appoint three persons as a court of appeal. It does not say three members of the local authority, but only three persons. I presume it would be three persons in or around the district because it would not do to appoint one committee for the whole State as it would take five years before an appeal could be heard in some instances. So it will mean one committee in each area involved.

What is the position of the committee, tribunal or court of appeal, or whatever else it might be called? The council has been obliged to accept the Taxation Department's value. The ratepayer is dissatisfied and goes to the committee. If we are to be compelled to adopt the Taxation Department's valuations, then let us adhere to them, although I make it quite clear that I object to being compelled to adopt them. If we are to be compelled to adopt them, why play about with the right of appeal by an extraneous body?

In my opinion we should let the local authority decide whether it will adopt those valuations in whole or in part. Let them on all occasions be made available to the local authorities. Let them determine whether they will adopt them in whole or in part, and then when they do, it will be their business to justify, if they are called upon to do so, the values which they decided to adopt. Then we will have some semblance of local government, and not a local government getting more and more control from some person or organisation some distance away.

There are also in this measure a great many other proposals with which I do not entirely agree. I am sure the Minister will agree with me that the second reading debate should only be used in this case for a discussion on the major objections to the Bill. There are other objections and matters which, for the sake of time particularly, should be dealt with in Committee. I have raised three or four of my principal objections to the measure. I have criticised the Minister for some of his remarks which I think were entirely unjustified. I have pointed out to the best of my ability that part of the Bill, in my opinion, requiring examination because we are losing sight of the cardinal factor that this is supposed to be a local government Bill and not a Bill to control local government. The rest of my remarks and arguments can be advanced in Committee.

On motion by Mr. Bovell, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.28 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 18th September, 1956.

CONTENTS.

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

QUESTIONS.

TRAFFIC.

Convictions, Deaths, Injuries, etc.

Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Chief Secretary:

Will he give the House the following information in respect to the years—

1951-52;
1952-53;
1953-54;
1954-55;
1955-56:—

(1) How many persons under the age of 21 years were convicted of negligent driving of motor-cycles?

(2) How many persons over the age of 21 years were convicted of negligent driving of motor-cycles?

(3) How many deaths occurred as a direct cause of the offences mentioned in No. (1) and No. (2)?

(4) How many persons received major injuries as a direct cause of the offences in No. (1) and No. (2)?

(5) How many persons were charged with drunken driving?

(6) How many of the persons so charged availed themselves of the opportunity to consult a doctor?

(7) How many of the persons charged were convicted of drunken driving?

(8) How many deaths occurred as a result of accidents which were the subject of the charges under question No. (5)?

(9) How many persons received major injuries as a result of the same accidents?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1), (2), (3) and (4) The Government Statistician, who compiles figures of this nature, does not keep statistics showing the ages of persons convicted in negligent driving; nor does he tabulate the classes of vehicles driven.

(5)	1951-52	238
	1952-53	252
	1953-54	318
	1954-55	284
	1955-56	264

(6) This information is not available, but all persons charged with driving whilst under the influence of drink are advised at the time of their arrest that they have the right to be medically examined at their own expense.

(7)	1951-52	218
	1952-53	229
	1953-54	285
	1954-55	261
	1955-56	246
(8)	1951-52	11
	1952-53	0
	1953-54	3
	1954-55	0
	1955-56	5
(9)	1951-52	56
	1952-53	55
	1953-54	53
	1954-55	31
	1955-56	34

WESTERN URANIUM LTD.

Freight on Building Materials.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER (for Hon. J. McI. Thomson) asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) What amount of building materials has been forwarded to Ravensthorpe for the housing scheme of Western Uranium Ltd., over the railways to Newdegate and the subsidised road transport on to Ravensthorpe?

(2) What is the total amount of freight paid on such materials to date?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 342 tons for the period from the 1st January, 1956, to the 31st August, 1956.

(2) Railway freight, £1,597. The cost of road haulage from Newdegate to Ravensthorpe account Western Uranium Ltd., which is not subsidised, is 6d. per ton mile.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Tenth Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

HON. H. L. ROCHE (South) [4.40]: Before speaking to the Address-in-reply I wish to express my regret at the loss of two valuable members of this House by death, and of Sir Frank Gibson and Mr. Craig by retirement. I extend my condolences to the relatives of the two gentlemen who died. They were both, in their own spheres, strong advocates of the interests they felt they represented in the House.

It is fortunate that, in passing from condolences, one can congratulate the members who have taken their place, on the manner in which they expressed themselves in furthering the interests of the people whom they feel they represent in this Chamber. The people who elected them will be able to feel confident that they will be well and worthily represented here.

Last year when speaking to this motion, I expressed myself on our economic position in such a way that I fear some members felt that I took a somewhat too pessimistic view. It seemed to me that with the falling overseas income and rising imports, despite savage import restrictions and rising costs within Australia, it would not be long before we faced a crisis. I think the position is still very serious, but I am somewhat more optimistic, solely for the reason that today many of our people are giving heed to the position. They are concerned at the state of Australia's economy and finances generally.

That in itself should be a matter of strength for the country in dealing with the problems that beset it. That wider appreciation, which has developed over the last 12 months, is fortunate, because it seems to me that we have been granted a breathing space which, in all the circumstances, only the most optimistic of us could have expected.

We have experienced a marked increase in the price of wool, which is one of the major means by which Australia finances its overseas commitments. There has been an almost world-wide demand for our wheat, although not at high prices, occasioned by adverse seasonal conditions elsewhere. This has enabled us to unload a considerable portion of the wheat that was stored in Australia: more than we could have expected 12 months ago. The result has been that our economy has been steadied to that extent. It has given us an opportunity, as a people, to take stock of our position, and we would be extremely foolish if we neglected to avail ourselves of this opportunity.

A big proportion of our people today—particularly those amongst the more thinking sections of the community—are anxious to know what those in authority in this country—that is, the Governments—are contemplating, and what action is in prospect in order to stabilise our position as it is now, before a further drift results, so that the present acute position reaches crisis proportions. I believe that if the people are given a lead by the Governments, they will be prepared to accept it.

Human nature being what it is, we all—it is no use condemning the other fellow, because we are all in it—are hoping that if any sacrifice is called for, it will fall on the other fellow's shoulders rather than our own, as individuals. If we are wise we will recognise the fact that the boom in development that followed the war has temporarily to be consolidated; that the inflation which is the result of the war has to be adjusted, or that all of us will as individuals be confronted with a crisis, unless as a people we are prepared to rise to the occasion.

This applies not only in respect of wages, profits, hire purchase, interest rates, price control and trade practices, but right through the community. It does not seem that we have yet reached the stage where sacrifices, as such, or reductions, are called for, if we can achieve some measure of stability, or a stand-still arrangement that will enable us to maintain conditions as they are with reasonable stability.

In that respect I was interested at the time—and I think it is still appropriate—in a Press report of a statement made by Mr. Adlai Stevenson last year in America. As members know, he is a contender for the Presidency of the United States. He was reported as follows:—

> He said he was not a "prophet of gloom," but that certain economic trends pointed to trouble ahead and the nation's leaders should talk less about the size of the boom and more about how to make it last.
>
> Mr. Stevenson said that United States farmers were not sharing at all in the prosperity.
>
> "Their prices continue to fall while prices to consumers do not, and the profits of manufacturers rise to unprecedented levels," he said.
>
> "In the past, such a trend has been an ominous warning of trouble ahead."

Much the same conditions, I think, apply here except that within the last few months we have had the unexpected increases in wool prices. We should all give a lot of thought to our position. We have reached a standard of prosperity for the general mass of our people which compares favourably with that of any other country in the world. I do not, for the life of me, believe that this country or any other country is any different from an individual or an aggregation of individuals in that it cannot be expected to go on uninterruptedly from one spectacular gain to another. The boom conditions we have had over the last 10 years cannot be expected to continue without some steadying influence.

If we are ready to face this fact and prepare for it now, I see no reason why we should not avoid a crisis and having, eventually, to ask our people to make sacrifices which they will feel are out of all proportion to the conditions, or the standards to which they have become accustomed.

I am not foolish enough to believe that proposals for restraint and for the stabilisation of our economy will not be met by bitter opposition, especially as we are served by the sort of daily Press which, unfortunately, we have in this State. If such proposals are advanced, I think we can rest assured that every form of misrepresentation and specious propaganda will be advanced against them by the daily Press, which enjoys a monopoly in this State.

I have never agreed with Sir Charles Latham more than when he directed the attention of this House to the abuses that are practised by "The West Australian" newspaper in this State in its neglect to keep the people informed; in its misuse of its monopoly, and the fact that advertising seems to be its primary concern. A friend of mine recently made a check of the advertising matter in "The West Australian," and he found that it represented 65 per cent. of the newspaper space. That could be an exaggeration but as members know from their own observation, it is a very considerable proportion.

As far as I can see, sport, slime, slops and silly bits of news—such as reports of a goat eating the tail of a man's coat in South Africa—seem to be the news features that are important in these times. The Press gives little or no space to news items that inform the people of this country of the difficulties that might lie ahead. Members will recall that "The West Australian" tried to belittle Sir Charles as a publicity-seeking politician.

Members will agree with me, I think, that, after 30 years of public life, the amount of publicity that he has had, both favourable and unfavourable, would probably suffice Sir Charles for the rest of his days. I am quite sure that he is not so interested in publicity as "The West Australian" would have the public believe. That newspaper is more concerned—and it realises this more than anyone else—with the fact that if any restraint or curbing of its exploitation of its monopolistic position were to be made, it would have to be done through this Parliament; and if it can belittle politicians in advance, it will be conditioning the public mind against any restrictive legislation that may be proposed.

Previously, I have expressed myself as being extremely concerned about the problem of the half-caste population in this State and the operations of the Native Welfare Department. To me this is a matter for very real concern, as anyone can see that the position is still further deteriorating, because no worth-while effort seems to be being made by the department, and its main purpose in life appears to be that of looking around for someone to blame when any criticism is made of it or any trouble

arises in regard to the half-castes in this State. Instead, this Department should accept the blame itself.

If any protests are made on any subject, in order to cover up its own uselessness and ineffectiveness, the department resorts to tactics designed to lay the blame on to someone else. From the Press reports that we receive, it is obvious that the position is deteriorating still further, and that the difficulties which are being encountered in regard to the half-caste population in this State are increasing considerably.

I note that only recently, in connection with a case that has become somewhat notorious, the Minister for Police stated that he was concerned about the morale of the Police Force being affected by an incident that had happened following which he recommended that some rather etxraordinary procedures should be followed. I would suggest to the Minister for Police, who is also the Minister for Native Welfare, that he might make some inquiry as to the adverse effect on the morale of the Police Force in the country districts where the half-caste population is numerous, because of the position brought about by the activities of the Native Welfare Department.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Did you say "activities"?

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: Yes; I said activities. With respect to the half-castes, the action of the police is limited. Before they make any move they first have to consider what the repercussions will be and how the Native Welfare Department will react; and secondly, how such action is going to affect their own position with their own department, namely, the Police Department. The position is particularly bad in those districts where ony one policeman is stationed. This is a most unfortunate state of affairs because no one benefits, least of all the half-caste population.

In order to cite an illustration to show the lack of control by the Native Welfare Department, and how it shifts its responsibility on to someone else, I am going to quote some correspondence. Any member or the Minister may see this correspondence later if he so desires. Representations were made to the Minister by a member of Parliament about a district, on behalf of a certain road board. I will not quote the first two paragraphs; but, in the letter, the member of Parliament who wrote it goes on to say—

> They are also concerned over the position of natives with citizenship rights in two ways: first, while there is only a limited number of these people, there seems to be a reluctance, they say, on the part of these people to camp with the natives who are not possessed of citizenship rights, and the question has arisen, whether the department were prepared to co-operate in setting aside some special area where these people can set up their tents and other habitations. In addition, there are indications (which seem to be quite plain to members of the board) that at least one of these people is buying liquor and selling it to the other natives.

The reply which was sent by the Commissioner of Native Welfare to the Minister reads as follows:—

> Natives who are camped elsewhere than on the native reserve must be residing on property either privately owned or Crown land or under the jurisdiction of the road board. They are therefore trespassing and can be only legally dealt with by the property owners.
>
> This department has no legal authority to interfere with them, and its official representative in the district has jurisdiction only in respect to land that has been gazetted a native reserve. It would be inimical to his role and duties as their agent and friend if he took part in the punitive action which it seems would be necessary to remove the natives from where they are now camped.
>
> Holders of citizenship rights are no longer "natives" within the meaning of the Native Welfare Act and this department consequently has no jurisdiction or responsibility whatever in respect to them.
>
> It is presumed that any constituted authority vested with the authority to allocate land for any purpose could set aside a "special area where these people can set up their tents, etc." This department has no such authority, as has been stated.
>
> The Citizenship Rights holder who "is buying liquor and selling it to the other natives" is committing an offence and police action should be taken against him.

So the department has no responsibility for the law. It was also stated in the letter to the department seeking information as follows:—

> There is also being experienced great difficulty in persuading the natives, particularly those without Citizenship Rights, to accept work. Two responsible farmers informed me that they had offered work to two ablebodied natives at the usual rates of pay, but both of them said that they were not interested, and the allegation was that, as a result, they were really loitering about the town with no visible means of support.

To this the department replied:—

> I am not able to make any worthwhile comment about people who refuse to accept work, but suggest that if they are, in fact, "loitering about

> the town with no visible means of support" they could be dealt with by the police under the Vagrancy Act.

So apparently there is no responsibility on the department in that regard. The letter to the department went on to say—

> Dealing with the question of the supply of liquor, I understand that for a time the local publican refused to supply liquor in bottles to natives with Citizenship Rights because he was satisfied that the quantities being purchased could not be consumed by the individual, and were being illicitly disposed of, as above suggested. He was advised, however, that he could not lawfully take this stand, and abandoned the idea.

To that the department replied as follows:—

> In general, our department is in the same position in so far as those complaints are concerned as the "local publican" referred to, whose action with the holders of citizenship rights had to be abandoned because it could not lawfully be sustained.

The department apparently welcomed the idea that it has no authority in this matter. The letter to the department further stated—

> The purpose of this letter, therefore, is not to criticise the department or the natives, but to seek the advice of your department as to what can be done to better the position.

The department replied to the Minister as follows:—

> The road board seems to believe that this department has power to control the behaviour of natives and even some people who are no longer natives according to law. This view is as widespread as it is fallacious. Natives are well aware of our duties and our limitations, and the only notice they take of unauthorised actions or instructions by welfare officers is more hostile than attentive.

I read that correspondence at the risk of boring members because I wanted to bring home to those who are not in close touch with this problem the position as it exists and the utter ineffectiveness of the department, which seems bent on regarding as its bounden duty the stimulation of hostility and misunderstanding as between local authorities, local citizens, and the half-caste population in the districts where they live. I should say that, at the moment, that seems to be the chief activity of the Department of Native Welfare. For what other purpose it exists I cannot say. We in the Great Southern see very little evidence which would lead us to believe it serves any other purpose. The statements it makes in response to criticism lead me to think that perhaps one of the greatest difficulties is to sort out fiction from fact in the statements it issues.

I have come to the conclusion that it is very questionable whether this department will ever function with any prospect of doing anything worth while to overcome the problems of the half-caste population under its present control. The missions are helping for as long as they can, and some of them are receiving substantial grants. They can look to the holding of the native children until they reach school-leaving age, but what happens from 14 to 20 years of age? We have the half-caste children educated to the same standard as a 14-year-old white child.

When the half-caste leaves school he goes back to the bush, in the impossible conditions under which his parents and forbears have lived. Such a child knows no better. If anything, we are creating a worse problem for such children. It would probably be better if we had not tried to educate them at all. This, of course, is not acceptable as an alternative to anyone who has this problem at heart and who wants to see something done to assimilate the native into the white population.

I would like to express the hope that the Government and the Minister concerned will proceed with their proposals to overhaul the traffic set-up as it exists in the metropolitan area today. Although we have not the details, no doubt there will be plenty of room for criticism. It is a problem that is growing every day. It is one which, from one cause or another, for one reason or another, has not been dealt with in the past when it might have been easier of solution. If Cabinet and the Minister follow the lines which they have indicated, despite the opposition of sectional interests, and are prepared in the main to carry through their proposals, I believe they are entitled to the support of all right-thinking people in respect of metropolitan traffic.

Perhaps when the Government has finished with some of the long-overdue reforms that it thinks this State should have, it might give some attention to the major overhaul of our licensing laws. The position has drifted and is continuing to drift. We have in the Licensing Court very estimable gentlemen who seem, as a court, to have outlived their usefulness. The hotels in this State, and even the ones in the metropolitan area, are not above criticism in regard to accommodation. To a very large extent the accommodation for the public does not mean a thing to them.

There are some hotels—and I am speaking particularly of the country—that are doing an excellent job and providing an excellent service. So many of the licencees however, seem to be so greatly tied up with their commitments, their ingoing and their rentals, that only the bar trade makes any appeal to them. They do not seem

disposed to give any worth-while consideration to the accommodation side of their business at all.

To my mind, the conditions, particularly in the country, do not seem likely to be improved whilst we maintain the present farce of not allowing anyone to go in and compete, when, with the best intention in the world, through our licensing legislation, we have built up a monopoly; and that monopoly in most hotels has a tremendous goodwill, merely because of the operations of the Licensing Court and the licensing laws. The court is not responsible for the laws.

I should think—and I am speaking now of places like Kalgoorlie, but there are others affected, though not to the same extent—that if it were possible for people to go in with their own capital and build a few hotels, the accommodation and the service to the public would be improved tremendously. That applies to a lesser extent in other towns in this State. I do not think there is a prospect of achieving much whilst we retain the restrictions of the present licensing laws.

It is well-nigh impossible for anyone purchasing one of the existing hotels, paying for the goodwill, paying for the business and then spending tens of thousands of pounds in making it into a modern building, to provide accommodation. Even in the metropolitan area it seems to me that the Licensing Court hardly gives the regard to the accommodation side of the hotel business that it might, when we see that a licence for the sale of liquor is given to a new hotel, with accommodation for only 16 bedrooms, that is to cost £70,000. If I remember correctly, another one was advertised as having only 22 bedrooms, and costing £90,000. This renders the position farcical and makes the bar trade the only side of the business to be considered. Admittedly it is the most profitable side; but if we cannot ally the profitable side, which is the hotel bar trading, to the other side, which is not so profitable but so essential to the travelling public—that is, the provision of accommodation—then our licensing laws are breaking down. I support the motion.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [5.14]: Mr. President the number of speakers in this debate—there were 23 out of a posible 28—I would say without going into the records and making a close examination, must be very nearly a record. It must be realised that with 22 members speaking for varying periods, the total amount of time spent on the Address-in-reply is indeed astonishing. I am not complaining that members have taken too long. What I am saying is that so many subjects have been introduced by the 22 speakers that it is only natural I am not in a position to reply to all that has been said and all the points that have been raised.

Hon. H. K. Watson: We gave you the whole week-end to prepare your replies.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I would need to take a whole week-end to reply to them all. Members need not think that because on many occasions, the Minister for Railways and I were not in our seats no notice has been taken of what they said. I can assure them that it was; and the procedure we have adopted through the years since we have been in office is that every member's speech is examined and portions are extracted from it and sent to the relevant departments with the idea of obtaining the information required. This is done in order to secure answers to questions asked and to indicate whether statements made are correct or otherwise. When they are incorrect, this is pointed out in the course of the reply to the debate. So a thorough examination is made of everything which is said by each member who speaks on the Address-in-reply.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Then we can look for some improvement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. If the hon. member is fair, I do not see how he can say there should be an improvement on what has happened to the speeches of members, at least since I have been Chief Secretary. The same procedure has been followed. Even the minutest statement of a member has received examination. However, I want to emphasise that although that has been done, I am not going to attempt to reply to all the statements that have been made. I have merely made these few preliminary remarks in order to let members know the manner in which their addresses are dealt with.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Jeffery on the excellent speech he made on opening day. I am sure that he satisfied members who had the privilege of hearing him that he will prove an asset to this Chamber and will be one whose views will at least be taken into consideration by other members on every question on which he speaks.

In a most interesting fashion and reminiscent vein Sir Charles Latham during his speech, submitted some excellent advice to the young people of today. I really enjoyed his speech on that occasion more than ever I had done previously. That is a proof that the longer one is here the greater improvement he shows.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Or is it that you have improved?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On no occasion have I enjoyed a speech by the hon. member as much as was the case this time. Perhaps it was because he did not criticise. Both he and Mr. Simpson spoke with a broad vision and did not refer to parochial matters. When I make that statement, I do not want members to think that I believe they should not introduce parochial

matters in their speeches on the Address-in-reply. As a matter of fact, I think that is the time—that and during the debate on the Supply Bill—when members should introduce what are termed parochial matters, because that is the only time during the session that they have an opportunity of referring to subjects that are of vital concern to their districts; and very often quite a lot of good can come from speeches made in this connection during the debate on the Address-in-reply and on the Supply Bill.

Another excellent maiden speech came from Mr. Mattiske and, as he said himself, it is to be hoped he will assist in presenting the views and information so excellently presented in the past by the late Mr. Hearn. I would re-echo those sentiments. If Mr. Mattiske can reach the standard of Mr. Hearn in debate, his contributions will be well worth while.

It was very pleasing to listen to the information supplied by Messrs. Teahan and Heenan in regard to goldmining, and to learn of the efficient assistance given to the industry by the Mines Department; and Mr. Murray furnished the House with a very interesting outline of the timber production position in this State. Other knowledgeable speeches came from Messrs. Lavery and Willesee and comments made by them have been forwarded to the appropriate authorities.

So far I have been throwing bouquets. Now I will be critical. Mr. Griffith was very critical of staff arrangements at the last State elections. However, he was somewhat astray in his remarks. Firstly he referred to a returning officer at a polling booth. He should know that there is only one returning officer appointed for each district, and the returning officer engages the staff required for the polling places within his district. No staff is allotted by the Electoral Office.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Will you alter the word and make it "presiding" officer? That will make it read all right.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Secondly, the hon. member mentioned that at the polling place at which he attended an elector could vote at any table irrespective of the alphabetical order of his surname.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I did not say that at all.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is the report we have.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I said there was a long table and that one could vote at any section of it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is the same thing.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Of course, it isn't! You are intimating that there were a lot of tables.

The PRESIDENT: Order, please!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It does not matter whether there was one or a dozen. A man could vote at any table. This is quite correct and is the established practice in State elections. It is in conformity with the Electoral Act and is regarded as much more satisfactory than alphabetical sections. Under the provisions of the Act, when a large number of electors is likely to vote at a polling place the returning officer may subdivide it into sections. If this happened, it would be necessary to appoint a presiding officer for each section, and a separate ballot box for each. It is considered such an arrangement would be a hindrance and, in fact, would result in increased costs in the staffing and furnishing of a large polling place.

The staff engaged at the chief polling place, East Victoria Park, at the last general elections was not regarded as excessive, as alleged by the hon. member. In the engagement of staff a returning officer works on the basis of two officers for every 500 votes expected to be taken, and two officers for every 150 absent and section votes. A similar basis is adopted by the Commonwealth Electoral Office.

At the East Victoria Park polling place at which there were 22 officers engaged, 3,540 Legislative Assembly votes, 1,002 Legislative Council votes, and 299 absent and section votes were recorded. On the basis previously stated, 14 officers would be required for the Legislative Assembly votes, four officers for the Legislative Council votes, and four officers for the absent and section votes. In addition, it is essential to have a presiding officer in charge at a polling place of this size, and also a doorkeeper. It can be seen, therefore, that this polling place was far from being overstaffed, as implied by Mr. Griffith.

It seems he was wrongly informed in regard to the staff instructed to report at the R.S.L. hall. In a compact district such as Victoria Park, with an enrolment of approximately 10,000, it is usual for the returning officer to engage a couple of extra officials as relief officers, so that they can be moved from polling place to polling place at short notice during the day as occasions may arise.

On this occasion these officers were first instructed to report at the R.S.L. hall where the returning officer considered the impact of the early morning rush would be most evident. Unfortunately, the accommodation made available by the R.S.L. authorities was not adequate to accommodate the additional staff without jeopardising the free flow of electors, and in consequence the presiding officer in charge instructed them to report back to the returning officer at the chief polling place. The returning officer is quite satisfied that if accommodation had been available, these officers could have been

usefully engaged at the R.S.L. hall until such time as they were required at some other polling place.

It is rather illogical for the hon. member to attempt to compare the cost of respective general elections for the whole State over a number of years, as the cost of any election is reflected in the number of contested districts or provinces.

In the 1953 general election there were 28 districts contested, as against 34 in 1956; and it is estimated that the additional cost for the extra contests in 1956 would be £2,500.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Does the Chief Secretary realise that because there were Council elections on the same day, all those polling booths would be open whether there was a contest or not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Quite so.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then where is the logic in the comment the Chief Secretary made?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will leave that to the hon. member to point out.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: In other words, the Chief Secretary has not an answer.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have answered the hon. member. In the 1954 Legislative Council elections there were five provinces contested; whereas in 1956 there were six. The extra province contested was the Metropolitan; and if this province had been contested in 1954, it would have increased the cost of the biennial elections by an additional £2,000.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can the Chief Secretary tell us what the Assembly—

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will tell the hon. member everything he wants to know, if he will have a little patience.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are getting away with everything.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Doesn't the hon. member get away with lots of things when he speaks?

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not with you!

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Chief Secretary has the last word, don't forget!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Taking these figures into consideration, and allowing for increased fees to officers, substantial increases in advertising and cartage of material to polling places, the cost of the dual election this year would compare more than favourably with the combined cost of the 1953 general election and the 1954 biennial elections.

In comparing costs, the number of votes recorded should be taken into account. At the 1953 general election 192,225 votes were recorded; and at the 1954 Legislative Council biennial election, 24,171, making a total of 216,396 for the combined cost of £13,088; whereas, at the 1956 dual election, 241,863 Legislative Assembly votes and 50,935 Legislative Council votes were recorded, making a total of 292,798 for a total cost of £19,172. It will be observed that the votes recorded in 1956 showed an increase of approximately 33½ per cent. over the 1953-54 figures, and it is reasonable to assume that the costs must also increase proportionately.

It is interesting to note that the cost per 100 votes recorded at the combined 1953 general election and 1954 Legislative Council election was £6.04; for the 1954 Legislative Council election, £13.97; and for the 1956 dual election, £6.54.

It is considered most reasonable and proper to hold Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council elections on the same day when they both fall due in the same year. In South Australia voting for the Legislative Assembly is compulsory and voluntary for the Legislative Council, yet we find that for many years both elections have been held on the same day, and no accusation has ever been made against the non-Labour Government in office which has authorised this arrangement.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: What happens in Queensland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member know that there is no Legislative Council in Queensland.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who destroyed the Legislative Council in Queensland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is another point. The hon. member was speaking about elections being held on the same day, and now he makes a sillly interjection in which he asks me what happens in Queensland, when he knows there could not be a combined election in Queensland. He wants to trail away on some other question altogether. But I like to keep to the facts with which we are dealing.

In regard to the canvass carried out by the Electoral Office, the areas selected were those in which a large number of people had taken up residence in the last few years; and surely it cannot be considered to be morally wrong to assist and enlighten any citizen in respect of the franchise which he is justly entitled to claim! In point of fact, it would appear more wrong for canvassing for the Legislative Council to be left entirely to political parties and candidates.

Very few enrolments could have been obtained in Nedlands, South Perth and Mt. Lawley, the districts mentioned by Mr. Griffith, as these had already been closely canvassed by canvassers employed by the Liberal and Country League.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: How do you know that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think the Electoral Department would know by the cards coming in. The hon. member asks questions when he already knows the answers.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: What you are telling us is a lot of bunk.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is the hon. member's opinion, and he is entitled to it.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: It will remain my opinion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Jones suggested that in cases where applicants for land had equal qualifications the Land Board should hold a ballot to select the successful applicant. I have discussed this suggestion with the appropriate authorities and have been told that it would be extremely unlikely that two or more applicants would be equal in all respects as so many factors have to be taken into consideration.

Experience has revealed that adjudication by a board of three members which considers all the evidence taken in open court, is fair and equitable. As mentioned by the hon. member, each applicant is given the opportunity to state his case and to hear the cases submitted by each of the other applicants. An amendment of the Act or regulations to provide for selection by ballot might prove unsatisfactory in some respects. For instance, it might defeat the object of obtaining the best applicant. Board members would be given the opportunity, if they felt like exercising it, of deciding selection by ballot instead of selecting the best applicant by considered opinion.

Hon. L. A. Logan: They still make a lot of mistakes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: When the human factor comes into it mistakes will always be made. There will never be any perfect system and no one would suggest that there could be. Mr. MacKinnon's very able maiden speech presented problems of the South-West Province in a most interesting manner. In discussing the apple crop he said that experienced growers doubted whether the allotted packing sheds could cope with the fruit from the codlin moth quarantine area at Bridgetown. He hoped there would be no failure in providing adequate packing facilities and that there would be sufficient inspectors to check the fruit.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Packing.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I can assure the hon. member that the Department of Agriculture appreciates the fact that the packing of apples and pears in the quarantined area is of great importance. The area of orchards involved is approximately 1,500 acres and it would be impossible for officers of the department to inspect the fruit on the trees before harvesting commenced and to be certain that no infestation existed. Therefore it would still be necessary to see all the fruit in packing sheds during the packing operations.

Final arrangements with regard to packing will be a matter between the Bridgetown Fruitgrowers' Association and the packing firms concerned, and a meeting was called at Bridgetown for the 12th September, to discuss this matter. It is considered that the packing centres should be limited in order to meet the requirements of the inspection services. The Bridgetown Fruitgrowers' Association has recommended that six packing centres be approved and it is quite likely that this will be agreed to.

The volume of fruit in the quarantined area will probably be in the vicinity of 300,000 bushels and it is intended, if no signs of infestation are seen, to permit free marketing. This is a matter which is causing concern to growers in other fruit-growing districts as they feel that there will be risks of codlin moth infestation spreading to their districts. I think that is quite possible, too. An outbreak such as they had at Bridgetown naturally makes those outside the area fearful that if restrictions are not enforced, and a full inspection is not made, there could be a spread of the disease.

It is essential, therefore, that the inspection services should cope with the position; and as can be appreciated, there is a very limited number of officers with sufficient experience. The facilities to be provided were to be worked out with the growers themselves and it was anticipated that satisfactory arrangements would be made. In addition to the supervision of fruit in central packing sheds, inspectors will also be required closely to survey an additional 1,000 acres of orchards outside the present quarantined area.

In discussing Western Australian products, Dr. Hislop mentioned that the local fruit was not of the right type for canning, and he suggested inquiries be made into the possibilities of obtaining the right sort of trees. I am advised that in this State fruit varieties have been chosen for planting on the basis of their suitability for the fresh fruit market. The reason is that the return from the sale of fresh fruit is almost invariably higher than the return from sales to canneries.

Some varieties of the apples and pears grown here are suitable for canning and some of the stone fruit varieties can also be satisfactorily canned. Many of the varieties of stone fruits which are grown elsewhere specifically for canning have little value on the fresh fruit market, so that the return to the grower is automatically determined by the cannery. Means of stimulating the planting of canning varieties, however, are being considered by the Departments of Industrial Development and Agriculture.

The financial policy of the Government was attacked by Mr. Cunningham, but his accusations were not based on solid

foundations. He claimed that the Government received a record grant last year and mis-spent money belonging to the State, but he referred to two items of expenditure only. These were—firstly, a grant to the Surf Life Saving Association which amounted to only £2,000. Might I remind the hon. member that the advocate for this grant was a member of his own party, Mr. Ross Hutchinson, the member for Cottesloe. The other expenditure mentioned by the hon. member was a few pounds spent by the Electoral Department in checking the electoral rolls.

These two were the only items of expenditure that he enumerated, and the small amount of the expenditure is a refutation of his accusations of extravagance. Several grants were made to other charitable organisations, such as for additions to the blind school, the Sir James Mitchell Spastic Centre, the Civilian Maimed and Limbless and the Home of Peace; but I am sure no one could honestly say that any one of these grants had any political significance.

I would remind the hon. member that the McLarty-Watts Government agreed to find, by cash and guarantee, half the finance required by the Cockburn Cement Co., to establish its works in this State.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Did not the Government only guarantee it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The liability of the Government on this account was £1,100,000, and the Cockburn Cement Co. is now pressing the Government for the payment of the final instalment of £500,000. This liability has had to be financed by the present Government. A comparison of the grant of £2,000 to the Surf Life Saving Association with the £1,100,000 guarantee to this very wealthy company shows that the hon. member did not have much appreciation of the financial position. He made only those two complaints, of two small grants, and yet there are many other instances that could have been mentioned.

Hon. A. R. Jones: The money guaranteed to the cement company will come back again.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It may and it may not. I think a number of more deserving cases could have been selected in which the Government could have guaranteed £1,100,000 instead of guaranteeing it to a wealthy company.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Like Chamberlains, for instance.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, even Chamberlains. I think a grant to that company would have been more deserving, and welcomed more by the people of this State, than the grant to the company I have mentioned.

Hon. A. R. Jones: I do not think so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I mention that to show members how they get on to dangerous ground in criticising the Government for certain expenditure and forget about the expenditure of the Government that they have supported. If any member goes out on a heresy hunt like that, he will find bundles of evidence, irrespective of who the Government might be.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That company was responsible for the reduction in the price of cement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It may have been; I am not arguing about that phase. I am merely saying that expenditure like that, which we have had to foot, could have been used in many other directions, directions where we would have thought it more justifiable if we had been parcelling out the funds.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: For instance, what?

Hon. A. R. Jones: This one was justifiable.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member thinks that, okay; but I do not think so.

Hon. A. R. Jones: The Government will get the money back.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is one of the rich companies and a poor Government had to guarantee it £1,100,000. There are many local industries that could have been assisted by that large sum of money —much more deserving cases than this one.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And not one apprentice employed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, not one. Mr. Griffith was also critical of the financial position of the State but he got confused between deficits, revenue and loan funds. I would like to explain to the hon. member that at the end of June, 1956, the amount due for deferred payments was £2,451,000. This represented expenditure on behalf of:—

State Electricity Commission	633,000
Public Works Department	348,000
State Housing Commission	305,000
Railways	1,165,000
	£2,451,000

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: After all the loans the State Electricity Commission has floated.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Members will note that almost 50 per cent. of this total was for the railways. This large amount is part of the deferments inherited from the previous Government and which my Government has had to liquidate over a number of years.

The hon. member's accusation that the £4,000,000 requested for unemployment relief was really intended to meet deferments is misleading, and far from the truth. The Government has taken care of the commitments on its deferments for this financial year. These will be met from the respective loan votes. The hon. member may like to know that the whole of the liability due by the Public Works Department for schools and hospitals, and by the State Housing Commission was paid before the end of August.

The hon. member is travelling in the past so far as his accusation of £1,500,000 overspending by the State Housing Commission is concerned. This overspending occurred 18 months ago in the year 1954-55, and the whole of the amount was repaid during the financial year 1955-56 by allocating £5,000,000 of our loan funds to the Commonwealth-State housing programme in lieu of the customary £3,500,000 yearly expenditure.

I would like to remind Mr. Griffith that when the present Government came into power it inherited from the previous Government liabilities for railway rolling-stock, equipment, etc., that amounted to approximately £8,000,000. This inherited liability caused the Government a great deal of worry, but we have succeeded during the last three years in progressively decreasing that amount, until at the 30th June last only a little over £1,000,000 was outstanding.

During his remarks Mr. Bennetts stated that the Government did not provide sufficient assistance to prospectors to cover their prospecting expenses. However, I do not think the Government can be considered niggardly in this respect. The means by which the Government assists are—

(1) Weekly amounts of £4 10s. in the Eastern and Central Goldfields and £5 10s. in the Northern Goldfields, for prospecting sustenance, as well as a limited purchase of explosives and the loan of prospecting tools.

(2) Provision of State batteries of which there are 21 operating throughout the Goldfields, and cartage subsidies.

(3) Free assays and mineral determinations by the Government Chemical Laboratories and the School of Mines.

Another matter that exercised the mind of Mr. Bennetts was the lack of advanced trade training for children living in areas such as Norseman, Bullfinch and Southern Cross. I can advise the hon. member that the position with regard to apprenticeship training at Norseman is to be examined when the Superintendent of Manual Training and the Assistant Superintendent of Technical Education visit that area about the end of October.

Trade training on the other hand, is available only to indentured apprentices who work either in schools or by correspondence to syllabuses suggested by trade advisory committees. In the absence of suitable workshops, supervised day release classes are being organised at several high schools. It has been arranged that the Superintendent of Technical Education, and the Assistant Superintendent of Apprentice Training, will visit Kalgoorlie and Bullfinch later in the year to arrange for the supervision of apprentice work at Bullfinch.

Returning now to the metropolitan area, I would mention that in 1954 it was decided to erect stop signs at the minor of two intersecting roads or junctions. Approximately 750 of these signs were ordered and the Police Department was asked to report on the most suitable locations for them in the metropolitan area. In his speech Mr. Jones suggested that some stop signs around the city were badly sited. In discussing this, it may be interesting to examine the history of the signs.

On the 21st February, 1955, a start was made; and by the 2nd June of that year, 624 signs had been erected, 566 of these being on roads other than at railway crossings. Complaints were made that there were too many of these sings and subsequently a regulation was introduced providing for a new slow 15 sign. This regulation was gazetted on the 30th September, 1955.

Hon. A. R. Jones: There are about 600 too many.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: After a check of the whole of the existing stop signs the police recommended that a large number be replaced with the new slow 15 sign.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: They can replace a couple near my place.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On the 14th December, 1955, this replacement commenced; and by the 16th February, 1956, 200 stop signs had been replaced by the new signs.

Hon. L. A. Logan: You must admit my motion did some good.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That may appear so on the surface; but while I give credit to the hon. member for being alive and introducing the matter here, it is necessary for him to know the whole story as to what exactly was being done. We were not able to obtain slow and stop signs at the same time. The stop signs were available, and we decided that rather than have no sign at all we should use stop signs until they could be replaced with slow signs.

It was said by Mr. Jones that there were too many stops signs. I would hold the other view. It takes a motorist only a few

seconds to pull up, and he is not delayed for very long. It is easier and far better for a motorist to do that than have somebody killed at an intersection.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: "Slow" is much better than "Stop".

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I agree with that entirely, and only where it is absolutely essential is a stop sign left.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is not correct.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: When one is dealing with the whole of the metropolitan area it is difficult to just wave a magic wand and expect everything to be all right; this takes years of preparation. Accordingly, notwithstanding the fact that it may be irksome, the stop signs have had a wonderful effect in slowing down the speedsters in the metropolitan area; and members know there are many of that type about today. Speaking for myself, I would far rather be delayed a few seconds, than be able to gather speed and cause an accident while crossing an intersection.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Are they observing the stop-sign regulation?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member will agree that we cannot stop people from committing murder. That is not possible. We cannot prevent people from breaking the law, but we can do all in our power to draw their attention to the fact that they are doing so. If we indicate that there is a dangerous corner ahead, it has the effect of making them slow down. If they do not, then they render themselves liable to prosecution. While it is not possible to prevent them from committing the offence, it is possible to provide a penalty for the offence when it is committed.

Since the date to which I referred, as a result of complaints and requests a further few stop and slow 15 signs have been erected. The prime object of all these signs is to prevent accidents which might result in serious injury or loss of life, and I think this aim has been successful. After all, this is, or should be, the major consideration. I might mention that the stop sign is in world-wide use. It is not confined to this State.

Reference was made by Mr. Jones to the number of signs around the city. There is one stop sign erected at the junction of Milligan-st. and Wellington-st. and one at the junction of George and Hay-sts., Perth. There are no other signs in the city block as it is defined in the traffic regulations. There are only two. One can travel from Thomas-st. to the Causeway via Wellington, Murray and Hay-sts., and St. George's Terrace and not meet a stop sign on the outward or the return journey.

Hon. A. R. Jones: You want to go across James-st. some time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member may have been referring to the City of Perth, which of course is a different thing. If that was so, it is possible to have to stop frequently but in every instance the need for a sign was very thoroughly checked. Mr. Jones mentioned a stop sign in Princess-rd. I assume he meant the one located at the north-west corner of the intersection of Princess-rd. and Bay-rd., Claremont.

Hon. A. R. Jones: No, the one on the north of the school. The stop sign is past the school instead of being before it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This sign was considered to be necessary because of a house on the corner which had shrubs obscuring the view of motorists entering Princess-rd. south from Bay-rd. In addition, it is a fairly busy intersection.

The slow 15 sign is erected on the south-east side of this intersection because an excellent view can be obtained to the left or south along Bay-rd. across College Park. A stop sign was not necessary but motorists had to be slowed down because of the possible quick entry of others from their right in Bay-rd. into Princess-rd.

These signs are on opposite sides of Bay-rd. and face traffic travelling east and west along Princess-rd. There is no other stop sign in either direction at this point.

Dismay was expressed by Mr. Jones at the fact that despite the expenditure of £5,800,000, only 580 miles of new road was built last year by the Main Roads Department. I would advise the hon. member that the Lieut.-Governor in his Speech used the figure of 580 miles as the total length which received bituminous treatment during the year. Apart from this relatively small mileage, substantial improvements were made on over 10,000 miles of main roads and important secondary roads, as well as some thousands of miles on developmental roads.

In addition, 22 bridges and over 100 masonry and timber culverts were built, not to mention 2,000 reinforced concrete pipe culverts. Although the hon. member may not agree, the Main Roads Department in this State is regarded as the most efficient in the Commonwealth.

In suggesting that considerable economy could accrue from a substantial change-over from day labour to contract work, he made specific reference to the work done by Bell Bros. for West Australian Petroleum Pty. Ltd. In this connection the hon. member probably was not aware that Bell Bros. carried out this work, not by contract, but on a cost-plus basis. The hon. member might be interested to know that the Main Roads Department did road works for Wapet for about two years. Eventually, however, Wapet had to be advised that the department had so many

Government commitments that it would have to relinquish work for the firm. The management of Wapet thanked the Department for its assistance and very highly commended the class of work, the cost and the speed with which the work was carried out.

The hon. member also averred that Bell Bros. could do work at half the cost of the department's day labour forces. This is far from correct, and it may well be that investigation would find that the hon. member's statement would be very much altered. At Kwinana, British Petroleum were also full of commendation for the satisfaction they received at the hands of the department's forces in the building of internal roads in the area. At Medina townsite also, many miles of road were built quickly by the department at a satisfactory cost.

The matter of contract versus day labour has been carefully examined from time to time. Under the contract system, however, it is not possible to adopt the stage construction principle of developing the State's road system. Mr. Jones and his fellow representatives of country electorates will recollect that during the four years from 1949 to 1953 over 1,000,000 tons of wheat was carried through Midland Junction by road to the port of Fremantle. It is hardly necessary to emphasise to what extent this unexpected and heavy traffic took toll of the 16 ft.-wide main roads, particularly the edges, which were subjected to considerable attrition.

As a result it became apparent that an increasing proportion of the funds at the Main Roads Department's disposal would have to be spent on strengthening, widening and generally improving roads leading from the main ports. Due to the heavy and continuous traffic, many sections of these roads needed reconstruction. This, however, had to be deferred for as long as possible so as to extract as much use as possible from the roads until such time as the abnormal traffic ceased.

It was said by Mr. Baxter that too much time and money had been spent on the construction of deviations. However, there were obviously substandard sections which had to be rectified. One of these was between the 35-mile and 36-mile pegs on the Great Eastern Highway. This had a sharp and dangerous curve with very poor vision and a difficult combination of vertical and horizontal alignment which required much survey and investigation work to obtain the best possible line. There was no possibility at all of obtaining proper road standards simply by widening the curve as suggested by Mr. Baxter. Apart from the Bunbury-rd., the Perth-Northam-rd. is probably the most important in the State, and any substantial improvements that are made on this route should be carried out to State Road Authorities Conference of Australia standards of design and geometrics.

The hon. member made specific mention of the unsurfaced portion of the Red Hill-Toodyay-rd. and of extending the highway from Toodyay to Goomalling. I would point out that before surfacing can be placed on these sections, extensive deviation will be necessary away from the existing road. At this stage such works are not contemplated, as Toodyay and Goomalling are both served by good highways.

Only a very small proportion of funds is allocated to the heavily trafficked sections of main roads near the city. Out of a total of 320 miles of new construction and surfacing, apart from those works carried out under the contributory bitumen scheme, 289 miles were on roads over 100 miles from the city.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: So they should be.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am just showing it is quite wrong to say that too much is being spent in the city. I am giving the actual figures as to what is spent, and the hon. member will see that 289 of the 320 miles were roads over 100 miles from the city and only 31 miles near the city. It is necessary to give these figures for members to realise what is being done.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Chief Secretary did not say the roads were done over the years.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know what the hon. member did as a Minister.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Chief Secretary's Government did some years ago, too.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That may be so. I can only deal with what we are responsible for. With regard to the questions the hon. member asked concerning the cost of two concrete culverts on the Northam-rd. the figure of £4,000 he quoted as a reasonable cost for the work is quite accurate. So for once the hon. member was on the right track.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is a different figure from what I received in answer to a question.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Have a little patience. The actual cost of the culverts was £4,140 and £4,250. The figures of £5,500 and £5,700 given in reply to the question the hon. member asked earlier in the session included the cost of temporary repairs caused by the heavy rain in May and June. As a result of this bad weather substantial temporary culverts and side tracks had to be built and the incessant rains made it necessary to bituminise these temporary roads. So the hon. member can see we did not paint the lily when we gave answers. We gave the whole costs.

Hon. L. A. Logan: You paint the lily white when it suits you.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: The actual cost was for the culverts.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It was also necessary to maintain a 24 hours a day pumping programme to dewater the footings of the bridge which was being constructed. One of these pumps was electrical and required a skilled operator. During this period of emergency a certain operator, through working overtime, received one fortnightly pay of £91 0s. 9d. net.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I must have been misled.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perhaps it might have been better to put on two or three, but there were probably circumstances which made this impossible. It was work which required the services of a skilled operator. I cannot see the officer in charge of the Main Roads Department putting one man on and keeping him working so long as to earn £91 in a fortnight, if it were possible to economise on the job and get it done cheaper. That is only commonsense. If hon. members are fair they will realise there are emergency occasions when extra money has got to be paid.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Don't tell us he is the only one in the Main Roads Department!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He may have been the only one in that area. I give the Main Roads Department the credit of using services to the best advantage for money paid out. So far as that department is concerned it does not throw money around. This was the largest fortnightly sum paid. The pay records of the Main Roads Department reveal that no employee received £146 net as asserted by the hon. member.

It was said by Mr. Baxter that the Main Roads Department resumed and bulldozed about three-quarters of a mile of one farmer's property without any warning. The facts of this case were that a warning letter was sent by the department to the person shown on the title deeds as owning the property. Some time later, however, this letter was returned through the dead letter office.

Does the hon. member do everything right? Of course he does not! I want members to give the departments a fair go; and I would say, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone." Does the hon. member believe that everyone should be 100 per cent. perfect? It is the only complaint that has been made out of 300-odd jobs in the State; and all I ask is for members to be reasonable. The owner of the land is registered in the titles office. That office sent a letter to the owner, but it was returned from the dead letter office. The titles office cannot be held responsible if the person concerned does not keep up to date and has not his correct name and address recorded with the department.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Don't tell us that story!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Chief Secretary must not argue the point across the Chamber.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I would suggest that it is a person's duty to see that the titles office has his proper address so that correspondence can be sent to him correctly.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is a very big delay in the transfer of titles.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No; the delay is only with new titles in the course of transfer.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Was it addressed to Bunbury?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I could not say; but that is the information.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Before commencing on the deviation and approaches to the bridge, approximately three-quarters of a mile of fence was removed, and reerected, but a small section adjacent to the farmer's house was damaged by a bulldozer when a side track was being gravelled. When the department was advised that trouble had occurred, an investigation was at once made. Considering that the department has up to 100 separate current jobs on long lengths of roads scattered between Wyndham and Esperance, it may be regarded as notable that there are relatively few such incidents as the hon. member reported.

During the debate on the Supply Bill, Dr. Hislop discussed several aspects of traffic control. He wondered how long it would be after the building of the Narrows bridge before the exit roads were completed and he postulated utter chaos if the construction of these roads was delayed.

As the hon. member says, there is no doubt that ultimately traffic from the Narrows bridge must feed into an adequate distribution system; and it is obvious that a structure of such size and importance cannot be permitted to discharge its traffic directly into existing city streets. There are two methods of dealing with this problem, and the plan provides for them both in appropriate order.

The first is to intercept as much of the city-bound traffic as possible, and store it in a fringe parking area in the reclaimed land between Spring-st. and William-st. Provision is made for this in the first stage of the bridge construction and the associated reclamation. After the parking area is provided, the second requirement will be the provision of the western switch road, but construction of the road can be deferred until increasing traffic justifies it.

It is considered by traffic authorities that the hon. member is misinformed as to the causes of the difficulties on the Causeway at peak periods. Even if the Causeway

were made to operate on a four-two lane distribution as on the Sydney Harbour Bridge, there would be no improvement of evening peak traffic flow because the bottlenecks are the rotary at the eastern end and the limited capacity of Canning Highway.

Detailed studies have been made by the Main Roads Department into the reasons for the Causeway congestion, and it is clear that with the traffic pressure at the evening peak period towards South Perth requiring a large turning movement to the right, an increase of the outward lanes from three to four can give no additional capacity whatsoever. Even if more vehicles could be got through the rotary, it is quite impossible for any substantial increase to be obtained in the outward flow in Canning Highway, which at evening peak is now carrying traffic to the extent of 2,000 vehicles per hour in one direction.

Before approving of the Narrows bridge, my Government instructed that a thorough study be made of traffic and its growth at the Causeway. The conclusion was reached that the proper solution of the traffic problem at the Causeway was to provide another city radial at the Narrows bridge to take traffic from the south-west suburbs and thus relieve congestion at the Causeway.

The hon. member suggested that the western switch road from the Narrows bridge should be routed through Milligan-st. instead of George-st. When considering the alternative of George-st. and Milligan-st. it is necessary to be clear as to the functions of the switch road. The Stephenson plan provides for the Perth city centre to be enclosed within a free-flowing ring highway comprising Riverside Drive, an improved Roe-st., and the western switch road. The function of this ring road is to permit traffic to flow freely east and west and north and south to the various parts of the city without having to pass through the congested streets of the city centre. Thus it must be provided with adequate entry and exit points, properly designed as to traffic capacity, but not so many that the free flow of the traffic is impeded too much.

Briefly, the western switch road must satisfy these requirements—

(a) It should bound the commercial and business centre of the city on the west;

(b) it should not make intersections at grade with more than one street, which topography requires shall be Murray-st.;

(c) it must connect the Yanchep Highway radial from the north-western suburbs with the Narrows radial from the south-west on the most direct line;

(d) it must be located so that the vitally important fringe parking areas proposed on the river front and in Wellington-st. can be connected with the maximum use of the space available and with the provision of adequate entry and exit at the fringe parking areas.

The distance on the western leg between Mounts Bay-rd. and Roe-st. is so short that provided adequate interchanges are constructed at Mounts Bay-rd. and Roe-st. with Wellington-st., it is undesirable to have any grade intersections in its length except at Murray-st. The Stephenson plan is not the final word on the design of this switch road which is now the subject of more detailed design in the Main Roads Department. It is likely that the ultimate design will provide for more complete movements on and off the switch road than shown in the Stephenson plan. There is, however, a large amount of difficult and precise drawing office work to be done before a final plan can be completed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At the tea suspension I was speaking about the Narrows bridge and the approaches thereto. Following what I said then, I desire to state that complete studies have been made of the traffic-generating capacity of all the suburbs in the metropolitan region in respect of peak hour movement to and from the city centre. These studies have taken account of the working population in the city centre, the population of each suburb, the requirements of local activities and industries in the suburbs, and of the employment needs of the industrial areas proposed under the Stephenson plan.

Estimates show that the Narrows bridge and Mounts Bay-rd., with the Yanchep Highway, will ultimately discharge on to this western end of the city something like 13,000 vehicles per hour at morning peak. In addition, there will be several thousand more vehicles reaching the city along Malcolm, Hay and Wellington-sts.

The magnitude of these figures renders it essential that the western switch road should not be taken across Mount-st., St. George's Terrace and Hay-st. at grade. Grade separation is essential on this western switch if the traffic movements estimated for the future are to be handled.

Once the magnitude of these figures is digested and the view accepted that grade separation is essential wherever the route is taken, it is clear that the Milligan-st. line would require resumptions at least equally expensive as those on the George-st. line, to say nothing of the increased construction costs due to the greater length of the Yanchep Highway.

Moreover, it does not meet three of the four requirements I just mentioned and, because of ground levels, can be made to satisfy only the fourth requirement, that

is, for grade separation except at Murray-st., by construction at much steeper grades between Hay and Murray-sts. than are acceptable in a major road of this type.

Taking everything into consideration, the Milligan-st. line is regarded as far less suitable than George-st. I know there are varying opinions on this point of view, and I realise that those who do not share the views I have just expressed would take a lot of convincing that these are the last words so far as that is concerned.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Would you like to express your own at the moment?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope I spoke plainly enough. The water supply problems in several centres in his province were referred to by Mr. Bennetts. In this connection I am able to advise that at Norseman the Public Works Department is carrying out a detailed investigation into the water supply position but plans are not yet finalised. No expenditure is envisaged during the 1956-57 financial year.

The department is aware of developments in Bruce Rock and has plans made to improve progressively the water supply position, commencing this summer and completing to normal standards within two years. The department is aware also of the age of the Merredin pumps on the Goldfields Water Supply main conduit and also of the limitations which they impose on the availability of water beyond the pumping station. The question of replacement pumps is under active consideration but meanwhile every precaution is being taken to ensure that the existing pumps continue to function satisfactorily within their capacity.

Criticism of the Licensing Court was felt by Mr. Thomson to be justified. He believed that great improvement could be made in the court, as well as to the Act, and considered that some of the smaller hotels situated between country towns could be relieved of the necessity to provide residential accommodation.

In this connection, of course, Section 51 of the Licensing Act sets out that no licence shall be granted for any premises within the City of Perth or City of Fremantle unless such house contains not less than 12 bedrooms and two sitting rooms besides the rooms occupied by the family and servants of the applicant, and elsewhere than in the City of Perth or City of Fremantle six bedrooms and two sitting rooms.

Section 50 provides for a wayside house licence of not less than two bedrooms and two sitting rooms independent of apartments occupied by the family of the licensee. The court can, of course, order such further accommodation if in its opinion it is justified.

In regard to small hotels in between larger towns being licensed to sell fermented and spirituous liquors only, the court's opinion is that this would not serve any useful purpose in Western Australia. The court states it does not know of any small hotel not being called upon at some time or other to provide accommodation. There may, for instance, be a risk that a breakdown would occur in one's transport. I am told that the extra cost to small country hotels to provide accommodation is not great.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Who told you that one?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Every small hotel has refrigeration and the licensee can supply a bed and breakfast at very little cost to himself.

Hon. A. R. Jones: What about the staff cost?

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is negligible according to the Minister.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In these small hotels it is not considered that staff costs would be involved, because it would be necessary to have some staff as the people running the hotels would need staff themselves; and where only limited accommodation is provided, as it is now, at these in-between hotels, no extra cost for staff would be involved.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Where are these in-between hotels?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There are many in the hon. member's district. In regard to the hon. member's statement that the Licensing Court has refused licences for new hotels in places where they would be an acquisition as a tourist attraction, I am advised that the court has refused only one application at a seaside resort. This was at Bunbury, outside the hon. member's province altogether. This application was refused because the proposed site was too far removed from the town and the beach to attract any tourist trade.

The court did grant an application for a provisional certificate at another seaside resort in Safety Bay. However, the applicant has not been able to commence building operations because of finance restrictions. This certificate will in consequence lapse at the end of the year. The court reports that it is at all times mindful of the importance of attracting tourists to Western Australia.

Comment was made by Mr. Thomson on improvements to guest accommodation and the building of hotels in the country, and the failure of the court to have its orders carried out. In this regard I would advise that the responsibility of reporting upon hotel maintenance is that of the liquor branch of the Police Department and the court considers it carries out these duties very satisfactorily.

From about October in every year the court receives a report on every hotel in the State. Renewal courts begin on the first Monday in November and must be completed by the end of December. Before the renewal court sits, the reports are perused by members of the court; and after careful consideration, if, in the opinion of the court some improvement is necessary, the licence is renewed conditionally that certain improvements are carried out. It is not a recommendation but an order of the court.

The liquor branch is acquainted of the order and once a quarter a progress report is submitted to the court. In no instance is the court aware of a licensee ignoring a court order. In some instances a licensee may require a little time to complete the order because of lack of finance.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Perhaps three or four years.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There could be varying periods. The hon. member would not object, I think, if some little leniency were extended in times of stress from a financial point of view. The court always follows up its orders and sees to it that they are completed in a reasonable time. I know, of course, that there can be many definitions of a "reasonable time." If a licensee fails to comply, then at the next renewal court the licence is renewed for part of the year: that is, either three or six months. If not completed then, it is possible for the licence to lapse and a new licensee to take over; this has happened.

The opinion that Mr. Davies has expressed previously was reiterated by him—namely, that diagonal lines on pedestrian crossings would enable motorists to see pedestrians more easily. Observations, however, lead senior officers of the traffic branch to believe the contrary. They consider diagonal lines tend to merge into the colour of the roadway, particularly when the road surface is shiny or wet.

Hon. E. M. Davies: That is a different expression of opinion from last time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We vary with the times. As a result of the use of both parallel and diagonal lines, the authorities in England favour the parallel type.

Hon. E. M. Davies: I suggest they go to the Eastern States and have a look at some of the crosswalks there.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The solution, however, appears to be the uniform overhead lighting of crossings. I think the hon. member will agree there. Lighting, of course, is the responsibility of local authorities and this matter will be discussed with them.

Complaints were made by Mr. Jones that too great a delay occurs in paying compensation when land is resumed by the Government. In this connection I am advised that the number of unsettled claims is relatively small and that many of these are caused by delay on the part of claimants to take necessary action. In very many cases it is in the interests of claimants for departmental officers to spend a great deal of time and research in order to ascertain the highest value that can be placed on the land.

There is a tendency for many claimants to delay the submission of claims. As a matter of fact, there are a number still outstanding although the two-year period, which is allowed under the law, is about to expire. It is the policy of the Government to pay fair and reasonable compensation irrespective of the amount of the claim, and in many cases settlements are effected at a figure exceeding the amount of the claim. That often occurs.

The amendment of the Public Works Act passed last session was designed to expedite payment by the department and to give claimants the right to take action against the department if assessments were not made within a reasonable time. There is also a provision that where the department is unable to negotiate a settlement the claimant may at any time after an offer is made be paid an advance sum of up to two-thirds of the offer without the claimant in any way being committed to a specific final settlement. That procedure has been adopted in a number of cases, too. A case was mentioned by the hon. member in which he claimed there had been unreasonable delay. If he will furnish me with the name of the party concerned, further inquiries will be made and extra information furnished.

The Milk Board and its chairman, Mr. Stannard, were strongly attacked by Mr. Baxter. He alleged that owing to the early rains in February and the early feed, the board apparently panicked and reduced producers' quotas by 20 per cent. He went on to say that when summer came a restoration was made, but that producers only received 18 per cent. of the 20 per cent. reduction, and that this created discontent. The hon. member asserted that the producers were forced on threat of not getting a quota to sign contracts with the Milk Board, which then altered the basis of fixing quotas to be the production of March, April and May.

I will have to correct the hon. member, as I often have to do. In the first place, producers do not sign contracts with the Milk Board. The contracts are made between producers and milk vendors who conduct treatment plants. The board provides the contract forms and, as required by the Milk Act, approves of the contracts.

They are not actually made between the board and the producers, but between the producers and other persons.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Of course, that is splitting straws.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And, of course, when one is proved wrong, one always looks for an excuse.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Who made a statement about a contract between the board and the producers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member made a definite statement about contracts between the board and producers. I am merely stating that the board does not enter into contracts. The board also determines the maximum amount of milk for which a producer may contract, this being part of the board's many functions in providing an adequate regular supply of milk.

It is not agreed that the board panicked last year. Owing to the phenomenal rains in February and the following rains there was an unprecedented upsurge of milk production. Vast quantities were produced in excess of the amount the market could absorb. It had been the practice for a few years past for the treatment plants to purchase all of the production of licensed producers during March, April and May—the months of the "quota" period. However, the exceptional production, aggravated by the action of some farmers, resulted in the companies purchasing during March, April and May, 1955, 927,020 gallons more than they sold.

A minority of farmers abused the contract system by organising their herds for a high production during March, April and May in order to establish a large quota. They then allowed their cows to dry off during the summer months to the detriment of their fellow producers. In view of the heavy excess supply during March, April and May last year, a 20 per cent. cut was imposed by the board in the quantity of milk which producers could supply. I think the hon. member will agree that the board could not allow the irregular practices of the minority of producers to continue. It was for this reason that the board altered the quota system.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: They did not do as they should have done according to the Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It was decided that for the contracts to be made on the 1st March, 1956, the amount of milk to be supplied would be a quantity equal to the average daily quantity of milk supplied by a producer during the months of November, December and January—plus a percentage to be fixed by the board, which, this year, was 20 per cent.—and that the average amount sold by a producer during the months of March, April and May, would be the quantity he could sell for the remaining nine months of his contract, which terminates on the 28th February next, subject to any rise or fall approved by the board.

This new system was endorsed by the Farmers' Union and by the treatment plants, and although in operation only a short while, it has proved its worth. Last summer was the hottest in our history, and there was more than sufficient milk for all requirements. This happy state of affairs would not have occurred under the old system. I am advised that the new system protects the genuine farmer who maintains regular production and is the backbone of the industry.

In saying that at any time the board can terminate a producer's contract, Mr. Baxter was not quite right. A contract would be terminated only if there were valid reasons, and I would refer the hon. member to the milk contracts which, like many other contracts, can be terminated by one party if the other party makes any substantial default in the performance of his obligations. There is ample protection under the Act for suppliers. The board is empowered to cancel a licence where offences are committed and faults exist, but the licensee has the right of appeal to the Minister for Agriculture.

It may interest Mr. Baxter to know that there are producers still in the industry who were licensees of the board at its inception almost 25 years ago. In other cases, where original suppliers have either passed on or, through age or incapacity, have ceased active milk production, their farms are being conducted by their families as licensees. There can be no place in the milk industry for the man who does not supply milk of satisfactory quality produced under hygienic conditions.

The hon. member referred to one man in the Armadale district as having had a little trouble with his solids-not-fats. What happened in this case was that the firm which had been buying milk from this producer informed him that it did not wish to make a further contract with him. It is of interest to note that there were only four producers who could not obtain contracts this year.

They, in company with Mr. N. L. Marsh, president of the milk section of the Farmers' Union, saw the chairman of the Milk Board on the 29th February and an offer to assist them was made by the chairman. One man, who had allowed his production to drop to five gallons daily, decided to leave the industry owing, mainly, to family reasons, and contracts were secured for two of the others. These two started supplying on the 2nd March.

The fourth was evidently the producer referred to by Mr. Baxter. He was informed that if he demonstrated his ability to supply milk of satisfactory quality there was no doubt that a contract could be secured for him. However, he refused the board's assistance, claiming he did not wish to receive favours from anybody.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I do not think that is quite correct.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The board does not now permit an established producer to buy a quota from either a man who leaves the industry or who remains in it. This type of thing developed into a racket and, at one time, quotas were being purchased at as high a rate as £10 per gallon for the goodwill only. Such a state of affairs was never envisaged by Parliament. It was the result of a policy made in the very early days of the board and which got out of hand. As a result, the board had to take remedial steps. The board, however, does permit a man who wishes to enter the industry to buy a quota, either from somebody who is leaving or who has left the industry.

Special consideration is extended to men on low quotas. In fact, a great number of these have been reviewed and quantities higher than those established by them have been granted according to the merits of each individual case. It was asserted by Mr. Baxter that if the board increases the number of zones, producers' quotas will get smaller and smaller. It appears he is not aware of what the board has done or proposes to do in this connection.

The board has already stated that its policy is to obtain milk for the metropolitan area from no further south than the Capel River. Mr. Baxter's statement that producers' quotas will become smaller and smaller is quite wrong. The aim of the board is to increase the quotas of the smaller suppliers. The hon. member accused the Milk Board and Mr. Stannard of dilly-dallying with a request by the Farmers' Union for an increase in the price of milk. I think the hon. member will agree that there are many other sections of the community, apart from the producers, who are affected by the price of milk.

The board fixes margins not only for the producer but also for the man who carts the milk from the farms to the country depots; for the treatment of milk at these depots; for the conveyance of milk by road tanker to Perth; for the treatment and bottling of milk in the metropolitan area; for the distribution of milk; and for the sale of milk from shops. The fixing of the price is a complex matter involving an examination of costs and financial statements of all these varying sections, and, in addition, the board has to safeguard the interests of consumers. Obviously, this takes time, and the board was delayed in its considerations by the non-submission of information considered vital to its inquiry.

The hon. member might be interested to know that the board has not received one complaint of delay from any section of the milk industry, including the producers who obviously understand the position in which the board is placed. The chairman has asked me to mention that he has never stated, as claimed by Mr. Baxter, that he was willing to consider the question of the price of milk provided an examination of the facts proved that rising costs have affected the industry. The chairman says that no such statement appeared in the issue of the "Farmers' Weekly" of the 9th August, as asserted by Mr. Baxter, nor, he believes, in any other issue of that paper.

The question was asked by Mr. Davies why large passenger vessels were not berthed at "A," "B" and "C" sheds. The reason that passenger ships of up to 26,000 tons are berthed in the vicinity of "F" and "G" berths, Victoria Quay, is that tides, currents, weather, and passenger facilities make this the safest and best position.

There is sufficient depth of water at "A," "B" and "C" berths for large ships, but this vicinity coincides with a narrow portion of waterway near the entrance which is sufficient for manoeuvring or swinging of large ships. In addition, it is hazardous so far as winds or currents are concerned.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Where is that berth for 80,000-tonners?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We will get it. A further problem is that the berths are curved, and this makes them in a measure unsuitable for the berthing of long commercial ships. Large passenger ships can be berthed at "A," "B" and "C" berths during fine weather, but if adverse winds develop a ship could be delayed in getting away from the berth. The safety of the ship and of the wharf structure, with the existing tug power and limited width of waterway, would make this manoeuvre too hazardous to attempt whether the port was crowded or empty.

In handling the big incidence of cargo and ships in the inner harbour, the harbour trust must depend on complete flexibility and continuity of berthing. It cannot, therefore, and neither can the shipping companies, risk any delay which might be caused by bad weather. In contrast, large passenger ships can safely berth in the wider portion of the inner harbour at either the north or south quays in most weather conditions.

In the foreseeable future passenger berth accommodation will have to be made available for passenger ships of up to 40,000 tons. There would be no possibility of navigating and manoeuvring ships of this tonnage in "A", "B", or "C" berth.

Another aspect is that at these berths the transit sheds are much narrower than at the other berths and are insufficient for passenger and cargo purposes. The areas at the rear of the berths are also very restricted and are fully occupied among other things, with labour pick-up areas and car parking, particularly in the early morning when most passenger ships berth. Bunkering and fresh water facilities are the same for either set of berths.

The hon. member referred to the fact that H.M.S. "Hood," the longest ship ever to use the inner harbour, was berthed in the vicinity of "A," "B" and "C" berths.

This warship had a very much reduced superstructure, with a consequent reduced windage resistance and far greater power for manoeuvring than a large passenger ship. It used the port at a period when the inner harbour was not unduly pressed for berthage space and it would not have caused serious disruption of the inner harbour shipping and cargo traffic had the vessel been delayed through bad weather. Its berthing in the vicinity of "A", "B" and "C" berths cannot be used as a criterion.

There was a complaint by Mr. Logan that people in the country with combustion stoves found it difficult to obtain coke. He said he had heard that supplies which should go to the country had been diverted to the Royal Perth Hospital. On making inquiries, I was told that the sale of coke by the State Electricity Commission to the Royal Perth Hospital had not increased. As the hon. member most likely knows, coke is produced only from imported Eastern States coal. More than half the gas produced by the commission comes from Collie coal, which does not give coke as a by-product.

In selling what coke is available the commission gives first preference to hospitals, including those in the country; then to industry and primary producers; and finally to domestic users in areas not served with gas or electricity.

Hon. L. A. Logan: The people who were buying coke previously cannot buy it now.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I cannot state the reason, but it is not because of the Royal Perth Hospital receiving greater supplies.

Hon. L. A. Logan: It must be going somewhere.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Our lady member considered something should be done to house the more sophisticated delinquent boys instead of sending them to Fremantle Prison. The Government is alive to this necessity, and negotiations are at present proceeding for the purchase of a site for such a home. The necessary funds have been set aside, and when it is built it will be unnecessary for adolescent boys to be committed to Fremantle Gaol except for capital crimes.

In regard to the provision of a girls' home, it is interesting to know that delinquent girls in the care of the Home of the Good Shepherd learn household management in an extremely well-equipped domestic science centre. The home is at present building a new school and already provides classes in needlework, dressmaking and typing for the girls. Trained female staff of the Child Welfare Department advise these girls on their employment and mode of life on leaving the institution. Many of these girls have a fuller and better life and take their places in society after their period of re-education in the Home of the Good Shepherd.

The wood-distillation, charcoal iron and steel industry at Wundowie worried Mr. Baxter, who considered it strange that another blast furnace was to be installed at a cost, he thought, of about £300,000. He hoped that if this second furnace was to be established steps would be taken to repair the existing furnace which, he said, was in rather a shaky condition.

I can advise the hon. member that preparations for the overhaul and relining of the existing furnace have been complete for some time, but it will not be shut down until necessary. It has been in operation for three years and the lining is still in quite good condition, particularly in the hearth. The fact that new production records have been set several times in recent months is hardly indicative of a "shaky condition."

It is estimated that the cost of expanding production from 12,000 tons to 36,000 tons per year will be £800,000 spread over the next two years. Sawmilling operations will not be extended as all wood for the expanded plant will be drawn from trees unsuitable for milling and from limbwood. Logging operations over the past few years have already resulted in a surplus of six years' supply of waste wood at the present rate of consumption. The waste wood within an economical hauling distance will sustain the expanded production for at least 40 years according to a recent survey by the Forests Department. Extraction of further by-products, though possible, is not envisaged at this stage. The gases from the extended plant containing the by-products will be burned as fuel for boilers, etc.

It is most pleasing that the demand for the high purity pig iron produced at Wundowie is increasing rapidly as it becomes better known throughout the world. Contracts have been offered for as far as three years ahead for the full output. Current orders will take all surplus to the end of 1957. Clearing of the forests around Wundowie is achieving the objects outlined by Mr. Baxter. The land so far cleared has been put into production for grazing purposes, when suitable, at very little cost to the land-owner.

The hon. member has been misinformed about what he termed elaborate garages. It is not intended to house the vehicles at all. An area is being cleared and fenced for open-air parking, and it will contain a fuelling depot. The only new building proposed is a motor workshop, which is most essential as present facilities are inadequate and a great deal of maintenance work has to be carried out in the open.

It was said by Mr. Cunningham that it was time a clerk of courts was appointed to deal with the multifarious Government activities occurring at Esperance. I had

this investigated and obtained a report which disclosed that the extraneous duties being carried out by the police at Esperance would not warrant the appointment of a full-time clerk of courts. It is estimated that these duties occupy an average of one hour a day only.

In discussing flora and fauna reserves, Mr. Logan asserted that the procedure was for officers of the Fisheries and Lands and Surveys Departments to just pick out an area and call it a flora and fauna reserve. In reply, I must say that officers of the Lands and Fisheries Departments do not "just pick out an area in the country as a flora and fauna reserve." The Lands Department does not consider any recommendation for a reserve unless it is satisfied that a sound case has been prepared and that the proposed reserve is in the best interests of the State. In addition, I am informed that the Lands Department consults the local authority before any reserve is created.

Hon. L. A. Logan: That is bunkum!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If that is the hon. member's opinion, I would like him to produce the proof.

Hon. L. A. Logan: The evidence is abundant. The board has protested about it all the way through.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If there is proof, I want it in order that I do not give false information to the House. Also, the Fauna Protection Act contains a direction that the views of the local authority must be sought by the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee before it makes any recommendation in respect to the reservation of land.

The hon. member could not understand why these reserves should be under the control of the Fisheries Department. This is not quite correct, as control of reserves for the purposes of fauna conservation is vested, not in the Fisheries Department, but in the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee, which is set up under the Fauna Protection Act.

Hon. L. A. Logan: It comes under the Fisheries Department.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not so. As Chief Secretary I am responsible for the Motor Vehicle Trust and the Fremantle Gaol. There are many other departments under the heading of my department, but which do not come under it. Members of the committee include the Chief Warden of Fauna, the Chief Vermin Control Officer, the Conservator of Forests and leading zoologists. This would appear to be a body competent to control these reserves. The Chief Warden of Fauna is, of course, also Superintendent of Fisheries.

It was stated by Mr. Logan that he could not understand why in only eight road board districts grey kangaroos could be shot without a permit. He considered they should be classed as vermin in all districts and that no permit to kill them should be necessary; nor should royalty be paid on skins sold. In this regard I would mention that royalty is charged only on grey kangaroo skins.

It is not charged on the skins of red kangaroos or euros, which form the bulk of the population of marsupials outside the South-West Land Division. The grey kangaroo has a limited range and is almost entirely contained within the South-West Land Division. It is protected only in the more closely settled regions of the South-West, in what is known as the Grey Kangaroo Reserve, the boundaries of which run from Lancelin Island east to a point north-west of Merredin, then south to Gnowangerup and again east to Hopetoun.

The Murchison River Reserve is on the extreme northern boundary of their range, and consequently their numbers are not great in that reserve and are never likely to increase. It is a well-known biological phenomenon that no species is ever plentiful on the peripheries of its range.

The Fauna Protection Advisory Committee considers that grey kangaroos should not have been "declared" under the Vermin Act in any district, as the lifting of protection and easing of restrictions under the Fauna Protection Act allow professional hunters to operate. With the growing utilisation of grey kangaroo carcases in the pet-food trade, many professional hunters now receive an excellent return. Processors are offering 4d. to 6d. per pound, whole weight, for each carcass which, it is estimated, gives the hunter an average return of about 35s. for each beast. There are two men who consider that it pays satisfactorily to travel 600 miles or more for each load of carcasses.

For hunters who care to supply to processors, the licence fee of £2 per annum and 9d. per head royalty is an insignificant charge. The pet-food trade is causing a rapidly increasing demand for grey kangaroo meat due to the shortage of rabbits and the sale of whalemeat overseas, and there is no prospect of any reduction of royalty charges or the lifting of existing restrictions. It is possible that due to a greatly increased shooting pressure, restrictions will have to be increased to conserve the species.

According to Mr. Thomson the Education Department was wrong in sending young girls from the training college to one-teacher schools in country areas far removed from their homes. The Acting Director of Education has advised me that the hon. member is under a misapprehension. It is not the practice of the Education Department to send very young girls from the college to one-teacher schools.

No girl has been sent from the college to a one-teacher school during the past two years at least.

Of 120 one-teacher schools now open, 10 only have women teachers; and with one exception, these are mature women with long experience. The exception is a young woman who, at her own request as well as at the request of the local parents and citizens' association, was left in charge of the junior classes when the older pupils were taken to an outer metropolitan high school.

Practical considerations necessitate the appointment of girls from the college to country schools with more than one teacher. In a two-teacher school, for example, the appointment of a male assistant to take charge of the infant classes would be most undesirable. If girls from the college were given metropolitan appointments on completion of their course they would still get married and difficulty would be experienced in staffing country schools. Admittedly there is a lot of loneliness for young teachers in many country centres. In some cases parents and local associations could do much more to help young teachers to feel at home and adjust themselves to local conditions.

The only remarks to which I have omitted to reply are those of Mr. Roche, who spoke today. He referred to so many matters that I could not hope to reply to him now. I can assure him that notice will be taken of his speech, and it will be referred to the various departments. On receipt of the replies, I shall forward them to the hon. member.

It will be readily agreed that I have covered fully the main points which have been raised. If I am made aware of any others on which information is desired by members, I will obtain it for them.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

Presentation of Address.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, resolved:

> That the Address be presented to His Excellency, the Lieut.-Governor and Administrator by the President and such members as may desire to accompany him.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

1, Gas Undertakings Act Amendment. Received from the Assembly. (Hon. F. R. H. Lavery in charge.)

2. Traffic Act Amendment (No. 1). Introduced by Hon. A. R. Jones.

3, Licensing Act Amendment (No. 2). Introduced by Hon. N. E. Baxter.

4, Sex Disqualification (Removal). Introduced by Hon. Sir Charles Latham.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

MOTION—WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

To Inquire by Select Committee.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [8.15]: I move—

> That a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the war service land settlement scheme in Western Australia and to recommend such changes in procedure and methods as may seem desirable to ensure the early success of the scheme.

I have in mind that it is not quite four years since a select committee's report on this subject was presented to another House, and it might seem to some members that the request for another select committee at this stage is unwarranted. But if members realise that most of the complaints raised at that time in regard to war service land settlement are still being made today, I think they will agree that there is need for another committee to find out why those disabilities are still being suffered by the settlers, even though they were reported on four years ago.

Furthermore, the Central Council of the War Service Land Settlers' Associations endeavoured to interview the Minister in charge of the scheme and discuss various aspects of it with him. In that connection they made a written determination and presented it to the Minister about a week before the deputation was arranged. On the Minister receiving the deputation, he asked the members to withdraw the first paragraph of the written determination. They refused to do so, and thereupon the Minister declined to listen to any of the complaints of the deputation. Naturally the proceedings bogged down; and, without discussing any details, the deputation departed.

Whether the Minister was right in refusing to hear what the deputation had to say because it would not withdraw that paragraph, or whether the deputation was wrong in not withdrawing it, I will leave members to decide. I intend to read the paragraph in question and members can then make their own decision as to who was right and who was wrong. The paragraph reads—

> The Central Council of the War Service Land Settlers' Associations believes that as a result of the failure of both Federal and State Governments to honour their undertakings to ex-servicemen, many settlers under the war service land settlement scheme will face certain failure unless a drastic and comprehensive scheme of rehabilitation is instituted immediately.

Had I been on the deputation and asked to withdraw that paragraph, my first reaction would have been that if I did so my case would break down immediately.

I think that was the attitude of the members of the deputation. It was their complaint that the scheme had broken down because of the failure of the Federal and State Governments to honour their undertakings, and to withdraw that statement would have been to weaken their case.

On the other hand, I can understand the Minister contending that the scheme had not broken down, and that unless the deputation withdrew the statement he would not listen to them. There seems to have been stubborness on both sides. Nevertheless, had the deputation withdrawn that statement, that withdrawal would definitely have weakened their case. I intend to read the whole of this written determination because it will give members some idea of what was in the mind of the central council. The statement continues—

> While it is admitted that a number of settlers who were allotted good farms early in the scheme have been successful, there are still very many settlers, on substandard farms, whose position, without some drastic alleviation, is hopeless.

I might say there is no argument about the statement made in that paragraph. Many of the settlers who were fortunate enough to be allotted a farm prior to or during 1951, and were able to take advantage of prepared farms and the high values that operated in those years, did come out right on top. But those who, in recent years, have been allotted farms, find themselves in an entirely different position.

What is more, the earlier settler, before he was allotted a farm, was given the details in brochure form, of all the farms that were available, and what was required and what had to be paid. Under the new scheme, the settler who applies for a block does not know the terms and conditions and what he has to pay. It is not easy for him to make up his mind whether he is doing the right thing or otherwise. This statement goes on to say—

> It is believed that the present position stems from the failure of the administration to carry out the cardinal principles of the scheme that farms should be written down at the outset to a level at which a settler can make a reasonable living.

This of course could be subject to argument. But we have to remember that there has been a lowering of the standards in regard to what is necessary for a successful farmer and settler, and there has been a definite departure from the original principle of how a farm should be assessed. There has been a definite change from the 1947 idea. This statement continues—

> It was laid down in the original agreement between the Commonwealth and the State "that in regard to the values for allotment officers shall have regard to the need for the proceeds of the holding (based on conservative estimates over a long-term period of prices and yields for products) being sufficient to provide a reasonable living for the settler after meeting such financial commitments as would be incurred by a settler possessing no capital."

That was the original basis in 1947; and I might say that approximately 90 per cent. or more of the settlers being settled today applied for blocks under those conditions. They had their names down for blocks ever since 1948 and 1949, and some of them still have not received land. They applied under those conditions; yet, today, if they were to receive a property they would have to sign an agreement embodying the 1954 conditions. The fact must not be lost sight of that they applied under the old conditions. Continuing to read this document—

> In conformity with this policy the department, when throwing open the earlier quotas of farms, published in the "Government Gazette" the values and rentals of the farms, while the brochures contained a list in respect of each farm of the proposed additional improvements to be carried out. Prospective settlers were, therefore, in a position to assess the financial prospects of the property at the time of allotment and make some kind of estimate of the final valuation. These settlers were thus in a position to contest attempts by the Government to impose excessive valuations when the final valuations were made.

I might interpolate here that a lot of these farmers having been given final valuations found that the valuations were not in keeping with the agreement. On the department being pressed to give the figures on which the valuations were based, it was unable to do so. In quite a number of cases that came to my knowledge, the final valuation had been decreased because of the inability of the department to live up to the figure supplied in the first place. The statement continues—

> No such initial values were given in the case of later allotments—mostly under-developed properties in the wheat and sheep areas and farms in the project areas. In these cases settlers had to rely on little more than a verbal assurance that they would be treated fairly. Although Federal and State Ministers claim that these later farms are still being valued under the principles of the old agreement, the treatment of these settlers bears not the slightest resemblance. In addition, settlers allotted farms in the latter part of the scheme are to receive a lease which is believed to be less favourable than that issued to the earlier settlers.

I have a copy of both leases. If members would like to peruse them, they will find that some of the conditions laid down in the later agreement are harsher than those in the original agreement. Continuing to read from the statement—

> The original Commonwealth-State agreement provided that rent should be "calculated at 2½ per cent. on the value of land and non-structural improvements owned by the Crown". On this basis interim valuations which have been issued to settlers in some of the project areas place values in excess of £25 per acre for land carrying not more than a sheep to the acre. There are many more settlers who are not sufficiently advanced to receive even an interim valuation and do not appear likely to receive one for many years yet.

In this regard I know there are some settlers who have been on their properties for four or five years—and in two instances for six or seven years—and they have still not been granted a lease, although they have had an interim lease which, actually, I have not seen; and whether it is a letter from the department, or what form it takes, I do not know. Surely it is only right that a settler on taking over a block should know the terms and conditions of what he has to pay, because until such time as a lease is signed these men are afraid that any equity they have put into their places could be easily lost. That is a fear they have, and I think they have some justification for holding it. The statement continues—

> As a means of restoring the W.S.L.S. scheme to the basis originally intended and promised to settlers, the Central Council of War Service Land Settlers' Associations urges:—
>
> (a) that settlers dissatisfied with their valuations be given the right to appeal to a valuations appeal board consisting of one representative of the Minister, one representative elected by the settlers and a chairman who shall be a practical farmer and mutually acceptable to both parties.

Members will recall that last year this House disallowed a regulation dealing with the appeal board. We tried to give some instruction to the Minister in charge of the Bill to set up a better type of appeal board. Members will recall that the appeal board as set up consists of the Minister's representative, a member of the R.S.L. and a police magistrate. The position is that no settler can, of his own volition, appeal against any of the decisions of the board. It is not until the Minister himself decides to agree that the settler can have the right of appeal; and naturally enough that is a case of Caesar going to Caesar, because he would only be appealing to the same board that laid down the conditions in the first place. So there was some justification for the central council asking for a different set-up from the appeal board.

I know one case where the settler has been trying for three years to get some final valuation of his property. It was given to him three years ago, but he protested and appealed. Yet after three years of negotiation he has still not been able to go to an appeal court and make his appeal in the correct manner, and is still waiting for a final decision on his original appeal. That should convince members that some set-up is necessary to give this man a better opportunity of appealing against valuations or other decisions of the board.

I do not think that the three members of the board should be permanently appointed. I think two should be appointed permanently and the third should come from the district concerned in the appeal. That would enable somebody with a knowledge of the district and its local conditions to assist the other members in coming to a final decision. That idea would work out much better for everybody concerned, and I am sure that there would be no trouble in finding, in connection with each appeal, a reputable farmer who had lived in the district for a good many years and who would do the right thing, irrespective of whether the appeal was decided in favour of the settler. I shall now carry on with the statement, which reads—

> (b) That such valuations appeal board, in assessing values, be guided by the principles laid down in the original war service land settlement agreement.
>
> (c) That where allotment valuations have been issued, final valuations shall not exceed the initial value plus the value of the additional improvements effected by the Crown since allotment plus survey fees.
>
> (d) That amounts in excess of the valuations assessed by the valuations appeal board be written off as provided for in the war service land settlement agreement.
>
> (e) That where Rural & Industries Bank officers have declared properties insufficiently developed to be carried by the bank, a vigorous policy of development be instituted to bring these properties up to the required standard.

The same thing is happening today. The Rural & Industries Bank is refusing to take over properties because in the opinion of the bank the development of those properties is not sufficient for the settlers to carry on economically. Yet the Land Settlement Board expects these men to take over the lease of their properties

and carry on while the bank refuses to accept a similar responsibility! That should be sufficient evidence that some of these properties have not been developed to a stage where they are an economic proposition.

I know of instances where some of these settlers have, over the last four or five years, been trying to make their properties into an economic proposition, and the standard of living of some of the settlers and their families is pretty low. The report goes on—

> (f) That all settlers receive the same lease as that issued to the earlier settlers.

There may be some argument against that, because the original Act has gone by the board and new legislation is now on the statute book.

> (g) That a committee including a practical dairy farmer be appointed to inquire into the numerous failures in the dairying and tobacco industries and to make recommendations for the rehabilitation of these settlers.

In regard to the last two items, Mr. Willmott asked some questions the other day as to the number of tobacco growers who had left their farms. The answer was 29. That in itself is sufficient proof that there is something wrong with this scheme so far as the tobacco growers are concerned. I have been informed, and I think the information is correct, that 93 dairy farmers have left the properties which were originally allotted to them under the war service land settlement scheme. This again is proof that there is something wrong with the scheme, and I think members should be given an opportunity to inquire into the reasons why these men have left their farms. If we could do that we would know the truth and would be able to discuss the whole question.

After all, we are responsible members of Parliament, and we have to make the laws. Surely we are entitled to make sure that the laws we pass, in this and another place, are carried out as was intended by the legislation! The only way we can find out the position in regard to this matter is to have a further inquiry. This statement continues—

> Surplus machinery: Would it be possible for the Land Settlement Board to give details from time to time of surplus machinery to this association to be passed on to the various affiliated associations and for W.S.L.S. to have preference in purchasing this plant?

I do not know whether I am right, but I believe that there have been one or two clearing sales of surplus machinery belonging to the War Service Land Settlement Board. It seems rather strange, as the board had this machinery in its possession, that it put it up for auction willy-nilly without offering it to the settlers in the district. Continuing the statement—

> Rentals: These are considered to be too high and there appears to be a marked disparity between developed and project area properties.

That would be because the developed areas should be able to carry a higher rental than the project area blocks. But apparently the rental on the blocks in these project areas is gradually increasing, until it has reached or is reaching the same level as the rental for the other blocks.

> Carrying capacity: This appears to be too high at 2-3 sheep per acre, particularly in the Rocky Gully area and some consideration is requested here.

I have one report with me which states that when some of these farms are brought up to standard, a 1,500 acre property will carry 1,500 sheep plus 100 head of cattle. It seems to me that the rental and the final valuation will probably be made on what these farms will produce in the future. Who can tell what a farm will produce in the future? I think we should be practical about a situation such as this and find out the conditions under which the farmer is working today.

We have also to take into consideration the number of years it has taken to develop the property to that extent in order to arrive at some price structure and a final valuation. When we hear of a valuation of £25 an acre for some of these places, it would seem that it is too high. I am certain that unless these properties are brought up to a very high standard—and that cannot be done for five, six or maybe 10 years—that carrying capacity can never be reached. This report continues—

> Principle of disallowing concessions: Settlers placed prematurely on lease through economic pressure with as few as 250 sheep were charged a high proportion of super, rent, interest and principal repayment. When it became impossible to pay these, the "assessment" scheme was introduced. It is understood, however, that any accumulated debts are to be a permanent debit against the settlers' accounts, and it is requested that the "assessment" scheme be made retrospective with the object of alleviating the settlers' financial position. In the event of a disputed assessment would it be possible for an independent assessor to be made available?

Again, in this respect, I consider a local farmer with many years of experience of local conditions would be the right man to give some advice about a final determination and an assessment of those conditions. I quote from this statement again—

> Dairy farmers: Particulars of how the living allowance for dairy farmers is arrived at.

Machinery pool: It is requested that machinery pools be established in the Narrikup and Denmark areas.

Knowing the difficulties in this regard, I think some inquiry is necessary before a recommendation can be made.

Accounts: It is requested that accounts be submitted to settlers within 30 days of the 30th June and the 31st December.

That is merely a machinery provision and would not take up much time.

I would now like to refer to two statements made by the present Minister for Lands when he moved for the appointment of a select committee in 1952. In my opinion the same conditions apply today. The first reference is on page 1052 of Hansard, volume 2, 1952, and it reads—

> That the department was not carrying out promised improvements to properties; that there was insufficient development before placing settlers on those properties; that the properties and settlers were handed over to the Rural & Industries Bank prematurely. This was all declared to be true in May, 1950.

That is exactly what I said earlier and it is the same as is happening today, four years after the recommendation was made and the report asked that something be done about it. On page 1053 the present Minister stated—

> I am sure it would be found that many settlers are credited with pasture development they do not in fact possess, and that they are expected to continue this developmental work themselves at their own expense, and later, under the new system, to interpret valuations made by the Minister. I will deal with this aspect later. These men who are expected to do this extra developmental work themselves at their own expense will, because of the increased value of their farms, be compelled to pay a higher rent on their own labours.

Members will recall the debate which took place in this House last year and the questions which were asked. We members of the Country Party had some fears in regard to the amount of work a settler had done on his property: we thought that in the final assessment he would be charged for his own work. So conditions today are exactly the same as they were in 1952. If the conditions were such as warranted an inquiry then, conditions today also warrant some inquiry, because after four years something should have been done about it.

I had the opportunity of meeting the Wagin settlers the other day. I suppose there were 30 or 35 men in the hall, and approximately 15 of them had grievances of some sort or another. I do not want to go into those grievances in detail, but the fact that 15 out of 35 had grievances —and the cases they put up to us were genuine enough—proves that some inquiry is necessary to straighten out the position. Maybe they are only trivial in the minds of the members of the War Service Land Settlement Board, but in the minds of the settlers they are important.

One of the worst features is that these fellows still do not have their leases, although they have been on their properties for some years. They are worried about their final valuations and what they will eventually have to pay. They are wondering whether they will get any reward for all the work they have put into their properties.

Nobody will argue that the original conception of the scheme was bad. As a matter of fact, in its original conception it was a good scheme; and had it been carried to fruition, there would not have been many complaints about it. It has been said, in their criticism, that the scheme now, particularly in the project areas, is almost what amounts to a confidence trick. I for one, do not like statements like that to be made. But apparently the settler who made it was dissatisfied with some part of the scheme, and there is only one way to prove him right or wrong—that is to have an inquiry and let him give evidence before the committee.

The cardinal principle of the original scheme was that the farm had to be an economic unit from the start. It appears to me, however, that too many of them were allotted before the required standard was reached. As I said earlier, it means that if a settler is going on to a projected area that has no initial valuation, he starts at a great disadvantage. I claim that too many of the properties are being valued at what they may produce in the future rather than on their productive value today.

One area that was brought to my notice is divided into five different farms, the first of which was the old original homestead. This was taken out of the area, and the settler was doing quite well. It was carrying about 1,100 sheep, and it comprised about 1,500 acres. The other four blocks are still almost in their virgin state, despite the fact that they have been allotted to settlers. Accordingly, what hope has any settler of trying to make a living under such conditions?

Another area has, I think, reached the point where £28,000 has been spent on about 1,500 acres, and yet not one hoof of stock has been carried on it. I believe the same area has cost at least £6 an acre for grubbing poison out. That seems to me to be ridiculous when one considers the methods used in handling poisons in these days. It could be done much cheaper. All these charges will be made against the block. If it is not all charged to one

party, it will be split up and spread over among the others under the new system. Naturally any extravagances such as these are frowned on by the settlers.

On one occasion a settler offered to take the risk, buy some ewes, and put them on land on which there was poison; but he was told that if he did so he would have to take the entire risk and, apart from that, would have to pay 4½d. a head in addition for agistment. These things may seem small to members, but when they are taken together they reach considerable proportions and it is most frustrating for the settler to sit around and wait. It is 10 years since the war ended, and these men are not getting any younger. They want some guarantee as to where they are eventually going. So the longer the scheme is delayed, the longer they will wait for their valuations and leases.

The Minister for Railways: What is the income of the settlers who are not running any stock?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know; that is what I want to find out.

The Minister for Railways: Are they not employees of the Land Settlement Board?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In the time available to me I was not able to get those particulars, and that is the reason why I want an inquiry into this matter.

The Minister for Railways: A man has done well if he can live for 10 years on a property that has carried nothing on it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is the story given to me. Whether it is all a fact or not, I do not know. There was another complaint brought up in regard to the purchase of stock; actually there were two complaints. The first was that the quality of stock was poor. Anybody who runs a farm will appreciate the fact that it will not help at all if one puts poor stock on to one's property. It takes at least four to five years before it is possible to get any decent stock. It may be all right if one proposes to get rid of them quickly. But bad stock are still bad stock two years hence, if they were not good in the first place.

The other complaint referred to the purchasing of stock at the wrong time of the year. If a man is going in for woolgrowing, and stock is purchased straight off the shears, it means he has no income for 12 months. This stock can be purchased for the same price six months later.

There is another instance of stupidity which comes to my mind, and that is in relation to a settler who had a one-ton truck on his farm. This man had 30 tons of super sent out to him in one lot six months before he required it. He had to handle all that super with a single one-ton truck, and this had to be done speedily in case the railways charged demurrage on it. In the case of two other farms that have been re-subdivided the settlers were promised that 500 acres would be left in a mowable condition, that another 500 would be partly cleared, and all of it would be laid down to pasture. It was anticipated that those pastures would carry 1,500 sheep plus 100 head of cattle. That is rather ambitious and I do not think it would be possible.

The point is that, despite the fact that settlers were promised that 500 acres would be left in mowable condition, one of them has informed me that much of his land will have to be levelled and reploughed before it can be left in a mowable condition. It seems to me there is a considerable time between the time the promises are made and the time the work is carried out, and the settlers are naturally frustrated and wish to know when the job will be done.

Under the agreement we find that the powers in regard to control of the area are vested in the Minister. These settlers are selected by the War Service Land Settlement Board as suitable types of men to carry on work as land settlers. Surely they should have the right to run their own farms after they have been selected by the board as suitable men, and after their value and qualities have been assessed! Unfortunately, however, they do not have this right; under the provisions of the lease agreement, the Minister has control over all of them. The Minister generally delegates his authority to the man in charge of the district and we often find the supervisor of the district concerned endeavouring to tell the farmer what he should or should not do.

Hon. L. C. Diver: One of the supervisors told me he was going to kill the suckers with super.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Many of these settlers know more about farming than the supervisor.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Who were the suckers?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have quite a considerable amount of correspondence with these people to which I would like to refer, but unfortunately I have not got it with me at the moment. However, I think I have given the House and the Minister sufficient reasons why a select committee should be appointed to inquire into all the ramifications of this scheme. After having spent six months on a select committee which was eventually appointed an honorary royal commission, I would be the last to tackle this job unless it were warranted.

I would like to point out that the Minister in charge of the war service land settlement scheme has assured me that he would not oppose my motion for a select committee, and that he would be only too willing to offer any assistance I may require in this direction. That is the correct approach. It is possible that the Minister may feel

that there are some faults and shortcomings in his department and he would like to know what they are. I hope the House will give the motion speedy treatment because time is getting short. If a select committee is appointed, I would get on to the job right away and report to the House without delay.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [8.57]: I formally second the motion; and in doing so, I would like to endorse the remarks made by Mr. Logan. He mentioned that the early settlers went on to properties which were more or less fully developed. In other words, they had been cleared; they were sweetened land. The latter-day settlers—those since the 1950's—have gone on to new projects which have had to be cleared. They have had many difficulties to face, and the result has been that the land on which they have settled is what is commonly known as sour land; and it would take at least five years to sweeten it.

It is ridiculous for the Land Settlement Board to envisage the carrying of 1,500 sheep and 100 head of cattle on 1,500 acres of that type of land in a period of ten years. Any farmer with experience would know that it would be impossible to take a property such as that and run that amount of stock on it in 10 years' time. These farmers find themselves in a most unenviable position.

As Mr. Logan said, under the terms of the Act when a settler was placed on one of these properties it was considered to be an economic proposition. But that has not been the case, as I believe you yourself know, Mr. President. Quite a number of these properties, particularly those in the Many Peaks, Rocky Gully and the Mt. Stirling areas, were far from economic propositions when the settlers went on to them. They may just as well have gone on to virgin land.

It means that they have to meet their rentals out of the proportional payments on their stock, machinery and sheds that are erected on their properties. These amounts are considerable, particularly with the small income coming in from the property. I cannot envisage how those settlers are able to meet those demands; and I think it has been proved that they have not been able to do so. That means that they have incurred a debt which they will carry for many years.

They feel that they have been done an injustice. When they applied, they were unable to be given more developed areas, and finally they had to take these areas which I have mentioned and have suffered a great disadvantage. So as can be imagined, they feel very sore about it. I think most members in the Chamber, excepting the new ones, will remember the wrangle in 1954 about the alterations in the conditions of the leases and the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. They will remember that the Country Party members, together with some other members, were very strong in their views on the subject, because we knew what was happening and what was going to happen, particularly in regard to some of the settlers.

The Minister for Railways: Has the question been raised in the Federal Parliament?

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Not to my knowledge. Mr. Logan also mentioned that the Rural & Industries Bank had refused to take over some of these properties. Naturally it would. The security from the point of view of the Rural & Industries Bank does not exist, when we consider the original or capital value of the property to the Government. When asked for money to finance carrying on and development, naturally the Rural & Industries Bank will not play ball on some of the properties.

A settler who wanted to put stock on his property was mentioned by Mr. Logan. I know of a case a few years ago where an applicant requested that the department let him put on the property sheep to be paid for out of his own funds. He had quite a fair account then. The department said he could do so, provided he paid agistment fees of 4d. per head. I think it is a ridiculous attitude when an allottee wishes to put stock on a property and the War Service Land Settlement Board would rather let the feed go to waste than let him put stock on the property and perhaps gain some little advantage which would also be to the advantage of the department in the long run.

The Minister for Railways: It was not his property at that stage.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: But it would have been in the long run. The same property was overrun with rabbits, and no effort was made by the War Service Land Settlement Board to do anything about it. Also, to the settler's dismay there was quite a considerable amount of poison in one part of the property, which he had to overcome himself at a cost of hundreds of pounds. This was at a time when sheep could be purchased at £2 per head; yet 12 months later they were £7 or £8 per head.

This settler has battled on and come good. He is not in a marvellous financial position today, but it is through his own efforts that he has got anywhere. Of course, he was at a disadvantage when compared to the earlier settler on a more economic proposition.

I am concerned about the settlers on the new properties. This land has to be developed from virgin country, and the chaps will have to struggle for 20 years if the price of wool drops further. The Minister indicated that it is rising, but it could take a slump; and then where will

these people be? They will not be able to meet their commitments. The motion moved by Mr. Logan is necessary. We should have a select committee to inquire into the ramifications of war service land settlement and I trust the House will support the motion.

On motion by the Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

MOTION—JURY ACT.

To Inquire by Select Committee.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [9.5]: I move—

> That a select committee be appointed to consider and examine the Jury Act, 1898-1953, and to recommend such amendments as may be considered necessary or desirable in the light of present-day conditions and requirements, particularly with respect to—
>
> (a) qualification, disqualification and exemption of jurors;
>
> (b) the question as to whether, and if so, on what conditions, women should serve on juries.

May I say at the outset in introducing this motion that I am not in any shape or form opposing the principle of jury service, but am asking members to give it consideration. I consider there are grave inconsistencies in a very important Act. It would be as well briefly to examine from our own point of view just when jury service was developed in British-speaking countries. Whilst I have done a great deal of research on the matter, it is almost impossible to trace the exact date of the introduction of jury service as we know it now. The textbooks that I have examined lead me to believe that it goes back to the time of the Normans.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: There were no women on juries in those days.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Jury service as we know it in Western Australia was introduced some years prior to 1898. The first Act on the statute book of this State was included in that year, and I think that when members look at the Act, a copy of which I have in my hand, they will agree with me when I say it is archaic, positively and absolutely. In one expression, it refers to the colony, whereas we know, of course, that Western Australia is no longer a colony.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: When did it cease to become a colony?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When the Federal Government took it over. Do not cross-examine me! I think that for the purpose of introducing this motion, it would be desirable for me briefly to refer to certain sections of the Jury Act; and in the first place, I refer to Section 5 and Section 6. Section 5 deals with qualifications and liability to serve as common jurors, and it says—

> Every man between the ages of twenty-one years and sixty years residing within the said Colony, and who shall have within the Colony, either in his own name or in trust for him, real estate of the value of fifty pounds sterling, clear of all incumbrances etc. shall be qualified and liable to serve as a common juror.

I lay emphasis on the words "qualified and liable to serve as a common juror."

Section 6 deals with those people who are eligible to serve as special jurors; and as members know, the property qualification for a special juror is £500 as distinct from £50 in the case of a common juror. Members also know that a common juror is called for the purpose of treating indictable offences and a special juror for the purpose of assisting the judge, for example, to assess damages. The common cases are contrary to indictable offences.

The Minister for Railways: The mere possession of £500 would not mean that a man was more qualified.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Minister will help me by interjections of that nature. I quite agree with him, and I think it would be appropriate for me to read a portion of Section 6 to show how ridiculous it is as compiled at the moment. It reads—

> (1) Subject to the exception hereinafter contained, every man between the ages aforesaid and residing as aforesaid, who is a Justice of the Peace, or is a bank director, or is a merchant not keeping a general retail shop, or who has within the Colony—

and then it goes on with the property qualifications for a person to be qualified and liable to serve as a special juror. I do not think it requires much examination to see how ridiculous in these enlightened times it is for a qualification for a special juror to be allowed to remain on that basis. Of course, the very question of special jurors is one which is the subject of a great deal of argument in various quarters, and I think it would be interesting for us also.

I will now turn to the common jury and how the list of jurors or the jury book is compiled. It is provided for in Section 9 of the Act. Section 9 says this—

> The resident or Police Magistrate of each district of the Colony, or (during a vacancy in that office) some other person to be appointed for that purpose by the Governor for the time being shall, on or as soon as may be after the first day of January in every year after the passing of this Act, prepare or cause to be prepared a

> suitable number of lists of all persons qualified and liable to serve on juries pursuant to the provisions hereof . . .

It goes on to say how the list shall be compiled and it refers to the Second Schedule of the Act; and this schedule is the pro forma of the jury book. The declaration that the magistrate makes is this—

> I hereby declare and aver that the above list contains, to the best of the knowledge, information and belief of the greater part of the magistrates at the special sessions holden for revising the jurors' lists, the names, qualities, and qualifications of all persons within the said district of
> who are qualified and liable to serve on juries according to the said Act . .

I cannot see how the resident or police magistrate would have the knowledge that he was signing a true statement of the facts. The Act provides under Section 9 that the resident or police magistrate shall make up these lists on or as near as possible to the 1st day of January each year. I have been down to the Supreme Court and have ascertained that the jury book contains the names of something fewer than 6,000 people between the ages of 21 and 60, as qualified by the Act.

If we look at the Year Book for 1956—I appreciate that these figures will include persons who are under the age of 21—we find that the male population of the State is 333,358, and the female population is 309,413. I do not know from these figures how many males there are between the ages of 21 and 60, but it would be reasonable to assume that at least 50 per cent. of them would come within those ages. If we work on that basis, we will come to the conclusion that 160,000 males are between the ages of 21 and 60, and those of them that have the meagre property qualification of real estate to the value of £50, would be eligible and liable to serve on the jury.

So it would appear—and I accept the reasonable excuse—that the jury lists have not been made up to date for quite a considerable time. I understand that the reason given for the jury book not being kept up to date from year to year is the expense involved and the shortage of members of the Police Force who undertake this work; and I accept that statement. But we see the difficulty being put forward. Members know that for the past three or four years we have had Bills in this House seeking to amend the Jury Act.

The Chief Secretary: You will have them again.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I hope the Chief Secretary does not mean that he is just going to dish up this hardy annual.

Hon. E. M. Davies: It says so in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so; but I hope that members, and the Government too, will consider there is some merit in the move I have made. Perhaps if we have another jury Bill it may not be the usual hardy annual, but something of use to the State. I do not think the Bills we have had previously would have been of any use; and, furthermore, I do not think that in the matter of application there would have been any commonsense to them.

From that point I would like to say that, working on the same basis of 50 per cent., there would be something like 100,000 to 120,000 females in Western Australia between the ages of 21 and 60 who, if the legislation that has come before the House had been agreed to would, in accordance with the Act, be qualified and liable to serve. What sort of a situation would we find ourselves in if such were the case? Members know that there are fewer than 6,000 male jurors listed in the jury book at the sheriff's office.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Pass the jury Bill and you will have 100,000 women on it.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They will be liable and eligible to serve; and then we have to get them on the jury book. Since no attempt has been made, for the reasons I stated a few moments ago—they are reasons which I accept—to increase the numbers on the jury list in recent years, what steps are we to assume would be taken as far as the female jurors are concerned? If it was intended to put them all on, then we would have the quite ludicrous situation of having over 100,000 female jurors to 6,000 male jurors.

If we have another look at the Act, we will find that when the jury book has been compiled and the necessary lists or notices have been posted giving opportunities for objections—I have not dealt with those people who are not liable to serve as there is such a long list of them, and most members know who they are; and that list narrows down considerably the field of male jurors—we find the situation that there is compiled in alphabetical order in the Supreme Court, the names of all the people, male and female, who would be liable to serve on juries.

Let us go a step further. This list is, we can assume, made up on the 1st January, 1957, or as soon thereafter as possible All indictable offences are required to be heard in the Criminal Court, and the sheriff has to get a jury. So he goes through the actions provided for in the list and draws out the names in alphabetical order, and calls the number prescribed for in the Act by way of summons.

On the basis I have mentioned, of 100,000 women and 6,000 men—Provided they are eligible; and a lot would not be—would not the number of women who

would serve on a jury be quite out of proportion to the number of men who would serve? Surely members would agree that a situation like that would be quite unreasonable. It is with one of these objects in mind that I hope we can do something about this question.

I trust we shall have an inquiry so that people who are able to give evidence and express their views on the question can be a guidance to the committee. A subsequent report could be submitted to Parliament and members could then view the question from quite outside a parochial or party point of view. For the good of the State some recommendations could be incorporated in a Bill to alter this archaic jury system that we now have.

There is no necessity, I think, for me to say a great deal more. I know it has been the desire of some members here to see women included on juries. Members know that I have supported that contention when the Bills have been presented. I do not depart from the principle that women should be entitled to serve on juries. I do not want it to be interpreted that the purpose of introducing the motion is to preclude or deny in any shape or form the opportunity or possibility of women being included as jurors. Far from it.

But I do want to see us evolve in this State a jury system which will be equitable from all points of view. If women are to serve on juries, then we should find out the conditions under which they are to serve. We have had the legislation before us, and we have heard a great deal of argument on it. I will not bore the House by going through the pros and cons again.

I have done quite a deal of research on the matter, and I notice that in the 1936-37 edition of the "Australian Law Journal" —I do not want members of the Labour Party to vote against my motion because I quote this—Dr. Evatt, when he was a High Court judge, dealt with the question of jury service. His statement is reported in vol. 10 of the "Australian Law Journal" for that year. He went through the jury service in each State and also as it applied to the Commonwealth. He said—

> The first time we knew we had any authority to appoint juries was by the Imperial Act of 1787.

He went on to say that the first Act that was introduced in New South Wales was later than that, but I just cannot find the year at the moment. He dealt with each State in the Commonwealth, and referred to Western Australia; and I found the reference an extremely interesting one. I felt, when going through it, that Dr. Evatt in his capacity as a High Court judge, did feel then that some revision of jury service was necessary.

I have introduced this motion in all good faith. I realise the work that is involved in these things, and I ask members to accept my statement that the motion has been brought forward in good faith in the hope that if the House agrees to the appointment of a committee, the investigation by that committee will result in recommendations that will be of such a nature that the Government will be able to forget these small Bills that have been brought down from time to time to amend the Jury Act—they are measures which cause quite a lot of dissension in certain circles—and that we shall be able to bring before this House and another place a measure that will bring the 1908 Jury Act more up to date with benefit for the State as a whole. I trust members will support the motion.

On motion by Hon. H. K. Watson, debate adjourned.

PAPERS—BETTING.

Applecross S.P. Shop.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [9.29]: I move—

> That the papers relating to the granting of a licence for the starting-price betting shop in Ardross-st., Applecross, with the exception of any report made to the Betting Control Board by the Commissioner of Police, be laid upon the Table of the House.

I asked this question of the Chief Secretary—

> Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House the papers relating to the granting of a licence for the starting-price betting shop in Ardross-st., Applecross?

The reply I received was as follows:—

> No. The file will be made available to the hon. member at the Minister's office as it contains personal reports of a confidential nature.

I appreciate the Minister's offer to let me see the file, but I am sure members will realise the position I would have put myself in if I had taken advantage of this offer. I would have found myself in the position that I had had conveyed to me, on a confidential basis, the papers referred to; and, in such a position, it would be impossible for me to refer to the contents of the file to anybody in this House or outside. Therefore, I did not accept the invitation that was extended to me by the Minister; and because it is necessary for me to have these facts tabled, I have moved this motion.

When I first asked for the information contained in these papers, the motion did not include the words which asked for

their tabling. In accordance with Standing Orders I amended the original motion, and the amended motion is now before us at the moment. I had a purpose in adding these words in relation to the tabling of the papers, because I had read the Betting Control Board regulations and found that in Section 19, Subsection (4), it says—

> A person shall not except in the course of his duty, pursuant to the provisions of the Act or the regulations for the time being in force, directly or indirectly communicate or divulge any information relating to any matter which comes to his knowledge by reason of a report being made to the Board by the Commissioner of Police.

I am not in the slightest bit interested in seeing any confidential report that has been submitted to the board by the Commissioner of Police. I would not, in any circumstances, expect to get it in relation to this or any other matter. I realise that when a confidential report is made by the Commissioner of Police on the record of any individual, it must be kept confidential in the interests of the public.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It is a privileged document.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; as Sir Charles has stated, it is a privileged document. Bearing that in mind, I want members to realise that I am asking only for the papers that refer to the granting of this particular licence for a betting shop. I cannot understand the answer to my question given by the Chief Secretary, namely, that the file contains personal reports of a confidential nature other than those to which I have referred. It is necessary for me, as briefly as I can, to trace the history surrounding the granting of this licence.

I think the first time that the residents of the Applecross district heard anything about this application for a betting shop was prior to the middle of February. When they did hear of it, they were greatly incensed—as the correspondence reveals—that the Betting Control Board was contemplating granting a licence for these premises. They started to protest in every way possible to prevent the licence being granted. They approached a great many people in order to bring that about, and they also held a protest meeting in Applecross on the 16th February, at which I understand 150 people were in attendance. Those present passed a resolution objecting to the establishment of this betting shop and requested that something be done to prevent the licence being granted.

On the 8th February a letter was sent by a Mr. Norris for and on behalf of the local residents whose signatures were attached to a long foolscap list which covered three pages. The opinions of the people of the district were also conveyed in a letter sent to the Betting Control Board on the 8th February, setting out the views of the residents. A similar letter was sent to Hon. H. H. Styants, Esq., M.L.A., on the 9th February, and another was sent to Hon. J. T. Tonkin, Esq., M.L.A., on the same date, pointing out the attitude of the people in the district and stating that they definitely did not want a betting shop established in their district.

On the 9th February the secretary of the Betting Control Board replied to Mr. Norris acknowledging the receipt of his letter and stating that he would be advised as soon as possible when his submissions were being put forward to the board. On the 14th Februray the Applecross Progress Association again wrote to the secretary of the Betting Control Board, pointing out that an emergency committee meeting of the association had been held, the members of which had set forth the objections which they had to the granting of the licence. They had also pointed out that the foreshore and the jetty were within 50 yards of the proposed betting shop; that Applecross was a venue approved by the Education Department for the holding of swimming classes; and, further, that the establishment of a betting shop on this site would considerably aggravate parking facilities for picnickers, swimming parties and so on.

Then, on the 14th February, the Applecross Progress Association wrote to the Melville Road Board, Hon. H. H. Styants as Minister, Hon. J. T. Tonkin, M.L.A., and to the secretary of the Betting Control Board, extending to those individuals—and, in the case of the Betting Control Board, to the chairman and the members of the board—an invitation to be present at this protest meeting which they planned to hold on the 16th February so that the views of the people in that district could be heard. On the 15th February, Hon. J. T. Tonkin, M.L.A., replied to the Applecross Progress Association and apologised for his not being able to attend, but said that he intended making an on-the-spot inspection with the Minister for Police and the members of the Betting Control Board on that very morning.

Later on the 17th February, a heading was noted in the Press, reading, "Mr. Tonkin Opposes Betting Shop." It went on to say that Mr. Tonkin was not in favour of the establishment of a betting shop in that particular place and that he would do everything possible to prevent its opening in the vicinity of the reserve and adjacent to the Applecross jetty. Also, on the 15th February, the secretary of the Betting Control Board wrote again to Mr. Hughes, the secretary of the Applecross Progress Association, acknowledging receipt of the invitation and stating that it

would not be possible for the chairman, Mr. Andersen, or the deputy chairman, Mr. Miller, to be in attendance at the meeting.

The Applecross Progress Association, on the 20th February, wrote a further letter pointing out that the protest meeting that was held—

> declares in writing its entire and unanimous opposition to the establishment of a betting shop on the proposed site at No. 3 Ardross-st., Applecross, and has decided that copies of the proposed resolution be sent to Mr. Tonkin, Sir Ross McLarty, Mr. H. H. Styants, Hon. W. Hegney, M.L.A., Hon. G. Fraser, M.L.C., the Chairman of the Betting Control Board, Mr. J. A. Hepburn, the Town Planning Commissioner, the Melville Road Board, candidates for election in the district, and Miss M. A. Fielman.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Did you say "candidate" or "candidates"?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is stated in the plural. Then the Applecross Progress Association, on the 20th February, sent to every member of the Melville Road Board a letter advising him of the motion that had been passed at the meeting. Following that, on the 22nd February, Hon. G. Fraser, M.L.C., wrote a letter. He said that he had received a communication from the Applecross Progress Association and had taken a careful note of the resolution unanimously agreed to by the ratepayers present and that he would communicate with them again as soon as possible. It was one of those non-committal letters which was not meant to get the Chief Secretary into trouble.

The Chief Secretary: He never gets into trouble, does he? Much!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Members will appreciate the feeling of the people in the Applecross district during the whole of this time. They had had a large meeting called by the progress association. They had made representations to every one they possibly could hoping to get some support to prevent the Betting Control Board establishing this betting shop on the site proposed, and they had even approached the Premier. However, it seemed that despite all their efforts the Betting Control Board intended to proceed to grant the licence. Then, on the 23rd February, 1956, Mr. W. L. Hughes, Secretary of the Applecross Progress Association, received a letter from the Premier which was headed—

> Re Protest Against Proposed Licensed Betting Premises at No. 3 Ardross-st., Applecross.

It then went on as follows:—

> I wish to thank you for your letter of Monday last in regard to this matter. I will make inquiries and will write to you again at a later date.

That letter was followed by another from the Premier dated the 13th March in which he said:

> Further to my letter of 23rd February last in this matter I would now advise, and you will be probably aware of this, that the owner of the proposed betting shop has decided not to proceed with its construction.

At that stage the people in Applecross were entitled to believe it was a closed book; that the construction of the betting shop was not going to proceed; that the representations they had made had been of value to them; and that everything was all right.

But everything was not all right. The building was proceeded with. Mr. Gaffy came into this matter and wrote to the Applecross Progress Association when he was a candidate for Parliament, and stated that he would do all he could to see that the betting shop was not established there. I believe he did that. I believe that other members of Parliament, in addition to Mr. Tonkin and the Premier, did all they could to see that the betting shop was not established there. But all was without avail, and the shop at present is operating.

On the 8th August, 1956, we saw in "The West Australian" that the Premier said he would not like to see betting shops near children's playgrounds. He was replying to a deputation of Applecross residents which objected to the site of the proposed betting shop near the Applecross jetty. The Premier does not want to see betting shops in areas such as this.

One of the highlights of this case was a letter which I must read out. It was subscribed by Mr. T. Andersen, Chairman of the Betting Control Board, and published in "The West Australian" of the 14th August, 1956. He set out why the Betting Control Board had seen fit to grant this licence, and this is what he said—

> From the doorway of the premises to the nearest point of the swimmers' changing room is just 200 yards; not a "few yards" as allegedly stated to the Premier, and published in your issue of last Wednesday. From the same point to the nearest point of the jetty is 89 yards. The shop is not visible either from the jetty or the change room. Where swimming takes place towards the end of the jetty on the farther side from the betting premises is at least another 100 yards farther away. There is no public access to the land at the rear of the betting premises or contiguous premises except by water.
>
> The hotel is about 150 yards away on the opposite side to the jetty and changing rooms. If Mrs. De la Hunty's fear regarding the proximity of the hotel to the reserve is supported by the powers that be in Applecross, why did they establish the reserve about 50 years after the hotel was built?

The certificate of registration of premises at 3 Ardross-st., Applecross, for the purpose of betting was granted on February 3, 1956, subject to the provision of premises of an area, together with suitable toilet accommodation for men and women, acceptable to the Betting Control Board and in all respects subject to the approval of the local authority. The latter gave its approval notwithstanding that some members afterwards denied knowledge of that fact. If there was widespread objection to the establishment of betting premises at this site instead of merely the opposition of two or three people on personal grounds, why did the local authority sanction the building?

It is not the policy of this board in granting registration of betting premises to commit the owner to expenditure, under agreement, of between £3,000 and £4,000 and then withdraw its approval, without very substantial reasons. The reasons given, so far, have been contrary to fact.

It should also be remembered that the Betting Control Board can only deal with premises which are the subject of an application. It cannot take the initiative and direct particular premises to be registered as betting premises without the consent of the owner.

After inspection of the premises concerned by all members of the board, it was unanimously agreed that there was no justification for rescinding its previous decision.

That would seem to be an irrefutable summary of the facts, but it would hold about as much water as a colander. Mr. J. E. Ellis, secretary of the Melville Road Board, replied to Mr. Andersen in "The West Australian" of the 27th August, 1956, by saying this—

I refer to a report made by the chairman of the Betting Control Board and published in your issue of August 14 in regard to the proposed betting shop at Applecross. It would appear that Mr. Andersen is very anxious to pass his problems to anyone who will accept them and in this case the Melville Road Board is not prepared to accept any mistakes that may have been made by the Betting Board.

The lot has been a business site for many years and the plans submitted for the shop complied with the building requirements. A permit was issued by the building surveyor in the ordinary way. Its use would not affect the issuing of a permit. It is therefore quite useless for Mr. Andersen to endeavour to pass it off on to the board. All the facts were investigated through the Local Government Department when the objection was first lodged by the residents of the area and it was found there were no omissions on the part of the Melville board.

The truth of the matter is this: I understand that an original licence was applied for in respect of these premises just after the Betting Control Act was passed. The original application to the Betting Control Board was refused. The premises that are situated at No. 3 Ardross Crescent, Applecross, are owned by a man who runs the tearoom there in conjunction with a store. The correspondence on the file which took place between the owner of the premises and the Melville Road Board indicates that the board had for some time been asking the owner of the premises to make renovations; otherwise the board would take steps to condemn the building because of its unsuitability for occupancy.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is the tearoom.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The shop on the corner. The hon. member knows that better than I.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I do not want it to be confused with the betting shop.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The betting shop is a new building. The person who owns the new premises made application to the Melville Road Board on the 17th January, 1956, for a permit to build a shop. To make sure that I could relate the facts reliably, I inspected the plans and specifications in the application made by the owner of the premises. Endorsed on the back of the plan are words to this effect: "The application to build a shop was granted subject to demolition of the old premises being completed within six months." That is endorsed on the back of the plan submitted by the owner to the Melville Road Board.

I ask whether members of the Melville Road Board were entitled to agree that the man wished to build a shop at No. 3 Ardross Crescent, to carry out the demolition of the old shop and to move into the new one. That was what the road board members thought. I am told they were given even more reason to think that when the person who owned the premises wrote and said, "I cannot carry out the demolition within the time you prescribe, and I would like an extension of time." The board gave him an extension of time.

Then we have the chairman of the Betting Control Board saying that the Melville Road Board knew all about this. In my mind I am quite satisfied that the board knew nothing about it. I am equally satisfied in my mind, and I am sure the Chief Secretary will agree, that the Melville Road Board had no alternative whatever but to grant the permit for the building of the shop to the man who applied for a permit to build, because these were the facts: The site upon which he wanted to build the shop was a gazetted shop site; the plan

he submitted to the board was consistent with the by-laws of the local authority. It showed a shop. It did not have to show a betting shop.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Surely they knew.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They did not know.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Could they not guess?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Why should they guess?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Did they not ask what type of business would be carried on?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: To replace another business premises.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Surely they used their imagination.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: They probably thought it was for the applicant's own use.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I appreciate the interjection by Mr. Heenan. It seems reasonable that they should guess. They did guess because they had correspondence on the file from this man which said, "Do not make me alter the premises. I am going to build a new shop. I know you have put on the back of my permit for the world to see, the words 'subject to demolition of old premises' ". They naturally guessed, or presumed—which is the word I prefer to use—that the man was going to move out of his shop into the new shop and carry on his busines from there.

Hon. F. D. Willmott: They guessed but guessed wrong.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: And as he said to the board, "I cannot get out within six months. I would like an extension of time."

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is that a grocer's shop?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is a tea-room and a grocer's shop.

The Chief Secretary: The Melville Road Board could not stop him building a new shop irrespective of whether the old one was demolished.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the Chief Secretary for this information. He has helped me considerably in my argument. As a matter of fact, I understand the owner has not yet fulfilled the endorsement that was placed on the back of the building permit, that being that he demolish the building within six months.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: That is because he has no need to.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Because he has no need to now. There is a betting shop in which the Melville Road Board thought the owner was going to conduct his ordinary business. To my mind, the bad feature is that responsible Ministers such as Mr. Tonkin, and even the Premier himself, wrote to these people and said, "You probably know this, but I want to inform you this man is not going on with the construction of this betting shop." For Mr. Tonkin to agree with that whole-heartedly and let the people think that the construction of the shop was not going on—

The Chief Secretary: He still does.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What does the Chief Secretary think?

The Chief Secretary: I shall tell you all about it very shortly.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Well, if he still does, I am pleased to know it. But Mr. Tonkin and the Premier must have known, too, that this licence was granted to this applicant on the 3rd February. It was already there; and yet people in Applecross could hold protest meetings and write to every Tom, Dick and Harry in the State —to members of Parliament and anybody they thought might be able to help them —in the hope that this betting shop would not be established there, and the Betting Board simply seems to have brushed aside their views and said, "There is a betting shop here, and that is all about it, and you can like it or lump it." That is a bad state of affairs.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: There is one point you have not made quite clear. When the original application for the shop—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member may be able to raise that point later.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is a constructive interjection, Mr. President.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I wish, Mr. President, that you would allow the hon. member to ask his question.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member can make his speech directly. Mr. Griffith may proceed.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The applicant shifted to Swanbourne.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know. I am not in the slightest concerned about individuals in this case—with the man who has the licence to run the betting shop, or the man who owns the building, or the fellow who originally applied. None of these things interest me from the point of view of bringing up their names in this House so that they can be repeated by the Press. That is not my object. My purpose is to ask this House to discuss the matter and vote for the motion I have placed on the notice paper that the papers be tabled.

The Chief Secretary: What are your reasons?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The reason is that the residents in the Applecross district feel that their representations, made

to all the people I have mentioned, have been completely fruitless. They feel they have not been informed correctly as to why this state of affairs was allowed to proceed in the way it did, and they consider they should still be able to make a protest and guard against a repetition of this kind of thing.

The Chief Secretary: Why didn't they go to the members for the district instead of to a member outside the district?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Because they did not get any help from the members for the district as far as I can understand. In that respect, I am subject to correction. The first letter that the Chief Secretary wrote to them could not be expected to fill them with a lot of hope.

The Chief Secretary: Forget about the Chief Secretary! There are other members for the district.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Would not the Minister agree that in the West Province the Chief Secretary is a very important member?

The Chief Secretary: I would not like to answer that. What about the other two?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think it is important to this debate to say whether those other members were approached or not, but I did mention that Mr. Gaffy played a part in it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is right.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When it was granted.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And he has played a good part since.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: And also since.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Mr. Lavery was not approached by letter or in person.

The Chief Secretary: They went to a member for another district.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am unaware of that fact.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is undeniable.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would not deny it, nor would I try to offer an excuse for the members of the Applecross Progress Association not going to the hon. member.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Is this area in your electorate?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Surely he has the right to protest! I think this merits a vote of no-confidence in the Government.

The Chief Secretary: I think it merits a vote of no-confidence against the Applecross people. They went to a foreigner and neglected their own representative.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know that the Chief Secretary's expression "foreigner" is purely colloquial.

The Chief Secretary: I meant to say to someone outside the area.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am completely unaware of why these people have not made a protest to other members; but I know that they got little or no support from those they did approach, and they approached the most responsible member of Parliament in the State—the Premier himself.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Don't you think they got any support from Mr. Tonkin?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He went out to the site and said, "I do not like this betting shop any more than you do".

Hon. E. M. Davies: I thought you wanted the file tabled.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Is the hon. member going to vote in favour of the motion?

Hon. E. M. Davies: I did not say what I was going to do.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not want to be parochial in this matter. I have tried to keep away from all forms of personality. It is just a matter that the residents of the Applecross district want ventilated, and they want to know why the Betting Board took up this attitude. When they found out that this licence was granted on the 2nd February, they want to know why they were very successfully hoodwinked over a period of time and did not discover till much later that the licence had been granted on the date mentioned. They did not find out, in fact, until it was far too late. For that reason I ask that the papers be tabled.

I would like to ask the Chief Secretary and other members why, if there is nothing on the file to hide, there should be any objection to allowing the papers to be tabled.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Why did your Government refuse to table papers for me?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If that is going to be the attitude, I know that in the eyes of the hon. member the case is doomed before it starts. Because one Government refuses to do something, he thinks that is sufficient excuse for another Government to make a refusal of the same kind.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Don't try to put words into people's mouths! I never said anything of the sort!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It appears to me to be like that. The hon. member asked why another Government refused to table papers that he asked for. I do not know what papers he is referring to. I do not think it is even competent to discuss them on this motion.

The Chief Secretary: I suppose they were papers referring to the hon. member's district, were they?

Hon. E. M. Davies: Yes.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know about them.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: He will be able to get them now if he wants them.

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

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: My word it is!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The people of Applecross want to see the situation in this case as it was from the start. I have particularly avoided asking for confidential reports to be laid on the Table. I do not want to see them at all, because I do not think they concern anybody in the case.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Don't you think it improper to bring up a matter like this which is outside your own district?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think so.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Are you legislating only for your own district? Certainly not!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think so. If members will recall, on the discussion we had in connection with the Betting Control Bill, I put forward a case, as strongly as I could, for what would have amounted to local option, with a view to giving the people in a district the right to say that they did not want a betting shop there.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Even so, you confined yourself to your own district.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Do I confine myself to my district in dealing with any matter pertaining to this notice paper, or when I cast a vote?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: That is not analogous.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course it is, on the question of war service land settlement, for instance.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: I would greatly resent it if you brought up something affecting my district.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot comment on that. I think it is competent to do so and that members will agree that one can bring up any matter he thinks fit.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is not etiquette.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Isn't it? I will give some illustrations from higher authorities than this House.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the hon. member were to make a study of Hansard he would find plenty of references to matters of all kinds that were brought up in this House by members whether they related to affairs in those members' districts or not.

The Chief Secretary: I could understand this if members for the district had refused to do this for the people. They could then go to someone else.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not propose to labour that point. I do not know why they did not go to the hon. member, except that they did not get much satisfaction from him earlier. All I know is that they asked that some action be taken because they did not expect to get the support they wanted, and I appreciated their point of view. They communicated not only with me, but also with the Town Planning Commissioner. They wrote to everybody they thought they could get some assistance from in order to prevent this from taking place.

The Chief Secretary: Their own member has helped them all the way through, but they did not request him to ask for the papers.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I regret that that set of circumstances occurred, but I do not think Mr. Lavery should be upset by it.

The Chief Secretary: I meant that the Assembly member had never been asked to secure the tabling of the papers.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is useless for me to stand here answering these interjections and saying the same thing over and over again. I only hope what the Chief Secretary has said will not be an excuse offered for not tabling the papers. I conclude on the note that I hope members will give the matter consideration. I have told them a story that I am sure they will agree needs investigation, and it is one I hope will receive it.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.