It is necessary to get parliamentary approval for any revocation of State Forests and on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, the papers have already been tabled. There are four areas involved, as follows:—

Area No. 1:

Adjacent to the north-western boundary of Karragullen Townsite. Approximately 12½ acres, remote from the greater part of State Forest No. 22 and carrying no marketable timber. The land was formerly the Karragullen Railway Siding Reserve and was included in State Forest some years ago and retained as a suitable site for a forest settlement. It is no longer intended to establish a settlement at this centre and the area is to be returned to the control of the Lands Department.

Area No. 2:

Six miles north-west of Denmark Townsite. Approximately 26 acres of Denmark Lot 652 forming part of State Forest No. 64 outside the Denmark River Catchment boundary and applied for by the adjoining holder of Lots 651, 659 and 660. The area has been heavily cut over and is unsuited for good Karri regeneration. To safeguard the catchment area and rationalise the boundaries it is proposed to include in the adjoining State Forest, the northern portion of Denmark Lot 547 which is vacant Crown Land within the catchment area. It is also proposed to release almost all of the southern section of Lot 547 as it has little potential for a forest crop.

Area No. 3:

1¼ miles east of Yanchep. Approximately 441 acres of State Forest No. 65 unsuitable for pine planting, adjoining "A" Reserve 9868. The area to be excised from the Reserve is to be set aside for "Forestry Headquarters" to supplement the existing headquarters site, extension of which is undesirable as it abuts on the highly developed area of public recreation. The area of State Forest No. 65 for excision is proposed for inclusion in the adjoining "A" Reserve 9868 as part of Yanchep National Park.

Area No. 4:

Adjacent to the eastern boundary of Manjimup Townsite. An area of 10 acres adjoining the Manjimup Townsite boundary required for the establishment of an additional cemetery site reserve as the existing reserve has a very limited future use due to the presence of heavy rock formations. Though the area contains marketable timber it has been found by test drilling to be the most suitable and practical area of all potential sites which were investigated.

These areas have been recommended by the Conservator of Forests after a close examination by the Forests Department. Last year, when dealing with this motion, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked that more detailed information be given. The department has endeavoured to meet the wishes of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in this regard and I commend the motion standing in my name.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Graham (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 1st November, 1967

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

QUESTION ON NOTICE

SMOKING

Discouragement Campaign: Result in Schools

The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Will the Minister obtain, if possible, a report on the success or otherwise of the anti-smoking campaign being conducted in Australian schools by the health service of the Seventh Day Adventist Church?

(2) If a report is procured and it indicates the success of the scheme will the Minister give consideration to the Public Health Department conducting, in our schools, a campaign on similar lines?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Introduction of Amending Legislation: Motion

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.36 p.m.]: I move—

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should, in this session, introduce legislation to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, with particular reference to the following:—

(a) Section 5—

(i) Basic wage;

(ii) Dependency; and

(iii) Definition of "Worker."

(b) Section 8—Compensation for worker dying from, or affected by certain industrial diseases.

(c) Section 10—Compensation for hernia.

(d) Section 29—Jurisdiction of Board—

(i) Provision for funds to be made available where deemed necessary; and

(ii) Board to be empowered to impose a penalty for unreasonable delay in settling claims or maintaining weekly payments.

(e) First schedule—

Clauses 1 and 3—To provide for retrospectivity of application;

Clause 1 (c) (iii)—To add "repair and replacement of artificial hearing aids"; and

Clause 11—To insert $10,000 in lieu of $7,000.

(f) Third schedule—To add "Industrial deafness".

The reason I have moved this motion is to give members an opportunity to discuss suggested amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act. Many people believe that these amendments should be introduced by the Government during the current session of Parliament.

The contents of the motion were submitted to the Minister for Labour by deputation through the leader of our party (The Hon. J. T. Tonkin); and answers to questions in another place have revealed that it is not the Government's intention to introduce any form of workers' compensation legislation during this session. This is a serious omission by the Government because it is essential that Parliament should keep this legislation under constant review, and always up to date. This is necessary because of innumerable factors, including the use of modern machinery.

Members will find enumerated in the motion the points which we consider should be included in amending legislation introduced during this session. They will have an opportunity to discuss, if they so desire, the points contained in the motion, and the problems confronting people who come under the Act. In that way members will be able to judge for themselves whether or not the Government has been remiss in not making several amendments to the Act.

In the application of this legislation, it becomes apparent to those people who are associated with it that there are many anomalies in the Act. However, apparently the Department of Labour and the Minister for Labour, who is in charge of the legislation, feel that such issues are not sufficiently important to be brought forward by way of amending legislation.

We go to meticulous detail at times to introduce to Parliament many amending pieces of legislation which in themselves are almost unimportant to the community, but they are important to people concerned with the particular sets of circumstances which are covered by those Acts. The most recent example I can call to mind is the amending legislation in connection with cremation, which was discussed only yesterday. The object of this amending legislation is to do away with what might be termed the red tape of applying to the Public Health Department for permission to remove the remains of a cremated individual. The position which will apply when the legislation is passed is that an administrator of an estate, or some other responsible person, will be able to apply directly to the controller of a cemetery to take control of the ashes of a deceased person. In itself, that was not a very big piece of legislation. Nevertheless, the Government saw fit to streamline the Cremation Act by modernising it to bring it up to date with present practice. The Government saw the necessity to present this legislation to Parliament, even though it is a Bill which contains only one operative clause.

There have been several instances of that kind throughout the session and, in the interests of efficiency, it should be done. There is never any question of disagreeing with what might be termed minor amending Bills. Accordingly, when it is a question of the legislation which surrounds the very serious issue of workers' compensation, we on this side of the House wonder why even the most simple and obvious amendments are not currently introduced by the Government to keep the Act up to date.

I do not intend to elaborate in great detail in moving the motion. I consider that the debate should bring forth further detail from members who are interested in the subject on the basis that I have proposed to the House. For example, we suggest that under section 5 of the Act there are three serious possibilities for consideration by the House, whereby a direction could be given to the Government as a basis for amending the legislation. In the case of the basic wage, as there now exists a total wage as distinct from the previous situation, we suggest the Act needs amendment in that direction alone. This is particularly so, as Parliament will not sit for a long period of time after this session ends.

The question of dependency is also raised. It has been submitted to the Minister that overseas and Eastern States residence should not automatically disqualify a dependant who is being supported by a wage earner. This would merely be an adoption of the provision in the New South Wales Workers' Compensation Act. It is not currently contemplated as an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act of Western Australia. We propose to discuss the situation under section 8 of the Act whereby a different form of compensation should apply in the case of a worker

who dies or is affected by a disease. Under the heading of pneumoconiosis, where dual diseases are present, subsection (13) of section 8 of the Act limits the examinee's compensation entitlement. We consider that this is an anomaly within the Act which should be corrected.

It is also believed that compensation for hernia should be considered within the ordinary accident provisions in the Act. The opportunity should be given to members of the House to consider this matter and express an opinion on the issue. It concerns something which, in itself, might well have been the subject of an amending piece of legislation.

It is also considered that the jurisdiction of the board should be extended to provide that funds may be made available. At the moment, the situation is most unsatisfactory and amendments should be made to permit funds to be made available for rehabilitation of workers. The Workers' Compensation Board should have the power to make these funds available if that action is considered necessary. This is a very broad question in itself and is one which is at least worthy of the open forum discussion of Parliament.

The question of added penalties where delays occur in settling workers' compensation claims and the weekly payment of maintenance is something that should be considered; because the matter is causing constant concern within the industry to those individuals who are affected by it. So many individuals are dependent upon the provisions of the Act. These people should be given every consideration and every opportunity to speed the payment of settlements. Where undue delay is evident, and this can be sheeted home to a company or a group of individuals, we consider the right course to follow is to provide for some imposition by way of penalty to be placed upon such an organisation. This subject has been denied the right of debate, because the Government just will not introduce legislation to amend the Act.

It is also our opinion that there should be retrospectivity within the confines of the first schedule to the Act. We submit that injustice is being created by the non-retrospective application of the medical and hospital expense allowances, and also in the award of the second schedule entitlements. In addition, the repair and renewal of artificial hearing aids should be added to the first schedule. Having in mind the very great and multifarious responsibilities which members of Parliament have to their individual electorates, I cannot believe that any member of this Chamber would have any quarrel if this issue were submitted as an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act.

Even when an elementary mistake in the Act is discovered, the Government will not introduce a Bill to correct it. An example of this can be found in section 11 of the first schedule to the Act which reads as follows:—

> When the Board orders redemption as provided for in clause 10 of this Schedule—
>
> (i) in the case of permanent total incapacity the lump sum shall be the sum ascertained by deducting the total amount received by the worker as weekly payments from the maximum sum of three thousand five hundred pounds.

In dollars, that would be $7,000, but already, in principle, it is admitted that figure should be $10,000. So in this instance, with a simple amendment, we could correct an obvious anomaly by increasing the amount from $7,000 to $10,000.

For some reason or other that has not been done. We believe, too, the question of industrial accidents should be further discussed and provisions inserted in the Act to effect much-needed improvements. So this issue has been raised by way of a motion in the hope that the House will give serious consideration to the points raised, and that members, in the light of the responsibility of their positions, will look upon the Workers' Compensation Act as being a most serious responsibility of a Government in the course of its administration, because day by day the Act governs the many problems that arise with people employed in industry.

At all times, if we seek to get the best conditions for the employment of labour in industry it naturally follows we must grant to the worker all the normal benefits that would reasonably flow to him because of the nature of his employment. If in the course of a long period we slowly but surely bring within the ambit of the Act the problems I have outlined in introducing this motion, the steps taken will be in the right direction. If we do not come to grips with these issues, and if we evade the responsibilities associated with them and continually pass them by by adopting the attitude, "We will have a look at them; we will think about them; or we will do something about them in the future," it follows that people will not enter various forms of industry when they know they will not be recompensed for any suffering caused by the nature of their employment.

I am sure all members of this House have had the opportunity to visit and inspect a factory, and I am sure the first thing noticed by any member was the continual noise; and yet, during the whole history of this legislation, we still have not been successful in having industrial deafness recognised as an occupational hazard. It is not unreasonable to say that, in the course of time, with free enterprise and with individuals having the right of choice of employment, this simple ban in itself will deter people from seeking employment in certain industries.

Many people have set ideas as to how we should judge the benefits obtained from the Workers' Compensation Act. The fact is that at the moment we are bound by the existing provisions of the Act operating in this State and it behoves us to add to or to detract from them if this will help the people who come within the confines of the legislation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines).

BILLS (6): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Poisons Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
2. Police Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

   Bills introduced, on motions by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and read a first time.
3. Statute Law Revision Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and read a first time.
4. Petroleum Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and read a first time.
5. Legal Contribution Trust Bill.
6. Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

   Bills introduced, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and read a first time.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

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

BILLS (4): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill.
2. Ord River Dam Catchment Area (Straying Cattle) Bill.

   Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.
3. Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill.
4. Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Registration Fees Bill.

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

CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [5.6 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As you, Mr. President, and all members are aware, under the Child Welfare Act the Children's Court deals with all offences or alleged offences committed by persons under the age of 18 years. Section 23 of that Act provides as follows:—

> (1) At any hearing or trial by a court under this Act, the court may order that any persons not directly interested in the case shall be excluded from the court-room or place of hearing.
>
> (2) A person shall not, without the express authority of the court, publish in any newspaper or other printed medium or broadcast or televise any report of the proceedings of the court on the hearing of a charge against, or any application concerning, a child.

This Bill is concerned only with children who have reached 16 years of age; it is not concerned with any offences committed by a child before he became 16 years of age; and it is not concerned with a child's first offence after he has attained 16 years. In all those cases I have just mentioned, the publication about a case will still be prohibited; but the Bill does propose to allow publication about a case where it is a second serious offence committed by a child after he has attained 16 years of age.

The offences specified in proposed new subsection (3), to be found on page 2 of the Bill, are as follows:—

> Any offences under the Criminal Code, the Police Act, 1892, or sections 25, 31, 31A, 31B, 32, 33B, 60, or 61 of the Traffic Act, 1919, or of any offence of which the substance is assault, the illegal consumption of liquor, drunkenness, or illegal betting.

The sections of the Traffic Act which I have just enumerated, and to which reference is made in the Bill, refer respectively to driving without the appropriate license, reckless driving, dangerous driving, careless driving, drunken and drugged driving, breaching the conditions of an extraordinary license, unauthorised use of a vehicle, and unlawful interference with the mechanism of a motor vehicle.

It is an unfortunate fact that in the 16 to 17-years age group crime and repetitive crime are all too prevalent. One gets a rather startling illustration of that when one reads the annual report of the Child Welfare Department. In the last report of that department tabled in this House—that is, the annual report for the year ended the 30th June, 1966—there are appended numerous tables which indicate the number of offences that have been committed in the different age groups in respect of various offences.

I will not burden the House with giving endless details of such offences, but it is worth mentioning that in respect of the

16 to 17-years age group, and in respect of offences of the nature of stealing and receiving, breaking and entering, etc., and offences in respect of motor vehicles, there was, during the year ended the 30th June, 1966, a total of 592 offences of which 262 were first offenders and 330 were second or third offenders. Then, too, we find that the statistics in respect of charges for the unauthorised use of motor vehicles are really extraordinary. One finds that in 1963-64 there were 675 successful prosecutions for the unauthorised use of motorcars; and of those 63 per cent. were committed by juveniles—that is, by statutory juveniles or persons under the age of 18 years.

By 1966-67 the position was even more extraordinary. One finds there were 1,036 charges, and of those 76 per cent. were committed by juveniles or persons under the age of 18 years. Those are rather extraordinary figures.

As a possible deterrent against crime or repeated crime by persons in the 16 to 17-years age group the Bill appears to me to have three merits. The first merit is that it is a pretty mild Bill. There is quite a body of responsible opinion which feels that anyone over 16—first offender or otherwise—should have his case published. But this Bill does not go that far. It applies only to second offenders—or persons offending twice—after attaining the age of 16 years.

The second merit of the Bill, as I see it, is that it should deter children in general, whether they have committed offences previously or have never committed an offence, from breaking the law after their sixteenth birthday. This deterrent rests in the certainty that if they break the law on a second occasion after their sixteenth birthday, their names, ages, and addresses will be made known to any person having a proper interest in those details.

For this purpose—and particularly because of the proposed new subsection (3) —it can reasonably be taken that members of the Press have a general interest in publishing, for the general good, the names of children who indulge in criminal misbehaviour. It is the hope of the sponsor of this Bill—and of myself—that children generally have sufficient self-respect and self-concern for the reputation of their families to avoid the embarrassment of the publication of their names and addresses, and to refrain from misbehaviour.

The third merit of the Bill, as I see it, lies in its reminding parents that they have a responsibility to supervise the behaviour of their children, so that not only the guilty child but also the other members of the family, and they themselves, will not have their reputations tarnished by the publication of their child's offences.

As I have already indicated, the Bill is limited, in its application, to children over the age of 16 years so that the younger and less mature children who do wrong are not penalised by publicity, nor are their parents embarrassed by it. In limiting its proposals to those children over 16 years the Bill has safeguarded younger children, but has rightly taken up the point that the older children—or young men—are expected by the community to be more mature and better self-controlled.

There is an interesting side issue which arises out of this because the combined effect of sections 23 and 126 of the Act produces a rather curious position with respect to any action of a civil nature. This is because, in a word, people are generally unable to take civil action against persons under 18 years of age who have damaged property, because the names of the offenders could not, by reason of section 23 and section 126 of the Act, be obtained from the court.

For example, let us take the very prevalent case—as an illustration—of the stolen motorcar which is severely damaged. The owner of that car is forced to forego his no-claim bonus unless the insurance company can find out the name of the person who damaged the car. It is even more drastic where the owner of the car is a young man because so many policies these days provide not only for the forfeiture of the no-claim bonus, but also that the young man shall bear the first $100 of damage to his car.

The person whose car is damaged is, in the majority of cases, precluded from finding out just who did the damage because he is not able to procure, from the Children's Court, any particulars with regard to the name or age or address of the person committing the offence.

Then, too, there is another good illustration of the present disability which was referred to in the *Daily News* of Monday, the 28th August, 1967. The newspaper article referred to a Cottesloe housewife whose home was robbed by two boys who were later charged in the Children's Court. The housewife knew the names of the two boys who, she believed, had been charged and she understood the court had ordered restitution. After a lapse of some months, she wrote to the court asking when she could expect her goods and money to be returned. The Clerk of the Court replied that he could give her no information and she should consult a solicitor. In fact, no restitution had been made, but the clerk felt that the Child Welfare Act prevented him from giving this information.

This Bill will, in part—but in part only—remove that disability which I have just mentioned because, as I have already indicated, it is confined to a person who has attained the age of 16 years; and who after reaching the age of 16 years has committed not one offence, but more than one offence. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Child Welfare).

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Amendments

Amendments made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee

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

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments made by the Assembly are as follows:—

No. 1.

Clause 8, page 3, line 25: Add after the section number "51A." the subsection designation "(1)".

No. 2.

Clause 8, page 3, line 32: Add the following subsections—

(2) The Chief Electoral Officer shall not, under subsection (1) of this section, remove the name of the elector from the roll unless,—

(a) he has, by notice in writing served on the elector, given notice of his intention so to remove the name of the elector;

(b) he has, in the notice, specified a date being not less than fourteen days from the date of the notice on or before which the elector may by notice in writing served on the Chief Electoral Officer advise him that he objects to his name being so removed; and

(c) the elector has failed to serve a notice on the Chief Electoral Officer under and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this subsection.

(3) A person whose name has been removed from a roll pursuant to this section may claim in the manner prescribed in section forty-two of this Act, to have his name entered upon any roll for which he possesses the necessary qualification.

No. 3.

Clause 11, page 5, line 9: Delete the words, "he is not entitled to a refund of".

No. 4.

Clause 11, page 5, line 11: After the word "nomination" add the words, "shall be forfeited to the Crown".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It will simplify matters if I first move that we agree to the amendments made by the Legislative Assembly to clause 8. When the debate ensued in another place there was, in the minds of members of that Chamber, apparently, some doubt as to the power which would be given to the Chief Electoral Officer to remove a name from the roll. The doubt was on the basis that the person, in fact, might not want his name removed from the roll. Personally, I can only suggest to the Committee that the Chief Electoral Officer is a very responsible person, and those officers who will follow him will be equally responsible. I am sure those officers would not remove the name of a person from the roll unless there was complete justification for doing so.

However, these amendments—which I suggest we agree to—were made in the Legislative Assembly on a different basis. The amendments simply mean that a name shall not be removed unless the Chief Electoral Officer has given notice of his intention to remove the elector's name. Furthermore, proposed new subsection (3) states that a person whose name has been removed from a roll may, in the manner prescribed, make application to the Electoral Office to be re-enrolled.

The amendments are quite clear and I have no objection to the elaboration of the section. I really do not think they are necessary but they do set out the provisions more plainly and therefore I have no objection to them. I move—

That amendments Nos. 1 and 2 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Members will recollect that by clause 11 we were changing the state of affairs in respect of nominations. The Bill, as originally presented, provided for the withdrawal of the candidate's nomination up to 12 o'clock on the closing date for the receipt of nominations, and that the candidate should be entitled to a refund of his deposit if he withdrew his nomination before 12 o'clock. The Committee decided that he should not be entitled to a refund of his nomination and provided for this by inserting the word "not." However, the position was not made clear as regards where the money forfeited would go; the Bill simply said that such a person would not be entitled to a refund.

The Legislative Assembly, by its amendment, has provided that the nomination fee shall be forfeited to the Crown. Not only does this confirm the intention of this Chamber but it also directs where the money so forfeited will go. I move—

That amendments Nos. 3 and 4 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

Report

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 5.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 1st November, 1967

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

ORD RIVER SCHEME

Finance from the Commonwealth Government

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Deputy Premier) [4.32 p.m.]: I feel sure that Australians—and, perhaps, especially Western Australians—were very pleased to hear of the announcement made in Canberra today that the Commonwealth Government has accepted the proposal submitted by the Western Australian Government for the Ord River scheme.

Several members: Hear, hear!

Mr. NALDER: The announcement was received with a great deal of enthusiasm in Western Australia. Members of the Government—and I am sure every member in this House—are very happy indeed that we are now in a position to proceed with the scheme which was outlined to the Commonwealth Government.

Up to this point we have not received any details, but no doubt these will be made available to us in the near future. I would like to express on behalf of the Government of Western Australia—and I think probably on behalf of the Parliament of Western Australia—that we are very pleased to receive news of the announcement. This will be a great day in the history of the development which has been going on in the north. I am sure the completion of the Ord River scheme will make a valuable contribution to the growing of cotton, sorghum, beef, and the many other products which will result from the great development which is taking place in the northern part of Western Australia.

I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to make this statement, and to express our appreciation to the Commonwealth Government for the decision which it has made.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [4.34 p.m.]: I trust, Mr. Speaker, you will extend to me the same privilege that you have extended to the Deputy Premier. I do not quite know how this fits into the notice paper, without permission to make a statement, but it is all right with me if it is all right with you, Sir.

The SPEAKER: It is all right with me.

Mr. TONKIN: I am delighted with the news, and it is very welcome. I think the people of Western Australia, with very few exceptions, will also be delighted because the provision of finance will afford an opportunity for this scheme to operate. I have no doubt it will mean considerable benefit to the State as a whole, and particularly the north.

Naturally, we are very interested and pleased because, whilst full credit should go to the present Government for its continued advocacy of this project, it should not be overlooked that the plan was initially submitted to the Commonwealth Government by the Hawke Labor Government. In my own period of administration, as Minister for Works, the initial planning was done and submitted to the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Government sent officers over to investigate, and those officers remarked to the then Director of Works, the late Mr. Young, that they were surprised we had made such progress in the preparation of the plan which had been submitted to the Commonwealth Government.

I think it has been overlooked that we have played any part in the development of this scheme, but I emphasise that, initially, it was our idea. We are very pleased to see that the Government which followed us appreciated the value of the scheme and did not leave any stone unturned in bringing it closely to the notice of the Commonwealth Government.

It may be just a coincidence that the Commonwealth Government, after all this time, has made up its mind when there is a Senate election in the offing. However, we do not criticise the decision in any way. We regard it as being welcome, regardless of the reasons which prompted it.

I am anxious to know, finally, if there are any strings attached to the offer. What is the basis upon which the finance is to be made available, because the announcement in the Press does not say "all the finance", nor does it say "the finance"; it says "finance"? The announcement may mean only a proportion of the finance. The State might be obligated to find a very substantial sum which might be difficult for it to do.

So, I am anxious to know the terms and conditions upon which the money is being made available. However, I say without any hesitation that, on behalf of the party I have the privilege to represent, we are indeed delighted and we welcome the news most heartily.