

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 25th November, 1953.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Railways, as to effect of State transport co-ordination legislation	2034
Lands, as to settlement west of Bolgart Education, as to Margaret River school and status	2034
Kindergartens, as to providing land at Innaloo	2035
Health, (a) as to dust and moth nuisance, North Fremantle	2035
(b) as to making official inspection	2035
Water supplies, as to flouridation of service reservoirs	2036
M.v. "Kabarli," as to memorial plaque to Daisy Bates	2036
Housing, as to construction at Kondinin Bulkhandling, as to resumptions for Geraldton facilities	2036
Electricity supplies, as to completion of South Fremantle and Bunbury stations Fisheries, as to prosecutions for sale of undersized crayfish	2036
Bills : Loan, £17,850,000, 1r.	2037
State Housing Act Amendment, 1r.	2037
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 1r.	2037
Reprinting of Acts Authorisation, 1r.	2037
Jury Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	2037
Abattoirs Act Amendment, 1r.	2037
Perth Town Hall Agreement, 1r.	2037
Builders Registration Act Amendment, 1r.	2037
Kwinana Road District, 3r.	2037
Cremation Act Amendment, 3r.	2037
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, reports	2037
Prices Control Act Amendment and Continuance, report	2037
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, Council's amendments	2037
Assistance by Local Authorities in Wiring Dwellings for Electricity, 2r.	2037
Upper Darling Range Railway Lands Revestment, 2r., Com., report	2037
Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	2038
Closer Settlement Act Amendment, 2r.	2039
Water Boards Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	2040
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	2040
Police Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	2041
Diseased Coconut, 2r., Com.	2043
Aborigines Welfare, 2r.	2050

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS.

As to Effect of State Transport Co-ordination Legislation.

Mr. ACKLAND asked the Minister for Transport:

In view of his statement in this House that £20,000 per annum would be lost to the railways should the Bill to amend the State Transport Co-ordination Act be passed, would he inform the House—

(1) How this estimated loss of £20,000 per annum is arrived at?

(2) Is he aware that the maximum freight rates approved by the Prices Control Branch for conveyance by road are 1s. per ton mile on a distance of 25 miles and 11.2d. per ton mile for a distance of 35 miles?

(3) Has he noted that the present railway freight rates are, for a distance of 35 miles, as follow:—

2nd Class, 1s. 9.5d. per ton mile;
1st Class, 1s. 5d. per ton mile;
C Class, 1s. 3.9d. per ton mile;
B Class, 1s. 1.1d. per ton mile;
A Class, 10.8d. per ton mile;
Miscellaneous, 7. 5d. per ton mile;
or an average of 1s. 2.3d. per ton mile?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The figure of £20,000 quoted was from memory and referred to the loss of revenue to this extent and not a direct loss on operation.

(2) Yes.

(3) The rates quoted are not quite correct with one exception. The rates should read:—

2nd Class—1s. 7.9d. per ton mile.
1st Class—1s. 3.7d. per ton mile.
C Class—1s. 3.7d. per ton mile.
B Class—1s. 1.2d. per ton mile.
A Class—10.8d. per ton mile.
Miscellaneous—8.1d. per ton mile.
Average—1s. 1.9d. per ton mile.

LANDS.

As to Settlement West of Bolgart.

Mr. ACKLAND asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to develop the land west of Bolgart under the land settlement scheme?

(2) If so, what area is to be developed?

(3) If it is not the intention of the Government to use the land for this purpose, is it intended to make it available for general selection?

(4) Is it a fact that large areas of land growing wandoo in this area have been set aside for the use of one company?

(5) If so, what is the acreage?

(6) How long will it be before it will be cut over?

(7) Will the land then be available for general settlement purposes?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, the area was accepted by the Commonwealth in 1950 as suitable for war service land settlement, and will be developed after removal of millable timber.

(2) Approximately 40,000 acres, extending from approximately 10 miles west of Calligiri southwards to a line approximately 12 miles west of Wattening.

(3) Answered by No. (1).

(4) Areas of land in this locality carrying wandoo are being reserved for integrated utilisation by general sawmilling and tannin extraction interests, and not necessarily by one company only.

(5) The area is approximately 82,000 acres.

(6) No definite time for utilisation of the timber has been set.

(7) Land unsuitable for retention for forestry purposes will be released after cutting.

EDUCATION.

As to Margaret River School and Status.

Mr. BOVELL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When does he anticipate the school now in course of construction at Margaret River will be completed and occupied?

(2) What are the proposals for the consolidation of surrounding schools?

(3) Will he give full particulars of the proposed status of the new school at Margaret River, and state whether it is intended to include instruction in subjects with an agricultural bias?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) November, 1954.

(2) Proposals for consolidation have not been finalised. The question will be fully investigated before the new building is completed.

(3) The status of the new school will be that of a primary school with a small post-primary top. It is anticipated that it will grow to Junior High School status in the near future.

KINDERGARTENS.

As to Providing Land at Innaloo.

Mr. NIMMO asked the Minister for Housing:

As nearly all the land at Innaloo is owned by the State Government, will the State Housing Commission make a block of land available to residents for the erection of a kindergarten?

The MINISTER replied:

At South Innaloo approximately 3½ acres will in future be vested with the local authority as an "A" class reserve. The local kindergarten committee and other bodies will then be able to negotiate with the local authority as to the use of this land.

In the North Innaloo area, which has been redesigned as a subdivision there is ample provision in the setting aside of

areas which can either be vested in the local authority or some other responsible corporate body.

Representatives of the Kindergarten Union have in recent months conferred with the State Housing Commission as to the general provision of kindergarten and nursery school sites in all State Housing Commission housing estates.

The new housing estates now being planned provide adequately for sites for this purpose.

HEALTH.

(a) As to Dust and Moth Nuisance, North Fremantle.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware that from the new silo in North Fremantle which has been erected by Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. right up against people's back yards, dust and moths are smothering residents?

(2) Is he further aware that no offers have been received for houses offered for sale in the vicinity?

(3) If so, can something be done to have these houses taken over at replacement values?

(4) If not, will he see that something is done to have this nuisance prevented in the interests of the comfort of the people and public health?

(5) If not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. On inquiry I am advised that wheat is not in motion and dust is therefore not due to wheat.

(2) No.

(3) Answered by No. (2).

(4) and (5) Everything possible is being done to minimise the moth, which receives constant attention and treatment. Underground and overhead conveyors are under construction which will enable the wheat to be moved and thereby control the moth.

(b) As to Making Official Inspection.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of his answer to my questions that he is not aware that silos have been built against people's backyards, with the result that they are being smothered with dust and moths, will he agree, on the first day there is a slight wind, to send an inspector to obtain the correct information which apparently has not been given to him?

The MINISTER replied:

I will do better than that. I will go down with the inspector.

WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Fluoridation of Service Reservoirs.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has he been approached recently about fluoridation of water supplies?

(2) Would a decision to add sodium fluoride to water in the service reservoirs be made by the Minister, or by the full Cabinet?

(3) Has he information that Toronto, Canada, and certain cities in U.S.A., have rejected the proposals?

(4) Can he see any objection to those citizens who wish to absorb sodium fluoride for dental reasons, doing so under private arrangements, without the mass of the people being involved?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) By the Minister for Water Supplies.

(3) No specific information is available in respect to Toronto. Certain cities in U.S.A. are adopting a conservative attitude.

(4) Yes. Citizens desirous of absorbing sodium fluoride for any reason should seek medical advice before doing so.

M.V. "KABBARLI."

As to Memorial Plaque to Daisy Bates.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

(1) Is it the intention of the State Shipping Service to place a plaque on the m.v. "Kabbarli" stating that the vessel was named out of respect to the memory of the late Daisy Bates?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, when will the plaque be erected?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied:

(1) and (2) Approval was given for a plaque to be placed aboard the m.v. "Kabbarli," but some time elapsed and no further word was received from the committee that originally raised the question.

However, it is now apparent that there has been a misunderstanding as to who would be supplying the plaque, and the matter is receiving further consideration.

HOUSING.

As to Construction at Kondinin.

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Housing:

In view of at least one applicant having no prospect of obtaining one of the State Housing Commission houses under construction, will the commission arrange for the early construction of further houses at Kondinin?

The MINISTER replied:

No, since the programme for 1953-54 has already been determined and is related to loan moneys available.

I might add, neither is it considered desirable to erect houses in any given centre to saturation point.

BULKHANDLING.

As to Resumptions for Geraldton Facilities.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What number of buildings will be affected by the resumption of land for the extension of bulkhandling facilities at Geraldton?

(2) How many families are resident in this area?

(3) What number of appeals has been received in regard to these resumptions?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Nine.

(2) Eleven.

(3) Nil.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

As to Completion of South Fremantle and Bunbury Stations.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Are all the necessary equipment and building material available to complete "B" station at South Fremantle?

(2) If so, when is it anticipated that this station will be complete?

(3) Has any programme of work been laid down for the new power house at Bunbury?

(4) If so, providing reasonable conditions prevail, when is it anticipated that the first machine will go on load?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) All but a few minor items.

(2) It is anticipated that the buildings and the full capacity of the four turbo-alternators will be ready for the winter of 1954.

(3) Yes.

(4) Within five years.

FISHERIES.

As to Prosecutions for Sale of Undersized Crayfish.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Fisheries:

What number of prosecutions of local fishermen have taken place from the 1st January, 1952 and 1953, for the sale of undersized crayfish, at—

(i) Dongara;

(ii) Geraldton (including the Abrolhos Islands)?

The MINISTER replied:

(i) Dongara.—Four persons were prosecuted and convicted for having undersized crayfish in their possession.

(ii) Abrolhos Islands.—Thirty-six persons were prosecuted and convicted for consigning undersized crayfish for sale. Geraldton off-shore.—Twenty-six persons were prosecuted and convicted for having undersized crayfish in their possession. Eight persons were prosecuted and convicted for consigning undersized crayfish for sale. Total prosecutions, 74.

BILLS (8)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Loan, £17,850,000.
Introduced by the Premier.
- 2, State Housing Act Amendment.
- 3, Fire Brigades Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Minister for Housing.
- 4, Reprinting of Acts Authorisation.
- 5, Jury Act Amendment (No. 2).
Introduced by the Minister for Justice.
- 6, Abattoirs Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.
- 7, Perth Town Hall Agreement.
Introduced by the Minister for Lands.
- 8, Builders Registration Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Minister for Works.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Kwinana Road District.
- 2, Cremation Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2)—REPORT.

- 1, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.
- 2, Prices Control Act Amendment and Continuance.
Adopted.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL—ASSISTANCE BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN WIRING DWELLINGS FOR ELECTRICITY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. H. Styants—Kalgoorlie) [7.51]: in moving the second reading said: Compared with the formidable length of its short title this is quite a small Bill. Its genesis emanated in a proposal from the Northam Municipal Council that local authorities be given the power to assist persons with the wiring or rewiring of their homes. It is a fact that for many people the installation or renewal of

electrical wiring is a costly process, particularly in country districts. The Government agreed that it was prepared to introduce a measure to provide local authorities with discretionary powers in this connection.

The Bill provides that the owner of a ratable dwelling house may apply to his local authority for financial assistance in the rewiring or wiring of the house. If the local authority considers that such assistance is warranted, it may arrange for the necessary work to be carried out, and enter into an agreement with the applicant for the cost of the work to be repaid within 10 years. The cost of the work may be met from the ordinary revenue of the local authority, or from loan funds raised for the purpose. All advances to applicants are to be regarded as rates owing, and to be treated for recovery purposes in a similar manner to rates.

Hon. D. Brand: Will the ratepayer have no say as to which contractor shall do the work?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I would say that, subject to the approval of the financing authority, which would be the local authority, he would be able to pick his own contractor. I emphasise that there is no obligation intended under the Bill to compel local authorities to do this work. They are given complete discretionary powers. The measure has passed another place and has been sent down to us for consideration. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—UPPER DARLING RANGE RAILWAY LANDS REVESTMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th November.

MR. OWEN (Darling Range) [7.54]: This small Bill is of considerable importance to a number of people, as well as the road board, in the Darling Range district. As the Minister said, its introduction has been necessary to enable the land formerly required for the Upper Darling Range railway, and vested in the Commissioner of Railways, to be revested in the Lands Department so that that department may dispose of it.

As the Minister said, a considerable extent of land is resting there, and he remarked that apparently no one took much interest in it. As a matter of fact, quite a lot of interest has been displayed in this portion of land in the last two or three years and particularly since the Railway Department took up the railway and all the fittings. Quite a few of the

settlers who own land adjoining the railway land have made application to purchase these adjoining pieces, and a few others already have leases from the Railway Department of portions of the land.

The local road board made application, first of all to the Railway Department some three years ago, I think, and it was told that when the department took its fittings away, the Lands Department would then be able to dispose of the land. The matter has been held up for quite a long time because the Lands Department has had no authority to dispose of the land.

I might say that this land will be of considerable value to the local road board because it has undertaken a programme of town planning, and it is felt that the portion of the land which was formerly occupied by the railway station, and which is in the centre of the town, can be used to great advantage in planning the future of the town. Miss Feilman, who is the town planning consultant, is drawing up plans in which this piece of land will be used, amongst other purposes, as a bus terminus and a car park.

With the reorganising of the roads, it will be quite an asset to the township. That part of the land which extends down to what was known as the zigzag section of the railway, can be of considerable value in providing a link road to Darlington and other centres on the other side of the river. The same applies to the land between Kalamunda and the old Carmel railway siding. It will make a useful through road. In the Upper Darling Range district, as was the case in many others of the older settled districts. When the land was selected in the early days, no provision was made for roads and later they were surveyed to connect up properties which had been selected as far back as 80 and 90 years ago.

Some of them are by no means suitable as through roads, and it is certainly hoped that the Lands Department will make all this land available for a through road as it will, having been used as a railway road bed, provide a good grade, and the curves will be moderate and suitable. Some sections of the railway land were leased by the Railway Department. Even in the township of Kalamunda there are three or four blocks that are leased, and the leases still have a number of years to run.

I understand that one such lease will not terminate for another 10 or 12 years. So it is hoped that the Lands Department, in making the land available, will ensure, if these leases are protected and that as soon as they expire, the land will be fully utilised for the purpose of town planning. As was also mentioned by the Minister, there are some parts of the land, particularly those sections which cross one or two gullies, which are very suitable for agriculture. I hope the department will

see fit to make these portions available to the adjoining settlers so that they can use them for agricultural purposes.

It is only natural that any portion of the land that is surrounded by forest country will revert to the Forests Department so that it can be used for forestry purposes. I am very much in favour of the Bill and I wish to thank the Minister for his interest in the application made by the Darling Range Road Board. He spent several hours in the district looking into the position and we are pleased that he has considered the application with favour. I hope that the Bill will have a speedy passage and I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (RESUMPTION OF LAND) ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [8.4] in moving the second reading said: This Bill owes its origin to the debate which took place in this House some days ago on a Bill to amend the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act. That Bill is still under consideration in this House. On the occasion of that debate members raised certain important points in connection with the operations of the Act and I undertook to investigate the position to see whether it might be possible to meet the points satisfactorily and, if it were found possible so to do, to consider the introduction of a second Bill to amend the parent Act.

The first point was raised by the member for Mt. Lawley who suggested that consideration should be given to the question of making more reasonable conditions available as regards the payment to owners of land which might be resumed under the operations of this Act. As a result of the inquiries made on that point, it was ascertained that the existing law is fair and reasonable and that it would not be appropriate to alter the conditions which now apply. I was assured that many factors are taken into consideration in deciding prices to be paid for land being resumed under the operations of this Act. For instance, the prices being paid generally in the district concerned at that particular time are considered. Therefore there is no amendment in regard to that angle contained in the Bill.

Another question raised concerned the possibility of industries already in existence, which in their operation are ob-

noxious, having land resumed for their extension. It was pointed out that if land were resumed under this Act for that purpose, obnoxious industries already operating within a particular district could be extended, and the obnoxious nature of the industry be spread over a wider field, with unfortunate effects and inconvenience to the many more inhabitants who would be affected. Under this Bill we propose to give power to local authorities which would enable any one of them to raise an objection, not only to land being resumed for the extension of an existing obnoxious industry, but also to raise an objection to land being resumed under this Act for the establishment of a new industry which could reasonably be considered as obnoxious.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: They have that power now, have they not?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: They have not that power under the provisions of the Act which this Bill will amend. Under the principal Act local governing bodies have very little authority. It is true that they can raise a protest or objection to the compulsory resumption of land under the principal Act, but their standing in regard to the Act is limited to that procedure. This measure, if it becomes law, will give a local authority the opportunity of making an objection which would be fatal to any land being compulsorily resumed under the Act for the establishment of an industry which could be regarded as being obnoxious, and also for the extension of an industry in a particular area where that industry is already regarded as obnoxious.

The other amendment in the Bill arises from the consideration which I gave to the provisions of the Act following the debate which took place on the other measure. I had a look at the set-up of the committee provided for in the Act, and, after considering it for some time, I came to the conclusion that it would be only fair and reasonable to provide for representation upon the committee of local authorities generally. At present the committee is made up of the Surveyor-General, the Director of Industrial Development, the chairman of the Town Planning Board and a representative of the Chamber of Manufacturers. That committee is a most important body. It is given extensive authority in regard to investigation and recommendation and it is given power to make decisions of its own initiative, which decisions become binding.

It could be argued, with some logic I think, that the personnel of the existing committee is slightly weighted in favour of the manufacturer who would be seeking to have land resumed under the provisions of the Act; it is not desirable that the committee should be weighted in that direction. The balance of the committee

should be at least equally fair in regard to the manufacturer, who would be the applicant, and the owner of the land concerned.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Is there no health authority on that committee?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: There is no direct representative of the Health Department on the committee. This Bill proposes to place upon the committee a representative of the local authorities; so I think that this amendment, as well as the other one in the Bill, will commend itself to members generally. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. F. Watts, debate adjourned.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. E. K. Hoar—Warren) [8.13] in moving the second reading said: This is a minor amendment, but a most necessary one, if the committee appointed under the Act of 1945 to inquire into utilised or unutilised land is to function today.

It appears that when the original Act was first introduced in 1927 the desire of the Government of the day was to establish a committee which would be empowered to make inquiries on behalf of the Government with respect to unutilised land. That was the limit of its functions—the matter of inquiring into what was called unutilised land. As far as I am aware, the Act did not function—or, if it did, it was only to a minor degree—because the depression years followed shortly after the passing of the Act, and consequently there was no demand for land and the activities of the committee were few. Towards the end of the last war, however, when it became known that war service land settlement, for instance, would play a big part in postwar planning, it was necessary to do something about this legislation.

In 1945, a new committee was constituted which was empowered to inquire into not only unutilised but also utilised land. When the committee was established, the first officer appointed to it was the Director of Land Settlement. Another was an officer of the Department of Lands and Surveys or an officer of the Department of Agriculture. There was a choice of an officer from either department. Another was a person selected by the Minister for his knowledge of agricultural and pastoral matters in that part of the State where the land was to be the subject of inquiry. I do not think there is any doubt that the activities of the committee have achieved excellent

results. A great deal of the land that was taken over for war service land settlement purposes could well have been settled as a result of the activities of this committee.

The position has now arisen that if the work is to continue, an alteration will have to be made in its personnel because the position or title of Director of Land Settlement has now been abolished by an amendment to the Land Act. For that reason alone, a slight amendment will be required to give the committee legal status so that it can continue to function. The war service land settlement scheme is now administered by a board and its chairman was the Director of Land Settlement, an office which no longer exists. The Bill, therefore, seeks to rectify that position so that if the Minister in the future decides that certain inquiries are necessary, these can be made.

The Bill provides for a committee comprising a member who shall be an officer of the Department of Lands and Surveys, one who shall be an officer of the Department of Agriculture, and a practical man, as is already stipulated in the Act. The measure merely seeks to provide for the appointment of a committee member from each of these departments instead of one or the other, and by so doing we can still retain the same officers on the committee but, because the title of one of them has been abolished, it is necessary to make some alteration to the Act. This is the best solution of a difficult position because, should there be an inquiry into a land matter, an officer of the Lands Department should have a place on the committee, and this applies also to the Department of Agriculture. As I have said, the third member shall be a practical man, who would probably be an experienced farmer living in the locality where the inquiry is to be made. There is nothing in the Bill apart from that. Because there may be necessity in the future for a Government to inquire into land, the Act is not much use if it cannot be put into operation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. F. Watts, debate adjourned.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th November.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [8.21]: I have no objection to the Bill. As the Minister pointed out, it is small and has only two important objectives, namely, to enable water boards to grant long-service leave to their employees, and to authorise the Minister or local authorities, as water boards, to establish a rating year. As far

as I can ascertain, it has been the practice of local authorities, constituted as water boards, to allow long-service leave to their employees but, because a query has been raised in Bunbury, as mentioned by the Minister, it has been deemed fit, while the Bill is before the House, to include an amendment to clarify and legalise the situation.

The question of rating is one which I think calls for some tidying up. When Minister, it was my intention to endeavour to make some progress in this regard in the various departments administered by the Minister for Works and Water Supplies, because it is quite obvious that over the years, due to changes and developments that have taken place, the overall system of rating has become fairly chaotic. This is a move, at least in one direction, to establish a rating year in order to regularise the position so that more efficient working can be achieved to expedite, perhaps, the ever-increasing work associated with the ratebooks and the despatch of rate notices.

Some progress can be made through mechanisation. Prior to my leaving office, the question had been discussed, and I am hopeful the present Minister will realise the advantages of mechanisation. In such an important change problems and difficulties will arise, especially with staff, but in the long run, having established a rating not only with respect to public works but also to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department, mechanisation will greatly assist the department in the tremendous task associated with account notices and other rating matters. Apart from that, the Bill aims at deleting certain provisions which are no longer operative, and this opportunity has been taken to repeal them and bring the legislation up to date. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th November.

MR. WILD (Dale) [8.28]: At first sight, the Bill seems a little extraordinary when one considers that it proposes to bring a crane, operated by hand for the purpose of raising a load exceeding one ton, within the provisions of the Act. One can visualise that the operator would have no difficulty in knowing if he had an excessive load on the crane, and he would not carry

on his operations if he realised that the crane was being overstrained. Seeing that there would be no braking device, I imagine that he would make certain that the brake was in good order because a hand-driven crane is different to one driven by a motor seeing that, with such a crane, the motor would have to stop before the brake could be applied. With a hand-driven crane, the driver would make certain that the crane would not run backwards, resulting in the load dropping suddenly to the ground.

Furthermore, there is need for a reduction gear and a considerable length of rope because of the velocity ratio. Normally, it is not possible for a hand-actuated crane to lift over a height of 20ft. From inquiries, I learned that there have been a couple of bad accidents, one fatal, which were possibly due to men operating such a piece of machinery, not looking after the rope. In mines where gear is inspected every day, accidents also occur through the ropes breaking. The inquiries disclose that this is one of the difficulties with hand-operated cranes. I realise there is necessity for inspection now and again to see that the machinery is in good condition, therefore I support the second reading.

In Committee.

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

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th November.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [8.35]: There is no doubt in the minds of those who are informed about the properties of heroin, that it is a drug with insidious qualities which can be used to demoralise a community. I agree that the measure before us to ban the manufacture, sale or possession of it is in the best interests of the public. All sources within the State which were contacted with regard to the implications of the Bill on the use of heroin, agree unanimously as to the necessity of excluding the drug from medicinal use, and indeed from any other use. The wholesale druggists, wholesale chemists and the B.M.A. were contacted.

Representations have been made by the Commonwealth Government that we should ban its sale. It asked the State Government to take action in this regard because a similar request had been received from the United Nations World Health Organisation. There appears to be complete unanimity on this measure. A perusal of the Minister's speech will show all too clearly the dangerous properties

of the drug. I thank the Minister for offering his file to enable me to study the matter closely.

Like the Minister, I consider it strange that the ban should have a year's grace. The Minister stated he could not understand it; neither can I. It appears that the purpose for this period of grace is to give an opportunity for the shops to dispose of the drug in stock. I accept that decision as the Minister has done.

I raise no further query with one exception. Should there be any stocks remaining after the period of 12 months has elapsed, what steps will be taken to dispose of them? Will the stocks be appropriated by the Government, given away or destroyed? I doubt if the Minister has explored that possibility. It is a possibility that should not be excluded from other considerations. I would ask the Minister to comment on that. I support the second reading.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [8.40]: I cannot make up my mind on this measure. The Minister told us that the drug was dangerous but at the same time no steps would be taken to withdraw it for the present. We have destroyed coconut because it was dangerous to the public. I gathered from the Minister's speech that he was not satisfied, and I understand it was the Commonwealth Government's request that nothing should be done until twelve months had elapsed. Since the introduction of the Bill I have consulted doctors and chemists. One doctor with a very large practice told me that he would not use $1\frac{1}{2}$ oz. per year in his prescriptions, and a chemist said that the use of this drug in his business was infinitesimal. In that case, its use in other channels, apart from medicinal and pharmaceutical, would be very great. We should agree to the Bill, and if the drug is that dangerous, it should be withdrawn from the market and disposed of.

Mr. Hutchinson: It is not dangerous if properly used.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: If it is properly used, no one would debar its use; but seeing that it is not properly used, there is great danger. It is better to withdraw it from sale and dump it into the ocean, by which means it would cost the State or Commonwealth Government a few pounds, rather than to allow it to circulate among the people at the risk of losing lives. I would like to ask the Minister to reply on this aspect. If the Minister were to suggest that the drug be withdrawn I would support him, but it seems futile to pass this measure and then not do anything for twelve months. It would be far better to pass a Bill in twelve months' time and then withdraw the drug immediately. I trust that some steps will be taken to withdraw this drug and destroy the stocks held.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE (Hon. H. H. Styants—Kalgoorlie—in reply) [8.42]: I cannot give the House any more information. The proposal in the Bill was forwarded by the Prime Minister's Department which had been requested by the World Health Organisation to ban the manufacture, sale or use of this drug. As stated previously, I thought it peculiar, considering the insidious nature and dangerous properties of the drug, that it was not intended to gazette the regulations until the 1st January, 1955.

This is not a new drug which has come on the market and then been found to be dangerous and undesirable. I suppose it has been used from the first days of pharmaceutical history in this State. According to my file, Australia has been using a large quantity of this drug. I can tell members the stocks on hand when the census was taken. The outstanding authorisations for its use and stocks on hand when the census was taken, show that for 1951-52, the details were as follows:—

	oz.
Outstanding Authorisations:	
New South Wales	40½
Stocks in hand:	
New South Wales	771.2
Victoria	531
Queensland	63
South Australia	66
Western Australia	100
Tasmania	23.4
Total	1554.6

The Minister for Health: What is the retail price of this drug?

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE: I have no idea. It is used in very small quantities. The fear is in connection with its undesirable after effects. It causes deterioration of the morale of the people, if taken in any appreciable quantity. It is a drug that quickly leads to addiction.

Mr. Hutchinson: But it is not dangerous when used in cough medicines and such like.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE: No; one would have to drink an enormous quantity of cough medicine before the drug would have any effect in the direction of causing addiction. I read in the newspaper yesterday or today a statement that China is flooding the United States of America with heroin. The inference was that this is being done with the object of demoralising the American people, though that idea may be somewhat far-fetched.

A point was raised by the member for Cottesloe as to what would become of any surplus stocks held on the 1st January, 1955. I understand that stocks are to be absolutely withdrawn and that there will be a complete ban upon the manufacture or use of this drug from that date. If

anybody has heroin in stock, it will be withdrawn and probably destroyed by the Health Department in the particular State.

Mr. Hutchinson: I do not think you said that before, and I was rather worried about it.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE: No, I did not mention it, but that is the intention. There will be a complete ban from the 1st January, 1955. I agree with the member for Fremantle that it is hard to understand why no action should be taken until that time. The only reason I can advance is that this is not a new drug and, although if taken in large quantities, it could have deleterious effects, evidently the Commonwealth health authority is not afraid of any particular danger in that direction seeing that the existing stocks in Australia represent only a little over two years' supply. Consequently, the intention is to permit the drug to be used until that date. This measure has been introduced at the request of the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth health authority. Victoria and one of the other States have already passed similar legislation, and I hope that members will approve of this measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Brady in the Chair; the Minister for Police in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Commencement:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Would it not be possible to prescribe an earlier date for the banning of this drug? If we intend to prohibit its use, we should do so as quickly as possible and not wait until 1955.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE: I hope no alteration will be made to the Bill. We are doing as we have been requested to do by the Commonwealth health authority, which in turn has been requested by the World Health Organisation to take action along these lines, and I do not know what complications may ensue if we alter the date upon which the measure shall be proclaimed. When the census was taken this year, there were 100 ounces of the drug in this State, and if we decided to prohibit its use immediately, we would have to pay compensation. Evidently the Commonwealth authorities are not afraid of the existing stocks having any serious effect on the health of the community; otherwise they would have requested our applying an immediate banning.

This drug has been sold in various medicines for probably 50 years and no harmful effects have been recorded, nor instances of people having become addicts. As the member for Cottesloe mentioned, it might be wise to give the medical fraternity an opportunity to provide a substitute for heroin. There is a reference to Ameri-

can doctors not approving of the banning forthwith because they are of opinion that another drug—it has a long name which I have forgotten—would be a reasonable substitute. Consequently, a breathing space may be required so that the medical and pharmaceutical people may obtain sufficient quantities of the substitute to take the place of heroin. He is a good man that does as he is told. We are doing what has been asked of us, and that being so, we shall have done our part.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—DISEASED COCONUT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th November.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [8.55]: What with dangerous drugs, diseased coconut and bad umpiring at the cricket today, I find it difficult to know where to start. Last Thursday I made a somewhat rambling speech on the measure because my notes had been compiled some five or six weeks before and, in the interim, I had forgotten the significance of some of the special marks I had made on them. However, in continuing my remarks tonight, I shall not detain the House at any length.

Of the three main provisions of the Bill, at least two of them have very little, if any value at all, and the third, if of value in safeguarding the public health, I shall have to take at its face value, and that is about all I can do because I cannot see any practical value in it. One of the provisions is that there shall be a prohibition of the importation of contaminated coconut. Under the present set-up, it is impossible to import Papuan coconut, and it will be impossible to do so until the source of contamination has been discovered, when the good name of this product may be restored and the public enabled to buy it without fear of ill-effects. Stocks in the Eastern States have been frozen, and so to legislate for the prohibition of the importation of contaminated coconut is to legislate for the impossible.

The Bill also provides that where coconut from Papua has been imported after the 15th September, no compensation shall be payable. That provision is probably the only one that is of any value, but, as I have shown, it is virtually impossible to import this product. I shall support the second reading because, in some miraculous way, contaminated coconut may be brought here to the detriment of public health. The third provision is that where compensation is payable, it shall be payable to the extent and subject to the conditions set forth in the Health Act.

The Minister for Health: Section 259 (5) of the Health Act.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Yes. The Health Act definitely covers that, so why duplicate the provision in this measure? The provision in the Health Act reads—

If the destruction has been rendered necessary in the interests of the public health and without any such breach or neglect as aforesaid, then the compensation shall be payable out of moneys to be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

Therefore I see no value in that provision. Finally, I wish to mention several general points, some of which I probably made previously, but which I would like to reiterate. The public should clearly understand that this instance of contaminated desiccated coconut from Papua was an entirely isolated one. Once the cause has been definitely established and measures have been adopted to obviate further contamination, I hope that the public will bear no ill-will against Papuan coconut.

Secondly, I would point out that the Administration of Papua has banned the export of coconut and so there is no fear of the public purchasing the contaminated product from that source. Members can imagine the alarm of those concerned in Papua at the banning of one of their exports and the hostility of the Australian public towards it. The Minister for Territories informed me that great precautions have already been taken to tighten up the hygiene requirements of all factories concerned with the manufacture of this product in Papua.

I repeat that the public can be assured that these precautions having been taken, when the cause of contamination has been established and eliminated there will be no fear of infection through the purchase of coconut from Papua. Members will realise that the territory of Papua is most important to Australia as a whole. In a communication that the Minister for Territories sent me he asked that it be pointed out to the people of this State that coconut is one of the products on which Papua hopes to build a decent-sized industry and he stressed that once action had been taken to eliminate any possibility of contamination in the future and the ban had been lifted, the public would run no risk at all in buying Papuan desiccated coconut.

If we pass this legislation as it stands, we will be unable to purchase coconut from that source for a period of 12 months. I can support the second reading only if certain amendments that I have on the notice paper have a possibility of being agreed to. Otherwise I feel the provision which bans the importation of desiccated coconut is so wide as to make it virtually impossible to import that product from any country. With that proviso, I rather reluctantly support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. E. Nulsen—Eyre—in reply) [9.5]: It seems to me that the member for Cottesloe has taken a reasonable view, in some respects, with regard to the question of Papuan coconut. I am hopeful that conditions of hygiene in Papua will be greatly improved and that we will again be able to use coconut from that source without fear, but I cannot understand the hon. member saying that the prohibition should not apply to the importation of this product from other parts of the world.

Obviously it is just as dangerous to import contaminated coconut from Ceylon as from any other source. We would simply be deluding the people of this State if we allowed a contaminated foodstuff to be imported from any source and sold on the Western Australian market. We have therefore included in the measure an absolute prohibition on the importation of contaminated coconut. Unfortunately, this State is the only one in the Commonwealth which pays compensation and that is provided for in Subsection (5) of Section 259 of the Health Act.

Mr. McCulloch: What about the housewife who threw her coconut away? Does she receive compensation?

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: If it were possible to calculate the loss, she would be compensated, but that could be done only if she took the coconut to the local authority and had it weighed and destroyed, and that would apply only until the 15th December as, after that date, under the provisions of the Bill no compensation will be paid.

The member for Cottesloe said the department had panicked, but that is not so. We simply did not want to see the people falling victims to typhoid fever or typhus through consuming an infected product. Action was taken immediately, and compensation will be paid up to the time I have mentioned. The importer can easily secure himself, but I think there should be some agreement with the exporter, under which the importer could be indemnified against the product carrying disease.

I believe all possible steps have been taken to safeguard the public and I am pleased the member for Cottesloe will support the second reading. Having perused his proposed amendments, I feel that I may be able to compromise on one or two of them, but cannot agree to the others as they would make the Bill ineffective.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.
Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Prohibition on importing diseased coconut:

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause (1) after the word "coconut" the words "which was produced in or received from Papua and" be inserted.

When replying the Minister said the purpose of this clause was to ensure public safety and I agree that that should be done, but why protect public health by the banning of one infected foodstuff only? Most of the desiccated coconut sold in this State comes from Ceylon and this broad provision would virtually prevent importers from securing supplies from that source. There are many products such as tinned fish, spices, peppers, dates and so on that could carry contamination or disease and to select one commodity because of an epidemic that occurred through an isolated case of contamination in Papua is ridiculous.

The Minister for Health: This provision will not prevent the coconut being imported.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It will mean a virtual ban on the importation of desiccated coconut. If coconut does become contaminated without the knowledge of the importer, he is liable to a fine of £500 or six months' imprisonment.

The Minister for Health: That is the maximum.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That is so.

Hon. A. F. Watts: He is still liable. You ask the member for Boulder if he is still not liable, although it is the maximum.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Manufacturers will not be prepared to import this coconut if they are likely to be penalised. The people I have contacted about this Bill are alarmed. Though certain importations will probably continue, the provisions in the Bill will occasion a great deal of inconvenience to the manufacturers of cakes and confectionery. There is no value in this all-embracing provision as it relates to public health. My amendment will safeguard public health and will provide a certain logical reasoning. There has been no instance of contamination from places other than Papua; and that was isolated. The all-inclusive clause could mean a virtual ban on coconut for a period of 12 months.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I oppose the amendment because coconut coming from anywhere could be just as detrimental to people as that from Papua.

Hon. A. F. Watts: What evidence is there for that? We have been given to understand that the only sample found to be contaminated was that from Papua.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: If that is so, then there is no need for the importers of coconut from Ceylon to worry, because it is only if they import contaminated coconut that they will be penalised.

Hon. A. F. Watts: How will they know?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: How does anyone know about the law? There must be some responsibility somewhere. There is no reason why we should import desiccated coconut or anything else that is contaminated and detrimental to the health of the community. The importers should have some responsibility. In the Eastern States there is no provision for compensation but there is in this State. The main concern, however, is the health of the people. Is there any reason why the importers should not have some responsibility to see that whatever the exporters send is pure? It would not be fair to Papua if we allowed others to export desiccated coconut without restriction. There has been an example of contamination and disease in the Eastern States, and we must protect ourselves. The provision should not be confined to Papuan coconut but should cover all coconut.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: How would the importer know that the desiccated coconut was diseased? Is it easy to detect?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: How many offenders know the law under which they are working? These people should make sure that it is not diseased.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Can they make sure?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Why should they bring it in indiscriminately? There should be some responsibility.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Why? They may not know it is diseased.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: They should ascertain whether it is diseased or not.

The Premier: It should not be allowed to be imported into Australia unless it is pure.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I oppose the amendment.

Hon. A. F. Watts: I think we should have another look at this. I do not oppose what the Minister is aiming at; nor do I think we should neglect the health of the public. But I do not think the Minister or the Government desires to impose a penalty on people for doing something in complete innocence, and that will be the effect of this clause if it is passed. I am not necessarily wedded to the amendment moved by the member for Cottesloe, but I do think the clause should be amended before it is passed.

This problem took the laboratories and the various State health authorities a number of days and a good deal of work to determine whether there was dangerous bacteria in the imported Papuan coconut. It came into the country without anyone in Australia having the slightest knowledge that it was contaminated. Nothing

could be seen with the naked eye or even under the microscope; laboratory tests had to be made to detect the contamination.

No sensible person would import coconut, particularly with the penalties provided because they could not find out whether it was contaminated or not until laboratory tests had been made. The penalties are six months' imprisonment or a fine of £500. There would be no means of knowing and it would not be wise for an importer to accept a guarantee from overseas that the coconut was not contaminated. That would be no more reliable than the present position.

Mr. Hutchinson: It could be contaminated on the voyage.

Hon. A. F. Watts: That is a possibility, but the examination or guarantee can be sketchily covered in the country of origin. Obviously the people in Papua did not intend to supply contaminated coconut to Australia. After it had been desiccated—which I understand is the final process in its manufacture for export—it apparently acquired the bacteria which caused all the trouble. At the moment the only place in which this has happened for a long period of years is Papua.

We have been assured, if Press reports are to be believed, that the coconut imported from Ceylon is perfectly good, and was so during the period of this investigation. Consequently, why is it not reasonable to ban Papuan coconut until we know that the Papuan factories have been properly cleaned up and the cause of the trouble removed, and allow other coconut, known to be uncontaminated and quite satisfactory, to be brought into this country? If we cannot do that, let us, further down the clause, make a concession to the individual who imports this coconut in all innocence and has no means of knowing whether it is contaminated. I hope the Minister will soften the clause.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It is foolish for the Government to try to bring down a Bill to safeguard the public health in respect of one food commodity.

The Minister for Health: It is just the same as bringing down a measure affecting a dozen commodities.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Because desiccated coconut was contaminated in Papua, we are virtually putting a ban on the importation of all coconut by saying that if any contaminated coconut is allowed to come into the State, the importer will be liable to a penalty of six months' imprisonment or a fine of £500. The Bill is foolish because it is absolutely impossible for an importer to detect contaminated desiccated coconut. If I were an importer I would have nothing to do with the importation of that commodity until this measure had run its course of 12 months. Coconut might be brought into the country and contaminated

after reaching these shores. It might be contaminated in a retailer's shop; but the importer is to be put to the task of proving that he is innocent of having brought contaminated coconut into the State.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I am not prepared to accept the amendment, but I will promise that the measure will be suitably amended in another place. I feel that there should be some responsibility on the importer.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Why not amend the Bill here?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Why should we?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: This is the place to do it.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: By amending it in this way, we would take all responsibility from the importer, and I want him to have some responsibility.

Mr. Ackland: Why not report progress and have another look at the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No, I will let it go through; but I promise faithfully that the matter will be dealt with in another place. I am not prepared to accept the amendment, and I do not think we have time to rephrase the provision now, unless the Leader of the Country Party has an amendment to submit which would make the importer accept some responsibility.

Hon. A. F. Watts: At this stage, I cannot improve on the position; but I think it should be looked at by the Crown Law Department and, after the officers of that department have read the argument against the provision, I am sure they will agree with it substantially.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: If the member for Cottesloe will agree, I will have the provision amended in another place. Then, if he is not satisfied when the Bill is returned, he can discuss the matter further. If he will not take that course, I must stand by the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I appreciate the offer of the Minister, but I do not see that we should do as he suggests. Already, a doubt has been raised in his mind which I think can be easily overcome by this amendment without jeopardising the public safety one jot. I, too, am all for protecting public health, but I feel we should be logical in our reasoning with regard to the passing of legislation such as this, and should not put on the statute book laws that are foolish. Because a certain commodity is contaminated in one part of the globe through an entirely local cause, that is no reason why a ban should be placed on similar products imported from elsewhere.

The Premier: There is no ban.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I think it has been pointed out that virtually there is a ban, because no sensible importer would import coconut under these conditions.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is nothing foolish about protecting the health of the community, and importers should carry some responsibility, though probably not as much as is suggested in the Bill. I am satisfied to have another amendment made as long as some responsibility is placed on importers.

Mr. PERKINS: The Minister has admitted that the Bill is not satisfactory. His words indicate that he considers the Bill is putting an undue restriction on firms desiring to trade in coconut; yet the Minister is suggesting that we pass a Bill which we consider, and he considers, is not satisfactory. Surely the right course in those circumstances is to report progress and get the Crown Law Department to produce a suitable amendment forthwith! What difference will it make whether the amendment is inserted here or in another place?

It is unreasonable to expect the Committee to pass something which, apparently, members on both sides agree is not satisfactory in its present form. If this procedure is to be adopted with other Bills, I am afraid we shall have a lot of argument that could be avoided if Ministers will accept the contention that the Crown Law Department should produce satisfactory amendments when required. While it is true that amendments are sometimes made in another place, in such circumstances, they are usually of a machinery character. But this is more than that. A vital principle is involved.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	20
Majority against				1

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. North
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Nuisen
Mr. Hoar	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lapham	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Yates	Mr. Guthrie
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Oldfield	Mr. Sewell
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Styants

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of subclause (1) after the word "which" the words "to his knowledge" be inserted.

The amendment would mean that a penalty would not apply if the coconut imported into the country were, to the knowledge of the importer, uncontaminated. This is a logical approach to the problem. A person importing coconut could have no idea whether it had been contaminated during the course of its transportation; or whether the health laws of the country of origin were such that contamination could be caused. The germs in the coconut which was contaminated in Papua were found only after exhaustive laboratory tests made by experts in the field of chemical research. My amendment will mean that the importer will be safeguarded, and public health will not be imperilled.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I must oppose the amendment because if the importer imported coconut which he knew was contaminated, he should get life imprisonment.

The Premier: He should be hung; and that ought to be the minimum.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You would give him six months' gaol.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: He should get life. He would probably kill half the population. It would be impossible to prove that it was brought in uncontaminated "to his knowledge."

Mr. HUTCHINSON: This is almost as silly as the Bill itself.

The Minister for Health: Do you mean the amendment?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: No, the remarks of the Minister. No merchant will bring into the country an article which is contaminated.

The Minister for Health: What rubbish!

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Why does the Minister say that?

The Minister for Health: Because you have unscrupulous importers.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Do I understand that the Minister for Health suggests that certain merchants will bring contaminated foodstuffs into the country?

The Premier: If they do, they should be hung.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Of course, neither the Minister nor the Premier believes there are merchants who would do that, and that is one reason why I moved the amendment. At present an importer can be penalised when he is innocent of bringing in a commodity which, although to his knowledge it is quite pure, has been contamin-

ated in circumstances over which he has no control. Should we penalise a man for doing that? If a person imports contaminated foodstuffs he should get life, as the Minister says.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: The member for Cottesloe has moved an amendment to provide that an importer who brings into the State coconut which, to his knowledge, is contaminated, will be penalised. The Minister says that if he brings it into the country knowing it is contaminated, he should get imprisonment for life. As the Bill is phrased at present, if an importer brings contaminated coconut into the country, in complete innocence, he can receive a penalty of six months' imprisonment or a fine of £500; and that is where we split.

We do not split on the question of public health, or because we do not want to see reasonable precautions taken to assist the Health Department in the preservation of public health, but because if we allow the clause to pass as it is, an innocent man can be heavily penalised. If we amend it as the hon. member suggests, we at least make certain that the innocent man shall not receive a heavy penalty, but the guilty man might get off too lightly. I suggest that the Minister report progress so that he can look into the matter. I want to help him pass the legislation but I cannot agree to it as it is.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	19
A tie	0

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. North
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May
Mr. Lapham	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Yates	Mr. Guthrie
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Oldfield	Mr. Sewell
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Styants
Mr. Thorn	Mr. O'Brien

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, my casting vote is with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause (3) the words "six months' imprisonment or" be struck out.

This is the more severe of the two penalties that could be imposed under the Bill for a contravention of any of its provisions. The amendment ought to receive the support of all members because an innocent man could, as the Bill now stands, be gaoled for a period of up to six months. In view of the feelings expressed by members opposite at certain times, I feel they should support the amendment because, in my opinion, the clause as it now stands is too harsh.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I am prepared to compromise and if the hon. member accepted "two months" in lieu of "six months," I would support him.

Mr. Hutchinson: Make it one.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Yes; it will have just as much effect.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member want to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I do not want any term of imprisonment to be mentioned in the measure, but I know that I could not get the necessary support.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member moves to strike out the words "six months' imprisonment or" and the Committee agrees to it, it would be quite suitable. But if the amendment were defeated, the hon. member would not get an opportunity of accepting the compromise suggested by the Minister, unless the Bill were recommended for that purpose.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I can only accept the compromise, so I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause (3) the word "six" be struck out and the word "one" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of Subclause (3) the word "five" be struck out.

If the amendment is agreed to, I shall then move to insert the word "one." I think a fine of £100 is much more reasonable.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I cannot accept this amendment, but here again I will compromise and if the hon. member will provide for a fine of £200, I will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. Hutchinson: Make it "one" like you did before.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I think a penalty of £100 would have no restraining effect on a merchant. It should be at least £200.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Committee has already agreed to a penalty of one month's imprisonment and surely the Minister will not argue that the penalty should be one month's imprisonment or a fine of £200! If a person commits an offence that warrants a penalty of one month's imprisonment, surely the alternative should be confined to a maximum fine of £100.

Mr. Hutchinson: It could still apply to an innocent man.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment and the proposed insertion of the figure "one."

Mr. Moir: Do not you think this is a more serious offence than where a man contravenes some section of the Industrial Arbitration Act?

Amendment (to strike out word) put and passed.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I move an amendment—

That the word "one" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I think that a fine of £100 would be ineffective so far as firms are concerned. I am satisfied that a firm would rather pay a fine of £200, or probably £500, than it would allow one of its members to go to prison for one month.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister can achieve his purpose by asking members to defeat this amendment and then moving to insert the word he desires.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I will do that unless the member for Cottesloe accepts my compromise.

Mr. McCULLOCH: I am surprised at the attitude of the Opposition on this occasion. They are putting up a great fight on behalf of the importers and exporters of coconut. The other night we were discussing penalties of six months' imprisonment in connection with the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill and members opposite resisted us in every instance when we tried to reduce the penalties. I have seen coconut being loaded on to the boats and if we provide for a severe penalty, these importers and exporters will pay more attention to the loading of coconut to ensure that it reaches us in a decent condition.

Mr. Hearman: What about dates and other foodstuffs exported from these countries? Are not the conditions just as bad?

Mr. McCULLOCH: Has the hon. member seen them being loaded?

Mr. Hearman: Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Has he seen the coolies standing on top of the dates and spitting all over them? I have seen them do that, and that is why I want provision for a heavy penalty; it will ensure that these importers and exporters take more precautions. The health of the people should be protected instead of being jeopardised by some of the people in St. George's Terrace who are friends of members opposite; I refer to the importers and exporters of these foodstuffs.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: They do not poison foodstuffs. That is a lot of rubbish.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The person who could be penalised could be entirely innocent and we should have regard for that fact. A penalty of one month's imprisonment is already provided for and where there is any possibility of a man being innocent of the charge, why should we impose severe penalties?

The Premier: This law would make the importers more careful.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Yes, to the point where they would not import any of these foodstuffs.

The Premier: I do not agree with you.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It seems foolish to make a law to provide for one particular commodity when exactly the same risks can be run with other foodstuffs coming into the country. There is food for thought there! Importers do not want to bring in contaminated foodstuffs and as an innocent man could be penalised, I think the Committee would be justified in accepting my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON: I find it difficult to imagine that anyone, under the provisions of the Bill, could be found guilty of any offence if he were innocent. No one could be found guilty unless he appeared before the court and the penalty would then be assessed by the magistrate if he were convicted. A man is guilty, however, if he takes less than the proper precautions. The Bill sets out what precautions shall be taken in a somewhat risky business. If a producer were to submit to the court a certificate to show that the goods were free of contamination, that would prove he was acting in good faith and it would be impossible to find him guilty of any negligence.

An argument based on the assumption that an innocent man would be found guilty is a reflection on the efficiency of our courts. Although one month's imprisonment is only a comparatively short period, any term of imprisonment is a very severe penalty to certain types of people. The person we are dealing with in the Bill would be a business man, to whom even a week's imprisonment would be a severe penalty. However, even the member for Cottesloe would rather pay a penalty of £100 than go to gaol, and I consider that a fine of £500 would be more appropriate.

Mr. HEARMAN: I understand that the original intent of the Bill was to deal with contaminated coconut brought from Papua and that the product imported from Ceylon was in the clear. What the member for Hannans said about dock workers in the Middle East and India may be perfectly true, but his remarks are quite irrelevant in this debate. We also import dates from such countries and to introduce an argument such as that is completely beyond the scope of the Bill.

The member for Leederville referred to the production of a certificate by a producer to indicate his good faith. He probably knows very little about the countries where this foodstuff is produced. The production of a certificate of that nature would be no guarantee of anything.

Mr. JOHNSON: Talk about something you know something about!

Mr. HEARMAN: We are getting away from the provisions in the Bill. If the member for Hannans desires to widen its scope to exclude the importation of foodstuffs from countries where the hygiene standard is lower than ours, that is a different matter altogether.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	19
A tie	0

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. North
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May
Mr. Lapham	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Yates	Mr. Guthrie
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Oldfield	Mr. Sewell
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Styants

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move an amendment—

That the word "two" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ABORIGINES WELFARE.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 17th November.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [10.27]: The Bill is a very important one and it could well have been introduced many years ago. Members of this Chamber and also the general public have considered for a long time that the Native Administration Act has become obsolete and that a new approach is needed towards the problems of the people with whom the Bill deals. Like myself, there are very many in Western Australia who at times feel ashamed because of the treatment that has been meted out to natives in years past. They feel that much is lacking in the aid and leadership that is given to them.

On many occasions on the Goldfields I have seen the sad spectacle of natives coming in from the bush wandering around the town scavenging in dustbins in back lanes. That is a sight that should not be tolerated in any civilised country. It is true that there are many missions that endeavour to do, and have done, an excellent job in caring for natives. Several of these missions operate in the goldfields districts. There is one at Laverton—the Mt. Margaret Mission—one at Norseman, and one recently established at Kurrawang; further afield there is one in the Warburton Ranges. They do a great amount of good for the people who are living under primitive conditions. It is a problem to decide what to do with regard to full-blooded natives because their ways and habits are different from ours. They have a different outlook on life.

Mr. Nalder: You would not call them natives if the Bill is passed.

Mr. MOIR: It does not matter what they are called; they are still human beings.

Mr. Ackland: Can you tell us how this measure will improve their conditions?

Mr. MOIR: If the member for Moore will restrain himself for a while, I shall give my opinions. He can express his views later if he desires. It is a problem to decide what is in the best interests of these people who have such a different outlook and habits. Many changes which, in our opinion, would improve their lot, would, I feel sure, not make them happy. I am certain they dislike being settled, housed and put to work. Essentially they are hunters, and since birth have roamed around the country. To a large extent they are happy, but I feel that not enough has been done to assist them in times of shortage of food, to assist them with medical attention, with education and such like to make their lives more enjoyable. By enjoyable, I mean that everybody born on this earth has a right to live happily.

Then there are the mixed bloods who are in a different category. Many of them desire to live in the manner of the white people. They work, they marry, they rear their families in the same community as the whites. In the main they have received a raw deal. I realise the Bill will not achieve all that we desire to be done; the passing of an Act of Parliament in itself does not accomplish very much. It lays down the law. It may give freedom and confer benefits on those able to avail themselves of them; but it will not make very much material difference to quite a number.

I hope that, by the passing of the Bill, public conscience will be aroused. It is not sufficient to place an Act of Parliament on the statute book and then forget about these people. Endeavours should be made to provide adequate housing, educational facilities, and the means to enable these people to avail themselves of that education. Employment should also be found for them. I could go on enumerating many other things that could be done. As regards education, all young people in this country should get the best possible opportunities in that regard that we can afford to give. Western Australia cannot afford to waste any talent. Wherever it lies latent, it should be brought out. The natives should after being educated be able to go into the trades, professions or other avenues for which they might qualify.

This measure provides for people of a varying degree of white blood to automatically become citizens. That right has previously been denied them. It is a right which should be accorded to every person born in this country, irrespective of his origin. It is rather ironical that people whose ancestors inhabited this continent for thousands of years, should need an Act of Parliament to give them the right to become citizens. The measure would remove the degrading necessity of making special application for full citizenship rights. Many of these people who are at present eligible for citizenship rights, do not apply for them; I do not blame them, because I understand their point of view.

When an amendment to the Native Administration Act was previously before the House, many assertions were made as to why citizenship rights should not be conferred indiscriminately. I expect to hear those arguments again. With the passage of this Bill, the immediate benefit will result in these people obtaining employment without any obstacles being placed in their way.

Here I would give an instance that I noted when I was a union official. A coloured man approached me and stated his case. One mining company was prepared to give him a job, but would not go to the trouble of getting a permit from the Native Affairs Department because it

did not want to be involved in the procedure of paying part of the wages into a fund, yet the company was responsible for paying premiums for workers' compensation for all its employees. The attitude of the mining company can be understood in that it did not wish to be involved in special circumstances of employment for one worker.

That man was deprived of the chance of a job. That is a great injustice to any man who knew he could obtain employment but was debarred because he came under an Act of Parliament which compelled him to get a permit and to comply with other conditions. The passing of this measure will overcome the obstacles I have just mentioned, and confer an immediate benefit on this section of the community. I have heard people outside the Chamber say that coloured men are not very fond of work. I do not know that I was ever very fond of work, notwithstanding the fact that I have had to work hard all my life. I have met very few people who were really fond of work. I worked through economic necessity and for the reward that I found in my pay envelope every fortnight.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You would have been very unhappy if you had not worked.

Mr. MOIR: I am not sure of that. I have often thought it must be a glorious feeling to be an independent man and not have to follow the whistle, as so many miners have to do, and descend into the bowels of the earth at midnight as I and many of my friends have had to do. On a gloriously sunny day, too, we have had to get into the cage and descend into the bowels of the earth, and I have never looked forward to that.

Mr. Nalder: You were not forced to do it. You did it of your own free will.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not be led into side issues in discussing this Bill.

Mr. MOIR: If I have digressed from the subject matter of the Bill, I apologise. These people will be given the right to work in any occupation of their choice, provided they are capable of undertaking such work. I have come into contact with quite a lot of these coloured people, and have worked with some of them, and they have proved to be really decent people. Quite a number at present are working in the mining industry. Some of them live in Kalgoorlie and are engaged in regular work; they are well housed and they rear their families and conduct themselves in a manner that any citizen might be proud of.

We have been told that we should not permit these people to enter hotels. If they enter hotels in Kalgoorlie, they conduct themselves far better than do a lot of Europeans. I believe that our attitude to these coloured people has been actuated by a sense of guilt, because those of

mixed blood did not come into being except through the actions of whites. We have a moral responsibility to ensure that everything possible shall be done for them and that they shall be placed on the same footing as we enjoy.

When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on this measure a few nights ago, he was critical of it and said that some of the coloured people were irresponsible, especially where money was concerned. A lot of my friends are irresponsible where money is concerned, and probably some people think the same of me.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I have not noticed it.

Mr. MOIR: That is readily understood because our paths outside the Chamber seldom cross. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of a young fellow who had approached him in Pinjarra and borrowed £10.

Mr. Brady: He was lucky.

Mr. MOIR: Yes; I should not like my chance of borrowing £10 from the Leader of the Opposition, so that young fellow must have been of very good standing in the eyes of the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member went on to say that he did not worry about lending it because the man was a good mark. The hon. member must have considered that he had a sense of responsibility if he did not have to worry about getting his tennor, or the equivalent, returned.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I said that his employer was a good mark.

Mr. MOIR: The money could not have been recovered from the employer unless the young fellow was giving service to that employer. Shortly afterwards, the hon. member said that he lent the same man another £1.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: No, I did not lend that pound.

Mr. MOIR: If I were foolish enough to lend a man a tennor, provided I had that sum to lend, he would probably make short work of it. Such an instance as that quoted by the Leader of the Opposition does not indicate irresponsibility on the part of these coloured people. Money does not go very far nowadays, and it would not take long to make a big hole in a tennor.

Let me give an illustration of the sense of responsibility that some of these people have. One of these men was employed on the Gwalia goldmine and was working in a certain place. He was warned by another man that the firing of shots was about to take place, and he proceeded to make his way out. Six or seven charges had been laid and a fall of ground occurred as a result of which another mine was pinned down by a large rock. The coloured man did not panic; he cut the fuses and then ran for assistance to lift the rock off the other man. Such action

called for cool courage, and the man was subsequently awarded the Royal Life Saving Society's medal for his heroic action.

If the opportunities proposed by the Bill are extended to these people many will avail themselves of them. They engage in responsible occupations and carry out their duties with credit to themselves. In Kalgoorlie, there is a coloured lad who is a school teacher, and he was so highly esteemed that he was made captain of one of the local football teams. That shows how highly he was respected by his associates. That such a man should be subject to the Native Administration Act and have to apply for citizenship rights is unthinkable. There are many others of similar calibre.

In yesterday's newspaper we read of a woman being fined for drinking in a hotel. She was under the impression that she had sufficient white blood to exempt her from the provisions of the Act. Probably many people would get a shock at discovering that they were subject to the Act. When we get down to measuring ancestry in thirty-seconds and sixty-fourths, it is reducing things to a very fine point. There are coloured men in Kalgoorlie who undertake contracting work and own their motor trucks. They are very industrious men and have families that are highly respected. This applies throughout the length and breadth of the State, and probably every member could speak of somebody he knows who is of equally good type.

The argument has been advanced that if these people are removed from the provisions of the Act, they will be entitled to enter hotels. Why not? We are told that they will become intoxicated. Well, lots of people get intoxicated in hotels, and in places other than hotels, but I have never heard a suggestion that legislation should be passed to prevent Europeans from entering hotels. From my observations, I am satisfied that no more of these people will misconduct themselves through excessive indulgence in drink than the average amongst whites who commit offences and attribute them to excessive drinking. A person who is classed as a native under our present obsolete legislation is not permitted to enter the premises of a hotel except to work.

Mr. Norton: He must have a permit.

Mr. MOIR: Yes. A respectable coloured person may come to the city and find that he cannot obtain accommodation at a hotel simply because the colour of his skin is not just right. What a terrible thing that is, and how ridiculous!

Mr. Ackland: Is this Bill going to alter that?

Mr. MOIR: It will probably involve an alteration to another Act before that difficulty will be overcome, but if this Bill be passed in its present form, the way will be open to amend the other Act.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It would not be necessary to pass this Bill in order to amend the other Act.

Mr. MOIR: The hon. member may know more about that matter than I do. The fears that have been expressed as to the advisability of passing this measure have no foundation in fact. We know there are in the community some who do things that they should not—weak people—

The Minister for Justice: If it were not for that we would not need our gaols.

Mr. MOIR: Coloured people are forced under this Act to break the law if they wish to live as their fellow human beings do and in this regard I have in mind those of them who like a drink of beer. In the early days of the recent war there was in Kalgoorlie a young chap of coloured blood who had enlisted to fight for the people of this country.

While staying in that centre on his final leave, he met one of his mates, a white man, and they went into a hotel for a drink. A constable saw them there and arrested the coloured man, who was consequently prosecuted. The magistrate said he was most reluctant to impose a fine but that the law had to be obeyed and he had to enforce it. That was a scandalous thing and a great many of the people on the Goldfields thought as I did on that question. This man was good enough to fight with the rest of our lads for this country, but not good enough to have a parting drink of ale with one of his mates in a hotel in Kalgoorlie.

Why should such people be forced to drink down in dark alleyways if they wish to drink? I might here add that many of them have no desire to drink and that applies to some I know that have their citizenship rights. I believe that many of those who would, under the provisions of this Bill, be granted a certain franchise would have no desire to drink in hotels or anywhere else. Of course, some of these people misconduct themselves when under the influence of liquor, just as many white people do. If we were to take away the citizenship rights of white persons who do not know how to behave after having had a few drinks, I believe a great number would lose those rights.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It might be a good idea.

Mr. MOIR: I do not think along the same lines as the hon. member does.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I was just seeking your opinion.

Mr. MOIR: There is provision in the Licensing Act at present to deal with people who misconduct themselves as a result of having a few drinks. They can be placed on the prohibited list and that provision would apply also to those who, under this measure, would be given the right to go into a hotel and have a drink. This legislation is long overdue

and I hope that when passed it will not be regarded as the be-all and end-all of our responsibility towards these of our fellow-citizens. I hope that a great many people will change their attitude and be a bit more kindly in their approach to our coloured folk and hold out a helping hand to them just as they do to others of their fellow-beings.

We should not regard the coloured section of our population as something apart and alien in our midst. Many of them are, I believe, superior to some who are akin to us. I hope the public conscience will be awakened and that most of us will realise that these people require a considerable amount of assistance. Of course, many of them could stand on their own feet but there are those who have not had the benefit of education and they should be given the opportunity to be educated if they so desire. They should have extended to them reasonable opportunities to live a decent life. We should give them all the assistance possible to enable them to become respected citizens of this country.

On motion by Mr. Ackland, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.5 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 26th November, 1953.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Bills : State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 3r., defeated	2053
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Com.	2053
As to inaccurate division list	2056
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1r.	2056
Prices Control Act Amendment and Continuation, 1r.	2056
Upper Darling Range Railway Lands Revestment, 1r.	2056
Water Boards Act Amendment, 1r.	2056
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 1r.	2056
Police Act Amendment, 1r.	2056
Veterinary Medicines, 2r., Com., report	2056
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 2), Com.	2058
Land Act Amendment, 2r.	2066
Electricity Act Amendment, 2r.	2068
Electorate Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com., report	2070

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading—Defeated.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [4.35]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	13
Majority against				2

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. C. H. Henning
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. E. M. Davies
Hon. W. R. Hall	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. Murray	Hon. H. Hearn
Hon. H. S. W. Parker	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 17—Second Schedule amended:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Clause 16 had been dealt with.

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

That all words after the word "is" in line 1 be struck out with a view to inserting the words "repealed and re-enacted as follows:—"

SECOND SCHEDULE.

TABLE.

Baris of Computation : 100% Disability—£2,000.

Nature of Injury.	Percent- age.	Recom- mendation (amount).
1. Total loss of the sight of both eyes	112½	£ 2,250
2. Total loss of the sight of an only eye	112½	2,250
3. Total loss of the sight of one eye	50	1,000
4. Loss of binocular vision	50	1,000
5. Partial to total loss of sight of one or both eyes :—		

*Schedule of Assessments for Uncorrected but
Correctable Visual Defects.*

One Eye 6/6 or 6/9.		One Eye 6/12.	
The Other Eye.	6/9 } Nil	The Other Eye.	6/6 or 6/9 } Nil
	6/12 } Nil		6/12 } Nil
	6/18 } From negligible		6/18 } from negligible
	6/24 } to 10%		to 10%
	6/36 } from 10%		6/24 } from 10%
	6/60 } from 20%		6/36 } from 20%
			6/60 } from 30%