutions. This is the case in many other sections of the service.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think you are on pretty weak ground.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Thompson might think so, but the fact remains that it is intended that the Secretary for Labour will be the administrative head.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think the Minister is on very weak ground for this reason: Not very long ago he told us that it was to be an advisory board. When a breach is committed under this section of the Act, who is the responsible person to whom the officer will go? Naturally, the Chief Inspector—the man with the knowledge and the ability to know whether or not prosecutions should be proceeded with. Not long ago, when dealing with Mrs. Hutchison's amendment, we were told that a person representing the consumers must know this and that, and be conversant with all aspects of the factory welfare board. However, when it comes to shops and factories, the Chief Inspector is the only person with the necessary knowledge to lodge a prosecution.

This amendment is not going to move mountains. Right throughout this Bill the Minister has told us we must have competent people. I am throwing the argument right back at the Minister, because the only person competent to judge would be the Chief Inspector of Factories and not the Secretary for Labour.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I would like to refer the Minister to other departments in which proceedings are taken against people for various offences—the Education Department, for example. If proceedings are taken against a parent for keeping a child away from school without very good reason, the Director of Education does not worry about taking the proceedings himself. They are handled by the child welfare officer of the Education Department.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Fisheries Department operates in the same way.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: All the departments are the same.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who decides whether or not action will be taken?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The head welfare officer of the Education Department.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The case goes to the head of the department.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: He is the head of only one section of the Education Department; and, in the same way, the Chief Inspector is the only one in the Factories and Shops Department.

I feel that the proper man to handle this sort of thing is the Chief Inspector. As the Bill stands at present, if an ordinary inspector wishes to report a case, he has to bypass his chief altogether and go to the Secretary for Labour before proceedings can be launched.

Amendment put and negatived.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment —

Page 17, lines 27 to 34—Delete paragraph (i) and substitute the following:—

(i) if an inspector holds a certificate from the Commissioner certifying that the inspector is qualified under the Health Act, 1911, to exercise the powers conferred by that Act, he may in relation to any factory, shop or warehouse exercise all the powers of an inspector appointed under that Act.

There is no doubt that this amendment will make clearer who can be appointed an inspector. When I first read the paragraph I realised that the commissioner would be placed in a very awkward position by having to decide if someone was competent. I do not think that the commissioner would appoint someone who was not qualified as a health inspector, but this amendment will make the position clear. I believe there are a limited number of shops and factories inspectors who have qualified under certain headings of the Health Act.

If the commissioner knows that one of the shops and factories inspectors has qualified as a health inspector, that man will be able to exercise all the powers under the Act. The present standard of the health officers will be maintained. I trust the amendment will be accepted by the Committee.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Having read a copy of the amendment and having listened to Dr. Hislop, I wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported, with a further amendment.

BILLS (13): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
2. Prisons Act Amendment Bill.
3. Offenders Probation and Parole Bill.
4. Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Bill.
5. Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill.
6. Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill.
7. Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.
8. Betting Control Act Amendment Bill.
9. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill.
10. Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment Bill.
11. Sale of Human Blood Bill.
12. Vermin Act Amendment Bill.
13. Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 13th November, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North) [8.45 p.m.]: This Bill is basically one which was requested by the Dental Board of Western Australia in an endeavour to modernise the Act and bring it up to date. The principal Act was first introduced in 1894, and remained in that form until 1939, when it was amended to cover apprentices

and the registration of assistants who would be trained by dentists under the jurisdiction of the Dental Board.

The Faculty of Dentistry at the University of Western Australia has brought about a great change both in the profession and in the administration of the Act, because the University now trains dentists, and therefore the registration of assistants and apprentices is outmoded. Any reference to them in the legislation is, therefore, not warranted. The Bill takes into account that the old method is redundant, and the provisions relating to apprentices and assistants will be removed from the Act; and the principle of training dentists at the University will be accepted if the Bill becomes law.

According to the Minister's notes there are still two assistants in dental surgeries in Western Australia who would not qualify for the University training schedule, but who would be capable of carrying on under the system which has obtained up to now. There is a special clause in the Bill to cover those two assistants, and I think that is a laudable move.

The Bill vests powers in the board to make rules and regulations to cope with changing circumstances for the protection of the public and the benefit of the dentists whom it controls.

The measure also provides that specialists may be appointed, and they will come under the control of the board. However, I notice that the Bill does not provide for the definition of a specialist, and it may be necessary to do this by regulation. Would a specialist be a person who, because of his years of experience, had become an expert in the field of dentistry; or would he be a person who would have to undertake postgraduate work and pass the necessary examinations to qualify as a specialist? I am prepared to accept the Bill which gives the board fairly wide powers in this regard; because at the present time there must be some dentists who are practising as specialists; and, with the introduction of this Bill I should think it would be desirable, and only right, to allow those people to continue as specialists because of the knowledge they have gained.

On the other hand, I think it is reasonable to allow the board to say that in future a certain standard will have to be attained, and that a specialist will have to undertake postgraduate work before he can obtain a specialist degree. I understand from the Minister's notes that at present the Dental Board recognises five specialties, and therefore it would seem reasonable that specialists should be controlled and regulated under the Act.

During his introductory speech the Minister drew attention to something which rather amazed me. I do not think this applies to any great degree in Western

Australia, but I would like to quote what the Minister had to say so that members will know what I mean. He said—

It may be necessary to curtail dentists from making statements which could be misleading to the public with respect to new methods of treatment or new drugs which may periodically appear on the market, or to new equipment which they might have in use.

Again it may be desirable that all dentures being constructed in a laboratory by a dental technician should be accompanied by a detailed prescription of instructions; e.g., dental design, tooth shade and mould, etc., from the dentist on the work to be carried out. This particular matter has been made the subject of a request by the Australian Dental Association to the board.

I think that is a laudable objective, and I am surprised that there should be any doubt in this regard. I always thought the position was much the same as that which applied when one went to an optician. If one goes to an optician and asks him to prescribe spectacles, he decides on the strength of the lenses and so on, and the only choice left to the individual is the design, or the colour, that might suit his features. I thought that applied to dentistry also.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Teeth are all the one colour.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I was looking at the Minister's spectacles and I was thinking how the Minister must have been careful with the selection.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Teeth are all the one colour; they are different from spectacles.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Except when the teeth get discoloured.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: There is one provision in the Bill which relates to undesirable practices, and this was mentioned by the Minister. He said that some dentists have been prepared to pay for the introduction of patients, and others have personally solicited patients for work. This is definitely unprofessional conduct in any profession, and I am sure the Dental Board of Western Australia will do its utmost to stamp out that sort of thing. However, I wonder how far the board will go in its definition of unprofessional conduct.

This point interests me because I am thinking of lodge dentists who give concessions to people who are members of certain lodges. I hope such concessions will not come within the terms of unprofessional conduct. I do not know whether this is even envisaged, but I mention it so that the Minister can give it consideration; and I would like his assurance that such concessions will not come within the scope of unprofessional conduct.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That would create a row, wouldn't it?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: There are further provisions relating to reciprocity so far as visiting lecturers are concerned, and the Bill will enable a dentist who comes to Western Australia for that purpose to have the privilege of opening a practice, or carrying on in practice for a period of 12 months. I think that would be all to the good for the people of the State, quite apart from the knowledge he would impart while lecturing. It is evident that such a person who carried on a practice in this State for a period of time would lift the standard, because nobody would come to this State as a lecturer unless he were an expert in his particular field.

There is also a provision to obviate the imposition of financial hardship upon a dentist who may leave the State for a period of time, and who may not be able to continue his registration with the board. To me this appears to be a domestic issue, and if the board and the Government are satisfied that a man should not be penalised because he practises in some other State, where probably he has to pay registration fees, I think that is sufficient. He should not have to pay the backlog of registration fees in this State before he can practise on his return to the State.

I know that in the case of English lawyers the fact that they had to pay the registration fees, whether they were in the country or not, to enable them to remain registered to practise there, caused a great deal of trouble after the war. Lawyers returning to England after the war found that they had a backlog of registration fees to meet, and many of them did not bother to practise again. I think the same position could arise with dentists if the provision in the Bill is not agreed to, and that would mean that the State would lose the services of some very good dentists who would not return to the State because of the accumulation of registration fees.

The provision in the Bill could be an encouragement for them to go abroad with the knowledge that they could come back to the State and commence practice without having to pay registration fees which would accumulate, if the provision were not agreed to, while they were away.

I have a humble amendment on the notice paper which deals with nurses. It is conceivable that dentists may be called upon to work alongside male nurses, particularly in the larger hospitals and Government institutions. I think the practice is developing in the nursing profession, whether the nurses be engaged in dentistry or medicine, to have male nurses as well as female nurses. My proposal is to delete the word "female" and leave simply the word "nurses" in the Act. This amendment was foreshadowed when the

legislation was first introduced, and the Minister concerned was quite agreeable to the amendment.

A number of amendments also appear in the name of the Minister, and I understand they were also agreed to by the Minister in another place. The amendments would be the machinery moves to honour the promises given elsewhere.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think it would be better if I put the amendments on the notice paper, and we could deal with them on Tuesday.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I cannot help but agree with the Minister after my earlier remarks tonight. Other members have not seen the amendments, and perhaps we should be consistent in these matters. With those few remarks I support the Bill, and commend it to the House.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [9.1 p.m.]: I have not been able to go through every clause of the Bill. However, I regard most of it as a Committee measure. There are one or two aspects with which I would like to deal. First I would applaud the Dental Association, the Dental Board, and the dentists, generally, for producing a measure like this. There is no doubt it is a step forward in an attempt to raise the status of the profession of dentistry, and of dentists generally.

I have seen the time in this State when practically no qualifications were needed for a dentist. I have seen the time when those practising as mechanics were appointed as dentists, and I have seen the position grow to the present stage. I believe this measure is in the interests of dentists and of the public generally.

There appears to be some difficulty in classifying their specialties, and I hope I can foresee at some reasonably early date, the formation of an Australian college of dentistry based very much on the pattern of the Australasian College of Physicians and Australasian College of Surgeons. Bodies of this character could determine the specialties under which people work. It is also possible that the University may consider the granting of diplomas in certain fields of dentistry—a wise procedure; because a person in possession of membership of a college, and of the diplomas given by the University, will be readily acceptable by the public as having the knowledge and qualifications necessary.

I think it is a move that dentists all over Australia should consider. They should form, as we have done in recent times—and it is only 25 years since this was done—an Australasian college; and it would be well for them to consider forming an Australasian college of dentists at an early date. This would mean the setting of examinations for membership

of the college, and, possibly, later for fellowship. This would raise the dignity and status of the holders of such degrees.

To a large extent there is an attempt in this Bill to bring the activities of the Dental Board to the degree of stability of the Medical Board. I think it is wise, because the dentists will be able to control the conduct of their own profession, and deal with people who are not upholding the traditions of dentistry as they should.

The remaining provisions have been covered by Mr. Willesee, and they can be dealt with in the Committee stage. There is one clause which I think could be explained to the House. It is clause 28 on page 11 which deals with a section of the principal Act. This allows any person visiting the State as an official dental clinician for the purpose of giving professional instruction, to do so; because he is not regarded as practising dentistry within the State while doing this work.

That is an excellent clause, and is based to a degree on what was requested recently by the Medical Board. We incorporated this last year in regard to the Medical Board. It means that postgraduate work can go ahead satisfactorily, because visiting professors from the Eastern States or abroad will not only be able to give lectures on their subjects to the dentists, but will be able, by practice, to demonstrate the principles under which they practise dental surgery. All this is in the interests of the profession and the general public. I heartily support the Bill, and during the week-end I will examine the remaining clauses.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [9.7 p.m.]: I am one who believes that wherever we can raise the standard of education we improve our national economy. But I wonder whether the provisions of this measure will exclude a group of people from the profession of dentistry, as was done some time back with those engaged in chemistry. At that time an amendment was moved in regard to apprentices in chemist shops which excluded completely the poor man's brilliant child.

The rich man's child can, of course, go to the University and get his diploma and then be apprenticed to a chemist. We had a chemist in this House who had practised chemistry for over 40 years. I refer, of course, to Sir Frank Gibson. Many young people have been trained in his shop and have become efficient chemists; and many of them have come from working class families—their fathers have been truck drivers and so on.

I was told personally by Sir Frank that what was done in regard to the chemist's apprentice could affect the dentist's apprentice, and that unless a parent could afford to have his child continue to the University, there would be no chance of that child being apprenticed to a chemist.

Now that I have raised the point I wonder whether those in authority will have a look at that side of it.

When the Chifley Government made scholarships available to pupils who were showing brilliance, it had in mind the great number of working class people with brilliant children who could not go on to the University. Nobody wishes to lower the standard of these professions. The higher the standard becomes, the more stable our national economy becomes. In considering these amendments, we must not lose sight of the fact that there are some brilliant children who leave the high schools and who have not enough money to go on to the University. I hope they will not be precluded from going to the University and becoming dentists.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [9.10 p.m.]: There is little need for me to say more in reply than to thank the members who have spoken for their support of the Bill. As Dr. Hislop has said, it is basically a Committee Bill, and I do not propose to ask members to consider it in Committee tonight, because there are some amendments requested from another place that I wish to place on the notice paper. We can give effect to these when we consider them next week.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 12th November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [9.12 p.m.]: This Bill is quite a short one, and what I have to say will be in support of it. The Bill could appropriately be called a mushroom Act, because it deals with trespass on people's property. I believe that, particularly in the mushroom season, hoards of people frequent the properties in the hills and do a considerable amount of damage. This Bill will protect such people and their properties.

There is another provision in the Bill which seeks to tighten up legislation in regard to juveniles. If it helps to control juveniles, it is certainly commendable. The onus is to be placed on the property owner to discourage juveniles of a certain age from frequenting his property. In this day and age, juveniles tend to get out of hand; they hunt in packs, and in packs they tend to become vicious. This legislation will help to curtail their unseemly behaviour. I am glad to say that not all juveniles behave badly, but those who do are certainly a menace.

Members will be surprised to learn that some of these young people come from good, comfortable homes, where they have everything they desire, and yet they behave in this fashion. Some of them, of course, come from humble homes. The legislation will make it easier to deal with amusement parks, shooting galleries, milk bars, and other places in which young people congregate. It will place the onus on the owner to make sure they behave, because he will be responsible for having them on his premises.

The portion dealing with trespass is necessary on account of mushroom pickers overrunning properties adjacent to the metropolitan area. Of course, it will deal with other places, but I believe the hills properties are those most affected; they are close to the metropolitan area, and it is well-known some people show an utter disregard for other people's properties.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: And stock.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: They knock down fences, the property is damaged, and stock are frightened and allowed to escape. Consequently the stock mingle with the stock on other people's properties and it is possible this might upset breeding arrangements which an owner has gone to a lot of trouble to commence. These things cause a lot of trouble.

As I said before, people arrive in their dozens in all sorts of vehicles. There has been trouble, too, in other parts of the State. We have experienced this sort of thing on the goldfields as a result of people shooting. We have had cases where people have killed stock on stations. Some people do the right thing and are welcome on properties. Those people help to eradicate vermin. They also travel along the correct tracks, respect watering points, and shut gates. However, unfortunately the other people cruel things for everyone. Of course, our laws are necessitated by the actions of inconsiderate people; and we have to protect the people who are being annoyed by others who do the things I have mentioned.

In the portion of the Bill dealing with mushrooms, the words "mushrooms or other fungus" are used. Section 82 (2) of the Act will read—

Every person who shall steal or shall cut, break, root up, or otherwise destroy or damage, with intent to steal the whole or any part of any growing tree, sapling, shrub, or underwood, or any growing fruit, mushroom or other fungus . . .

Provision is made for a penalty of £5. The owner of a property can request the name and address of a person; if the person refuses to give that information he is liable to be fined a maximum of £5. Provision is also made that if any damage is done, the value of the damage can be recovered. That should act as a deterrent to those people who wantonly abuse another person's property. This does not apply if

a person enters another person's property with lawful intent or for business reasons; it only applies when a person trespasses.

I do not anticipate any trouble in regard to the amendments to section 84 of the Act dealing with juveniles. Reference to juveniles is deleted from that part dealing with gaming places and people of bad character. A new subsection (2) will be added to section 84, reading as follows:—

(2) Every person who, being the occupier, keeper or person having the charge or control of a shop or other place of public resort, shall knowingly permit or suffer a child apparently under the age of sixteen years to enter and remain therein, under such circumstances as shall indicate that the mental, physical or moral welfare of such child is likely to be in jeopardy, shall on conviction for every such offence, be liable to a penalty of not more than five pounds.

I think that will do a lot of good. It refers to children being apparently under the age of 16. In my opinion, if a businessman feels juveniles are playing up, he will be able to say, "As far as I am concerned you are under 16." He will not have to prove it. This will help to break up the packs where certain people congregate. I support the measure.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [9.20 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on this Bill. I take it that section 84 of the Act refers to hotels and public drinking places. I think it is undesirable that playgrounds be attached to hotels, as parents leave their children in these playgrounds while they go into the hotels for a drink.

I think delinquency goes back to the uncertain times of the war. As I have said before in this House, they were uncertain times, and I can find a lot of excuses for children who were growing up at that time. I do not condone any wrongdoing or flouting of the law, but I think it behoves us as parents to look at our own shortcomings and to see that children are protected more against themselves and against the public amusement places which are in the proximity of drinking houses and hotels.

When you and I, Mr. President, were young, we did not experience these temptations. We did not know of things that children do today. The generation that has grown up since the war has never known what public security means. There is always the fear of war hanging over them; and the newspapers contribute to the problem. In any newspaper one looks at one sees references to horror, crime, death, and such things. We have to remember that the children of today read the newspapers; and I think what is published contributes towards delinquency.

We experience trouble at milk bars and shops that are open until all hours of the night. There is always the problem of speed. Whenever motorcars are spoken of it is always about the speed of a motorcar—how powerful the engine is and how fast it can go. However, I would point out that thousands of people are killed each year in trying to attain these speeds. I cannot understand why man makes these things available and then punishes the population for doing what they are asked to do.

I thought this was the time to get up and say a few words to the older people of today. At places like Rockingham and Sawyers Valley, one can see dozens of cars in which children are kept while their parents are in the hotel drinking.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Why pick on my pubs?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I do not know where the honourable member's hotels are. If we think of the pressure to which children of today are subjected, we will realise that the matter is not simple. When I was in America two years ago—

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I hope the honourable member will connect her remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That will be pretty difficult.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am speaking to the Bill in connection with what it has to say about children. I am speaking on behalf of our youth, and surely this is the place in which to do it. When I went to America I saw the cinema people and told them I objected to the type of films they were sending from America to be seen by our children. I told them that I objected in Parliament here and I said that I thought it was only fair that if I had the opportunity I should tell them personally. They were rather surprised. I told them that the horror films and others that were being sent here from America for our children to see were no more like American life than would be our way of life if Ned Kelly were depicted in our cities. Putting things into the Police Act is not the way to cure the ills regarding children.

In regard to mushrooms, I must say that I am rather fond of them, but I will not get over anyone's fence; I will ask permission. I think that on behalf of the youth of the country, we may well consider in Parliament ways of bringing more sanity into our community. I think our Press is very wanting and has reached an all-time low in what it prints for public consumption.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What do you think of the advertisements?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I think they are terrible, really.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: So do I.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: There is too much lewdness. If the things I have mentioned were not published in the Press, we might get some results and things would be better than they are. I do not condone the ill-doer, but I have a certain sympathy for the youth of today who are getting into the hands of the police; and so often the punishment does not fit the crime. We can do much more to protect our youth and show them better ways of living.

It is not a good thing when the Government of the day cannot provide employment for the youth of the State. There is nothing so degrading as unemployment; and when our youth cannot sell their labour it is not good for them. Some youngsters are on social services, and they are inclined to think that is an easy way out. I think the Government should look at this aspect to see what can be done. It will be necessary in time for us to re-educate working men who are not well educated, in order that they may take on technical jobs. We will have to do the same as was done for the returned soldiers.

This action will have to be taken because the time will come when there will be no room for a labourer; and what does one do when there is no work? It is a really good saying—I think you, Mr. President, have heard it—"Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do." That saying is very true, and it still stands, as many old maxims do.

I have expressed my views, because I do not think harsher punishment will cure the ills of our society so far as our youth are concerned. We will have to make useful, educated citizens of them.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

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

House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 14th November, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—	
Intro. : 1r.	2790
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Standing Orders Suspension—	
Alteration of Notice of Motion	2795
Time Limits on Debates	2796
Police Act Amendment Bill—Returned	2875
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—3r.	2875
Veterinary Medicines Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. : 1r.	2790
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Coal Mines—Position of Certain Leases	2791
Electricity Supplies—Provision for Darkan and Duranillin	2791
North-West Department—Administrator and Assistant : Details of Appointments	2793
Railways—	
Laporte Titanium Works—Opening : Cost of Transport for Invited Guests	2794
Railway Buses—	
Merredin-Northam-Narembeen Services	2794
Perth-Northam : Substitution of Diesels at Weekends	2791
State Building Supplies and Midland Railway Company—Comparison of Government's Actions	2791
Traffic Circus at Albany—Establishment at Road Junctions	2792
Water Supplies—	
Duranillin : Investigation of Dam Sites	2791
Resources—	
Salinity of Rivers	2792
Surface and Underground Supply	2792
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—New Standing Orders : Submission to Committee	2795
Legislative Council Provinces—Redistribution and Adult Franchise : Legislation	2795

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Bill.
2. Veterinary Medicines Act Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.