

That is a lovely thing to put in a letter! The boys are not even earning enough to live on, because they have to be kept by their parents, and yet the Minister wants to know why they have no motorcars. I do not know what they think we are in Collie, if they think we are going to swallow that. To continue—

My department will co-operate wherever possible by trying to so organise the classes attended by apprentices who do not have their own transport to enable them to travel at a time when apprentices from the same area with transport are doing so.

They want to climb on to the band wagon of somebody else, instead of meeting their own obligations, Mr. Speaker. They are dodging their obligations. The letter concludes—

Co-operation between the department, employers and apprentices could probably also assist in achieving considerable economies by the organisation of common transport for groups of boys in this way.

Your faithfully,
Minister for Education.

I think I have said enough to show there is a move on foot within the Education Department to centralise these things wherever possible.

I have already related what the Government did to Collie as a result of the last coal tenders. Anybody with a reasonable amount of gumption would think, "All right, we have done such-and-such a thing to Collie by taking away a certain thing. Now we will build on the buildings already at Collie, and we will set up the system which is to be adopted in Bunbury with regard to apprentices." It is no further for anybody to go from Bunbury to Collie than it is for somebody to go from Collie to Bunbury.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a question of going from Bunbury to Collie, or from Collie to Bunbury. You know that. There is Busselton to be catered for as well. It is further for Busselton people to have to go to Collie than if they had to go to Bunbury.

Mr. H. MAY: Very little. We would not get enough apprentices in Busselton to count on one hand.

Mr. Lewis: How many are there?

Mr. H. MAY: I asked the Minister that question, and he has not answered it.

Mr. Lewis: You answer the question.

Mr. H. MAY: Collie people are being forced to go to Bunbury. Up to date I have not received one word from the Minister in that respect. He is dodging it. I am not altogether blaming him. The only blame I can put on the Minister is that he has not seen through it. I am

going to tell the Minister that I have come to the conclusion there are some people in his department who are developing a tendency towards fascism. If ever I am able to find out who they are, I will not hesitate to tell the Minister and the House.

The Minister should safeguard everybody who comes under his jurisdiction. He should not favour one particular spot. I could go on and say that it is being done for political reasons.

Mr. Lewis: That is not worthy of you.

Mr. H. MAY: I shall have another half-hour speech to make later on in regard to another set-up, where Bunbury is being made the centre. A more inhuman set-up one could not imagine. I wish to move—

That I be given leave to continue my speech at the next sitting of the House.

Motion put and passed.

Debate thus adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 27th August, 1963

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : NINTH DAY— | |
| Speakers on Motion— | |
| The Hon. J. Heltman | 573 |
| The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery | 566 |
| The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs | 574 |
| The Hon. H. K. Watson | 578 |
| BILL— | |
| Marine Stores Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Com. | 561 |
| Report ; 3r. | 566 |
| MOTION— | |
| Town Planning and Development Act— | |
| Disallowance of Regulations Nos. 4 to 25 | 557 |
| QUESTIONS ON NOTICE— | |
| Drilling for Minerals—Drills Utilised, Results, and Cost | 556 |
| Local Government Act— | |
| Interpretation of Section 231 | 556 |
| Position of Main Roads Department Metropolitan Region Scheme—Effect of Adoption on Parliament House Site | 556 |
| Railway Transshipping Depot—Establishment at Coolgardie | 557 |
| Sulphur, Brimstone, and Pyrites— | |
| Norseman Pyrites | 557 |
| Prices | 557 |

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME

Effect of Adoption on Parliament House Site

1. The Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will the Minister inform the House what effect the adoption of the Metropolitan Region Scheme will have on Reserve A 1162, Perth Town Lot 55, Parliament House Site?
- (2) Will the scheme permit the Town Planning Authority, the Main Roads Department, the Public Works Department, or any other department or authority to use, without reference to Parliament, any portion of this site for any purpose other than in connection with parliamentary buildings?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) No direct effect, although the scheme shows the location of the Mitchell Freeway through the eastern part of the reserve. Construction on this alignment will be subject to such other approvals as are necessary.
- (2) No.

DRILLING FOR MINERALS

Drills Utilised, Results, and Cost

2. The Hon. D. P. DELLAR asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many drills are utilised by the Mines Department for the purpose of drilling for gold and other minerals?
- (2) What was the footage drilled for gold during the last financial year?
- (3) Were any encouraging results obtained from the holes drilled?
- (4) What expenditure was incurred in drilling for—
 - (a) gold; and
 - (b) other minerals; during the last financial year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Department owns 9 drills of various types.
- (2) One drill was loaned to Sons of Gwalia Ltd. during last financial year and drilled approximately 4,200 feet at cost of the company. In 1959 the department itself drilled for gold at four centres (Gt. Fingall, Coolgardie, Yilganie, and Meekatharra). 5,673 feet of drilling was then completed.

In 1960 further similar work was undertaken at Coolgardie and Meekatharra totalling 1,773 feet. In addition in 1960, the department met half the cost of 4,000 feet of drilling at the Western Queen gold leases at Day Dawn. In 1961, the department met half cost of drilling for gold at Widgeemooltha, Sons of Gwalia, Day Dawn, and Nullagine, the total depth drilled being 12,539 feet. In 1963, similar assistance was rendered to operators at Lawlers and Ashburton, the depth drilled being approximately 2,000 feet.

(3) Some encouraging results were obtained.

(4) No drilling by the department for gold has been done during 1962-63. Expenditure on mineral and water drilling during that year totalled £79,523 6s. 2d.

The bulk of the expenditure has been incurred on water drilling—a matter of considerable importance at this stage of the State's development—particularly in connection with domestic supplies for country towns and establishment of new industry.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Interpretation of Section 281

3. The Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Will the Minister give the House a ruling on the queries raised below on the meaning of section 281 of the Local Government Act—
 - (a) Subsection (1) (a) states that material may be taken for use of the council to be used within the district and within one mile of the land so entered upon. Does this mean that material must be used within one mile of a particular lot, or does it mean that if one owner possessed several lots extending many miles along a road material could be used one mile from any of them, even though it was taken from one at the extreme end of the lots?
 - (b) Is material used more than one mile from land entered upon subject to a royalty payment?
 - (c) If the answer to (b) is "Yes", is the royalty paid automatically, or has it to be claimed by the owner of the land?

Position of Main Roads Department

(2) Is the Main Roads Department subject to the Local Government Act?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) (a) The material must be for use within one mile of the land actually entered upon, i.e. within one mile of the point of entry.
- (b) Beyond one mile, there is no right of entry without either agreement or resumption action.
- (c) Any compensation, including the value of the materials where appropriate, would have to be claimed by the owner and would not be paid automatically.
- (2) The Main Roads Department has the powers of a local authority under the Local Government Act, but also has more extensive powers under the Public Works Act, and, as the Crown, has the right to take gravel, the property of the Crown, without paying for the material.

SULPHUR, BRIMSTONE, AND PYRITES

Prices

4. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What are the prices of imported—
 - (a) sulphur; and
 - (b) brimstone;
 to Western Australia?

Norseman Pyrites

- (2) What is the price paid for Norseman pyrites?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Sulphur and brimstone at works at today's cost is £14 2s. per ton.
- (2) Sulphur from Norseman pyrites after deducting Commonwealth bounty and State freight concession costs at works £18 17s. per ton.

RAILWAY TRANSHIPPING DEPOT

Establishment at Coolgardie

5. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

Has any decision been made regarding the request of the Coolgardie Shire Council to have the transhipping depot at Coolgardie, upon completion of the standard gauge railway?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No decision has been made but present indications are that Kalgoorlie will have to be the point of transhipment. A definite decision cannot be made until the route between Southern Cross and Kalgoorlie has been finalised.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Disallowance of Regulations Nos. 4 to 25: Motion

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West)
[4.39 p.m.]: I move—

That regulations Nos. 4 to 25 inclusive made under the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928-1962 as published in the Government Gazette of Tuesday, the 6th August, 1963, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 13th August, 1963, be, and are hereby, disallowed.

I move this motion because certain local authorities have had a look at these regulations and are concerned, indeed, inasmuch as when the Metropolitan Region Scheme was being formulated, local authorities had representatives to help in its compilation and did a great amount of work to get the original scheme ready for presentation to us at this particular stage.

However, when it came to the regulations, the local authorities were not asked to interest themselves as a body. It has been said, in answer to a question asked in another place and directed to the Minister for Local Government and Town Planning, that advice had been sought from several local authorities and from their legal advisers. That is not quite good enough so far as local authorities are concerned.

Those local authorities which have approached me claim they know nothing whatsoever of the formulation of these regulations. Those local authorities have problems, and they are going to be called upon to put town planning schemes into operation in their various districts. On the 26th August I received the following communication from the Cockburn Shire Council:—

As I am going on leave on Friday I enclose herewith all information relevant to Town Planning Regulations in *Government Gazette* No. 58 published on the 6th instant.

I now present to you a brief summary of administrative comments on the Regulations.

- (1) They have been done by an amateur which is a direct insult to Local Authorities generally. Perhaps the best way to study this is to look at the Planning Scheme Interpretations.

They are in the schedule of interpretations. The communication continues—

- (a) "An amenity building" is a lavatory.
- (b) "A car park" does not allow trucks or motor cycles to park.

- (c) "A petrol filling station" is not a petrol filling station if it does not sell automotive accessories.

These are not my own comments, they emanate from a prominent solicitor who has stated to me that they bear all the marks of an amateur.

- (2) There is an erroneous impression that objections are raised only to the current Regulations before the House. I have enclosed a copy of the original Regulations of 1931, which were also cumbersome. How cumbersome may be judged on our lack of success in the Gerald Road Scheme.

Suggestion:

It is suggested that Regulations be drawn up whereby Local Authorities can streamline local town planning schemes within the framework of the Regional Scheme to accelerate District Development.

Yours faithfully,

E. L. EDWARDES,
Shire Clerk.

The Minister cannot do anything but agree with me when this objection is raised by a local authority; because he knows only too well that this town planning authority has been attempting to put a town planning scheme into operation for more than 2½ years. It is not the Minister's fault altogether. I am not levelling accusations against the Minister on that score. I blame the various Government departments, about which I have complained previously, for lack of co-ordination.

This town planning scheme, which has been considered for more than 2½ years, is no nearer reality. To the best of my knowledge the Minister has not yet given preliminary approval to the scheme. The 1931 regulations were definitely cumbersome; but these are going to be extravagantly so. The shires concerned have sought opinions from a certain person. I have not been supplied with that person's name but he is an eminent figure in Australia regarding local government matters. The following letter has been forwarded to him:—

re: *Town Planning Regulations 1963*

On the 6th August, 1963 in the *Government Gazette* No. 58, Regulations relating to Town Planning Schemes prepared by local authorities were promulgated. The regulations outline the procedure to be adopted by local authorities, and at the same time provide a model text, and set out interpretations to be applied to schemes. The preparation of a Scheme is broken into stages, each of which

is subject to examination by the Town Planning Board, and approval of the Minister. The latter part of the regulations will be of considerable assistance to obtain uniformity in maps, symbols and interpretations, however, the procedure will involve far more administratively than is the practice at present. Experience to date in dealing with Schemes based on the previous regulations clearly shows that the new procedure will be lengthy and cumbersome.

Councils have over the past several years prepared and implemented a number of schemes for redevelopment of various parts of their Shires and will in the future undertake additional schemes as urban development spreads into the District and old subdivisions require alteration. The preparation of these schemes has been based on the existing regulations as gazetted in 1931 which has resulted in considerable delays and I may say some frustration, in passing through the lengthy procedure involved.

In the case of a disagreement with the Board, a Council has had very little say, as the usual reply received is that the scheme will not be recommended to the Minister until modifications are made as required by the Board, irrespective of the local considerations. There is a strong feeling that a local authority should have a right of appeal to the Minister or some other body in cases such as this.

In the opinion of this Council the regulations have been designed to subjugate local authorities to the Town Planning Board so that matters of town planning affecting local authorities and their respective districts will be subject to the Board's recommendation to the Minister from the very first stage. There is already a certain amount of discontent among local authorities at the interference of the Board in local planning affairs and the regulations will do nothing to ease this situation.

The disconcerting feature of the regulations is that local authorities were not made aware of their provisions until they appeared in the *Government Gazette* on the 6th August, 1963.

At the time that the Metropolitan Region Scheme was in course of preparation, for which purpose Local Government was organised into group committees, and played a substantial part, it was generally made known that as and when the Region Scheme was finalised the detailed planning of districts would be the responsibility of the respective local authorities. This responsibility was accepted by Local

Government, but the regulations now make it clear that any action taken by a local authority will be dependent on the Town Planning Board's recommendation to the Minister.

In effect, the initiative of Councils to proceed with redevelopment plans will be hampered by the lengthy procedure which it must now comply with to follow the regulations. One would have thought that these regulations would have been referred to the group committees of local authorities so that at least local government was given an opportunity to express its views as to the procedure which it was to be required to follow. This not having been done, it gives an impression that Local Government has been disregarded, and in effect is being told that should it want to delve in town planning for its own district development, it can only do so at the discretion of the Town Planning Board.

Councils concerned have already had a question asked in the House on the regulations and I set out the answer hereunder. These questions were directed to the Minister for Local Government on the 15th August, 1963:—

- (1) Before gazetting new regulations in respect to town planning on the 6th August, 1963, did he or the department of Town Planning have discussions with local authorities who may have been affected, or the Local Government Association?

- (2) If not, why not?

Answers:

- (1) The regulations which have been under consideration for several years have been discussed with a number of councils, and their legal advisers. The only material change from the 1931 regulations are the introduction of a model text standard notation and interpretations designed to simplify the local authorities' task in making town planning schemes, and in their administration.

- (2) Answered by No. (1).

The communication continues—

One must admit that there are a number of modifications in the new regulations on the 1931 set, but surely the opportunity could have been taken to simplify the procedure of the passage of schemes through to the Minister's final approval. During the course of preparation the scheme will be under the examination of the Town Planning Department on three different occasions, and lay on the

table of the Minister for his approval four times. It will be necessary for five advertisements to be inserted in the newspaper, and three advertisements in the *Government Gazette*.

All that means is that without any hold-up whatever it is estimated that for a local authority to put a scheme into operation will take at least 45 weeks from the commencement to ministerial approval.

From time to time we have heard Ministers, irrespective of political colour, praising members of local authorities for the wonderful job they have done and are doing. I believe that any local authority with sufficient courage should resign as a body if the members do not want to accept the regulations; because under these regulations they are just being wiped over completely. Mention is made of the 1931 regulations, but we are living in the year 1963, and if we want good men to stand for local government it is our duty to give them some incentive and not hamstringing them with regulations that were cumbersome 30 years ago, and are being made more cumbersome in the year 1963.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is purely a matter of opinion, of course.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In answer to the letter I quoted, this is the very brief reply I received today—

- (1) I have been asked to consider the Town Planning Regulations, 1963,—

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: Who is the letter from?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The name has been removed and I am not in a position to quote it.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: The chap who was supposed to be giving this advice was Mr. Gifford.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I do not know who it was. The name has been removed and I cannot quote it, but the honourable member can have a look at the file if he wishes. The letter reads—

- (1) I have been asked to consider the Town Planning Regulations, 1963, and to advise upon their desirability or otherwise.
- (2) These regulations are very materially different to the Town Planning Regulations, 1930, which they are intended to replace.
- (3) I have no hesitation in advising that the Town Planning Regulations, 1963, are prejudicial both to the council and the Town Planning Board.
- (4) If they remain in their present form, the Town Planning Regulations, 1963, will give rise to many legal conditions, and will also give rise to practical conditions.

- (5) The Town Planning Regulations, 1963, will make the carrying out of town planning more cumbersome and will render it less able to meet local conditions.
- (6) I accordingly advise that the council take all possible steps to obtain a disallowance of the regulations and their redrafting.
- (7) The defects and difficulties in the Town Planning Regulations, 1963, are so numerous that it has not been possible to give a detailed opinion of them in the time available. I have, however, examined them in detail and have itemised consideration of the various provisions setting out the defects and difficulties and expect that it will be forwarded within the next week.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is from Mr. Gifford, and the whats-his-name arrived by air this morning.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have not been supplied with any names.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I know all about it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That may be so, but I was not advised. As a matter of fact, I received letters covering this which were personal to me, but even Mr. Gifford's name was not mentioned in them.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is who it is.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I accept the Minister's word about that. Mr. Gifford would be the foremost authority in Australia on town planning regulations as they affect local government.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He is recognised as such.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No; he is not recognised at all in the Eastern States.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: No, there are different opinions about that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He was recognised in Western Australia, apparently, when it suited someone's purpose to do so.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He did not suit a lot of other people.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would be right in saying that, would I?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No, you would be wrong.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would be absolutely right in saying it. I can remember, before I came into this House, and if my memory of *Hansard* is correct, that he was quoted as an authority to have a Bill defeated that was before this Chamber.

I hope the House will agree to the disallowance of these regulations, and that the Minister will see fit to bring the local authorities into the picture and let them

have some say in the framing of regulations under which they have to work. That is only reasonable. Over the years we have found, through experience, that frequently political kites are flown. One is being flown at the moment on the fluoridation of water question. One political party is flying a kite to see the public's reaction to proposed legislation.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You are not suggesting there is any political kite flying in this, are you?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, but I am pointing that out as an example.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You would be well wide of the mark if you were.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister can have his say when I am finished. However, the right thing to do is to put the local authorities who will be concerned with this matter into a position where they know what is going on. I do not mean one or two, but I mean all the local authorities which will eventually become involved with it, and which intend, or which are likely to be, putting schemes into operation. Their advice should have been sought in the framing of the regulations, because men in local government give a good deal of their time, freely, to their constituents and to their shires. I have heard it stated that the local authorities have not been taken into the confidence of the Minister, the Commissioner of Town Planning, or the head of the Local Government Department.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: How many are objecting?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Three that I know of.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Three out of 27.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Three out of 27 is quite reasonable. The Fremantle City Council could not object, because its area is built out. East Fremantle could not object, because it is a built-out area; nor could Melville really object, because it is a new area.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is rather a strange approach to the matter.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Will the honourable member please address the Chair.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister says that only three out of 27 have objected. If these regulations are not going to affect the local authority what is the purpose of that authority objecting? But I do think that those local authorities who will be affected should be taken into the confidence of the commissioner and asked for their views before any regulations are drawn up. I do not think the Minister can say that a wait of one year, or even 18 months, before it gets his approval to proceed is a good proposition for a local authority.

We must consider the case of the average person who is called upon to have his land subdivided in an overall plan. These people get tired of waiting and continually ask, "When is something going to happen?" The Minister knows very well of one scheme that has been going on for about 2½ years. The result is that the people in the district do not know whether they are coming or going. Accordingly I move the motion on the notice paper.

Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 3rd September, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning).

MARINE STORES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 2 amended—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Last week I said I would endeavour to place the appropriate amendments on the notice paper, and that if this were not possible I would have them circulated among members. I am sorry it was not possible to place them on the notice paper, but I understand they have been circulated and that each member has a copy. The question was raised during the second reading debate—and I understand it was also raised in another place—as to the effect of this Bill on bottles generally. I think Mr. Ron Thompson said it might be possible to introduce a pickle bottle.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said vinegar bottles and methylated spirits bottles are returned.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that it deals with bottles in which non-intoxicating beverages are normally sold. There is a further amendment which will mean that it will not apply to bottles in which non-intoxicating beverages are sold and on which a deposit is normally paid. Mr. Wise suggested we might use the word refundable; but a reference to the dictionary indicates there is no common usage of the word refundable, whereas there is of the word repayable, and this is the word which it is proposed to use in the next amendment I have foreshadowed. If members read both amendments together they will see their combined purpose. I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 4—Insert after the word "bottles" the words "in which non-intoxicating beverages are ordinarily sold and".

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am not quite certain of the position of milk bottles.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The honourable member will notice that milk and cream bottles are included in the Bill.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There has been a great deal of anxiety amongst the people in the milk trade. It was suggested to me that milk bottles might be looked at from a different angle, and that practically all bottles ought to have a deposit repayable on them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Because the milk trade at the moment is faced with a loss of £150,000 a year on bottles which are not returned. The people in the milk trade feel that perhaps this could be overcome by the purchaser having to pay a small deposit. It is felt that this will assist the trade and provide better delivery facilities. The Bill should go much further, because the removal of bottles is almost as essential as their provision.

It is quite common to see milk bottles stacked in metal stands, and if those bottles are left in the sun for any length of time during the summer months they become brittle and dangerous and should not be used again. This also happens to beer bottles and that is why they are not returned.

The whole question should be looked at in more detail. Many things are provided in bottles, and if the bottles are not collected they constitute a nuisance. This, of course, does not overcome Mr. Ron Thompson's complaint of people refusing to take bottles because they do not happen to trade in the particular line. While this legislation will help to some extent, it will not cover the present-day usage of bottles, and the Minister should get his department to have a more detailed look at the matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Members will appreciate it was a chance court action which made this Bill necessary. For many years people have felt they had a right which suddenly, by a court ruling, they discovered they did not possess. The purpose of the Bill is to return to the position that obtained previously. In due course the Government will look more deeply into the question of the Marine Stores Act. This Bill is merely an attempt to rectify the position in the first instance.

I understand the milk bottle manufacturers have seen the Minister and they are satisfied with the Bill as it is. Milk bottles and cream bottles will be excluded, as will other bottles where normally a deposit is repayable. In the case of pickle bottles and beer bottles a refund is not normally charged and would therefore not be repayable. They will not be affected.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The milk people might be satisfied, but that does not solve the problem. The position of milk bottles is very similar to that of bottles for aerated beverages, inasmuch as if one buys milk from a particular supplier, he will not take back the bottles of another supplier.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: My personal experience is different.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: We have had the experience of such bottles being left by the milk trade. If they are prepared to take the bottles back, that of course is all right. I think we should provide that the milk suppliers should take all milk bottles back; and I trust this aspect will be looked into.

The Hon. G. C. MACKINNON: The problem to which Dr. Hislop referred is one which would be better left to the milk vendors to settle among themselves. It really comes down to a matter of the standardisation of the milk bottle. There are two shapes at present—the round and square—and a number of the bottles carry some advertisement on the label. However, there are moves afoot already to overcome this, so that small progress has been made. If standardisation was decided upon, there would be no problem in connection with a supplier not taking a certain brand of bottle. Most suppliers will take them, but it is a problem if different firms have different bottles for the one commodity.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: It occurs frequently in the city.

The Hon. G. C. MACKINNON: I do not live in the city, so I do not know. However, as I have said, steps are afoot to try to get a standard bottle, and this is a move which we hope will meet with some success. That is really the only positive way in which this problem could be solved, and it would be a far preferable method than legislative action.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The simple purpose of this amendment is to ensure that not all bottles sold as containers of a commodity—whether beer or aerated waters—come within the ambit of the legislation. It is to ensure that beer bottles are not included.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They will be included if a refund is normally repayable.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Unless it is specified that the legislation refers to bottles in which non-intoxicating beverages are normally sold, there will be some doubt as to whether all bottles sold as containers will be affected by this Bill. That is the sole purpose of this amendment, and the subsequent mention of milk and cream bottles has, of course, aroused the discussion by other members.

I am not entering that discussion at this point, but I agree with those who have said that milk vendors will accept bottles of other firms if they are left where bottles are normally left. Therefore that does not enter this argument at all. This amendment is to clarify the situation as to the sort of bottle on which a deposit is repayable by a vendor.

Amendment put and passed.

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

Page 2, line 6—Insert after the word "money" the passage ", repayable by the vendor,".

I have already explained this amendment when dealing with the previous one. I am grateful to Mr. Wise for his assistance in the matter. The draftsman has been pleased to use the words "repayable by the vendor," and these will restore the normal practice.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am wondering whether this wording is absolutely correct in the desire to cover refunds made on bottles which are not returned to the person who sold them; that is to say, small boys collecting bottles along a beach, football ground, or sports ground, might return them not to the person who was the vendor, but to a person who vends a similar sort of beverage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is no obligation on him to take the bottles.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: All I am wondering is whether the word "the" should not be "a".

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What about saying "vendors"?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would you mind telling me how it would read?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: "At the time of the sale of the contents thereof a deposit of money repayable by a vendor." It could be that the person to whom the bottle is presented is not the original vendor. My first reaction when reading this amendment was that a person could be finicky and not want bottles and so would tell a child that he did not sell him that bottle. On the other hand, another person not having sold the bottle could, and would, accept it and pay the child the amount of deposit originally paid with the purchase. I am making that suggestion without any desire to be finicky, but I think it would more amply cover the situation.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It has just been suggested to me that this is an endeavour to establish some obligation upon the vendor who sells the bottle as distinct from referring to him as "a" vendor, which may mean any vendor, bearing in mind of course that the vendor is not obligated to take the bottles back. He could tell the child that he did not sell

that particular brand. However, I think it would be safe to say that many shopkeepers would not be against taking bottles back, particularly from youngsters, because it helps them in their trade.

There may be a dozen shops in Scarborough which sell a particular brand of cool drink, yet one might find himself purchasing all the bottles back. Of course it would not matter in the long run. By using the word "the" it places something in the form of an obligation on him, although not a legal one.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I agree with Mr. Wise. Those selling drinks on sports grounds are pleased that the youngsters gather the bottles for them. This also applies to some shopkeepers. However, they do not take bottles back if they do not stock the brand. I thought the word "a" should be inserted to make it clear. As the Minister has said, a vendor is not compelled to take bottles back, but this is making it legal for him to take them back.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No, it is not.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Yes it is.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes; legal, as distinct from obligatory.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I did not say it was obligatory, but this Bill is making it legal. A vendor is someone who sells a bottle of a particular brand. When he sells it he puts into the till a cash deposit on the bottle. I agree with the Minister that in the long run, over a week or a month, it does not matter if a shopkeeper takes back a number of bottles he has not sold. Bottles are an exchange, the same system applying as applies in connection with oil companies. They charge £2 on a drum and the £2 is refunded when the drum is returned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you get £2 for returning a BP drum to Shell?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Yes, most decidedly. Having worked in the oil industry for 14½ years, I can assure the Minister that following the establishment of Pool, the oil companies found the drums were so costly to purchase that they agreed to take one another's drums, but not, of course, the damaged ones. In view of my preceding remarks, I move—

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

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know the honourable member intends to help, but the way I see it is that if six shopkeepers each sold six dozen cool drinks, only one of them might find himself the receiver of all the bottles.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: But he is not obliged to receive them.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, he is not. However, the point I am trying to make is that the use of the word "the" implies that a bottle must be returned to the vendor from whom it is purchased. If we allow the use of the word "a", any one of those vendors would have the same moral obligation to accept the bottle.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The point is that when a child collects a bottle he usually has no idea whence the bottle came. He may not take it back to the vendor who sold it at all, but the wise vendor knows that by accepting the bottle he is benefiting his business and he will usually accept it. Of course, if there are any "ring-ins" in which he does not deal he will usually tell the child. I think it is perfectly safe to leave the Bill as it is, and I hope the Committee will agree to it.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I think there ought to be something in the Bill to provide for the child being returned his full deposit. Some shopkeepers give the children a packet of chewing gum and send them on their way. Those vendors are cheating the child and should be made to refund the full amount of the deposit.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: We appear to be getting away from the simple purpose of this small Bill. Under the Act relating to collectors and dealers in marine stores, which we are amending, the term is a definition of "marine stores", and that includes bottles; just ordinary bottles. Then the Act goes on to lay down certain conditions applying to these marine stores, which include bottles. Licenses are needed by collectors, and so on. Now we want to get this class of bottle out of that definition. We are saying here that the definition is not to include bottles in which non-intoxicating beverages are ordinarily sold and on which a deposit has been paid.

Whether we pass the Bill as we now have it, including the words "repayable by the vendor" or "repayable by a vendor" is Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Personally, I do not think the words "repayable by the vendor" matter at all. They are only additional verbiage with not much meaning. The important thing is that we are going to exclude the bottles in which non-intoxicating beverages are ordinarily sold and on which a deposit is paid. I do not think we should lay down the terms that are to exist between the person who buys a bottle of lemonade and the person who sells one. Anyone who takes a lemonade bottle to a shop—usually a child—gets the deposit refunded. I do not think we need to go into that phase in this small amendment. Whether we put into the amendment "repayable by the vendor" or "repayable by a vendor" I do not think matters very much at all. The first amendment has made the position abundantly clear.

Amendment on the amendment put and negatived.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3:

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have indicated in the amendments circulated among members that I intend to move to delete this clause. Of course, the practice is to vote to defeat the clause, and in such a way it becomes deleted. I follow this procedure in order to indicate to members the course that will be taken.

I do not think there is any necessity for clause 3 to remain in the Bill. Quite apart from the varied objections that were raised during the debate the other night—which I share—to the effect that this clause is entirely in the wrong place, I repeat that if I did not move to delete it, some other member would do so. We should have attempted to put it into clause 2. But having tied up clause 2 and given the Act the power we thought it had previously, the Government does not consider it necessary to limit the life of the Bill to 31st December, 1963.

My colleague, the Minister for Police, has assured me that it is his intention to have a full investigation made into the Act. That will take a little time. If it is possible, he will introduce legislation during this session of Parliament, but if it is not possible to conclude investigations before the end of the session, a comprehensive amendment will be brought down during the next session. I think the Committee will agree that we do not want to be left in the position that this Bill, which will become the 1963 amending Act, will lose its effect from the 31st December, 1963. That would mean that on the 1st January, 1964, we would find ourselves in exactly the same position that we are now seeking to rectify. With that in mind, I hope members will vote against the clause.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: This clause, or what it purports to do, may be in the wrong place in the Bill but I think it is required in the Bill. The Minister has said that the Government will look into the matter in due course. I agree with Dr. Hislop. He said the Bill should go a lot further than it does, and went on to say that a deeper investigation is needed. I, too, think an investigation is needed now. This Bill was introduced as an expedient to overcome an anomaly of the moment and to give us an opportunity to look searching into the effects of the amendment. There may be other matters in the parent Act that require amending urgently to meet the present-day situation.

I hope that this Bill, when it becomes law within the next week or two, will continue to have the limiting clause within it. Even if this limiting period is in a separate clause and in the wrong place in the Bill, it should pass on to the statute book now

and be replaced by something which not only includes the present amendment, but any others which closer examination reveals necessary. I hope the Committee will support the Bill in its present form to ensure an examination before the end of this year.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I hope the Committee will delete this clause from the Bill. The Bill does nothing but remove an acknowledged and admitted anomaly. That is all it does. It is not as though there are any other provisions which are doubtful. It is agreed that it does nothing but correct something, the incorrectness of which no-one denies. It seems to me ridiculous to limit its operation to any particular period.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am grateful to Mr. Watson for his support. The mere title of the Bill suggests that it is limited to the amending of section 2 of the Act. I put this question to the House: What if the investigation made by the Minister reveals that no other amendment is necessary? What do we do then prior to the 31st December, but bring down another Bill to delete clause 3 of this present Bill? The Bill was introduced by the Government with the full intention of carrying out an investigation of the parent Act.

The idea of the Government in introducing the Bill, as Mr. Watson said, was purely to return to a situation which the people thought they were enjoying for about 60 years. The Minister has said that if Parliament agrees to the Bill, he will have an investigation made to see whether other amendments are necessary or desirable, and, if some amendments are necessary or desirable, he will move them in this session if he can; otherwise he will move them in the next session. But I cannot see the necessity for including a limiting clause in the Bill.

Governments of the day have a habit of amending some Acts almost every year in the light of practical experience. I cannot see the necessity for trying to limit the life of the Bill.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: According to the icing on the cake, so we eat it and like it, or not. For a number of years, particularly since the Minister for Mines has been the Leader here, we have many times been told that Ministers in another place have promised they will do this or that, and we have been asked to accept that undertaking; and many times we have found that what was promised in another place has not come to fruition.

I say here and now that I do not doubt the integrity of the Minister for Police, or the Minister in charge of this Chamber, as to what they propose in this matter.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you mean then?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: When a Minister in another place gets an affirmative vote because he promises to agree to an amendment such as this—an amendment which permits of a full look at the matter—then I see no reason why we should not avail ourselves of the promise that has been given.

I am raising this matter because many members of this Chamber have had a number of telephone calls from store-keepers and from people who manufacture bottles—I have had such a call—and we have quite a lot of interesting evidence that we could give to the Minister for Police.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is nothing to stop you from giving it.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is true; and we will probably give it, just the same. At the moment we are discussing clause 3, and that is all I intend to discuss. The Minister for Police promised members in the other Chamber that he would agree to this clause in order to allow a sparring time here so that other amendments to the Act could be considered.

Many times I have agreed with Dr. Hislop, and I agree with him entirely tonight when he says that the Bill does practically nothing except one thing. It amends section 2 of the Act, but it does not say that is all-embracing, or that is where we need finish.

I am not prepared to listen to the Minister tell us what has been promised in another place, and then ask us to disagree with it here.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson interjected.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am raising my protest against it. I do not know whether Mr. Robinson has had information from his constituents, but I have had plenty from mine.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: I know how they feel about it.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Order!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am sorry to interrupt the proceedings, but I am not going to allow any other member to tell me what my constituents are thinking.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I am not against what, I think, most of us have in mind: to tidy up the Act; and I agree entirely with those who have spoken with regard to the section being tidied up, and those who have said that the amendment will suffice to cover what we need at present.

But the whole Act needs consolidating, and it takes time to do that; and at this time of the year, when the draftsmen are particularly busy, we would be expecting

a little much to expect that the whole Act would be consolidated by the end of this year. The limiting of the measure to the 31st December, 1963, is something which may not be desirable; we may be left without an Act at all.

I feel that in discussing this matter we are out of order, because the purpose of the Bill is to amend section 2; and I take it we are dealing with another section when we are discussing this provision because we are, in effect, saying: "The Act is hereby cancelled or annulled." I put it to you, Mr. Chairman: Are we in order in discussing clause 3? I think it is outside the scope of the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think I could be excused if I were to take exception to the remarks made by Mr. Lavery in respect of any undertakings I may have given in the House on behalf of any of my ministerial colleagues in another place.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I said I never doubted your integrity.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not, however, going to be bothered taking exception to what the honourable member has said; but I remind him that whenever he has wanted me to do anything for him, in respect of the affairs of his electorate, I have always helped to the best of my ability. Whatever I am asked to do in this Chamber I do in good faith, and the undertakings I give on behalf of Ministers in another place are always given in good faith. I let the matter go at that, because I do not think the honourable member really meant what he said.

I feel that what Mr. Jones said is valuable in this debate. It may not be possible for this investigation to be carried out.

In regard to the undertaking given on behalf of the other place, I understand that this amendment, which amounts to a new clause—clause 3—was accepted by the Minister for Police on the basis that he would make inquiries to see whether effect could be given to suggestions which were made in the Legislative Assembly.

The Minister gave consideration to the points that were raised in another place; he produced those amendments for me to move in the Legislative Council; he thinks they will have the desired effect; he believes the members in another place will be satisfied with them; but I remind Mr. Lavery that the Bill has to go back to the Legislative Assembly, anyway.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This amendment might provoke a conference.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Heavens above! The Committee knows that if this clause is deleted, the Bill will go back to the Legislative Assembly. If the matters raised by the members in that Chamber are not fulfilled, no doubt we will hear about it again.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think it would be most unwise to limit the Bill, because what we are discussing—or what Mr. Wise and I have been talking about—is the question of what is going to happen to the bottles that we have already excluded from the Bill. It is more than likely that any further amendments or changes brought before us will not be brought under the Marine Stores Act at all, but under completely fresh legislation dealing with the handling of bottles in modern life.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Under the Health Act, or a marketing Act, or some other Act.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes. It looks as though further changes will not come under this legislation. The bottles we are referring to, and that we want controlled, have now been removed from the Marine Stores Act. I think we could get ourselves into a lot of bother if we terminated the legislation too soon.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I offer no apologies for what I said. I thought the Minister was a little more calm and collected than I am sometimes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Forget it!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I regret he was so thin-skinned that he took exception to what I said, because I was speaking entirely politically. The Minister comes into this Chamber and asks us to agree to some proposition because something has been promised in another place. We debate it and we win or lose the debate. That is all there is to it. I have no quarrel with what the Minister said in respect of the assistance he has given to my constituency; I thank him for what he has done.

Clause put and negatived.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.

UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

Visit to Legislative Council

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I wish to inform the House that later this evening Mr. J. D. Tilney, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, will be paying an official visit to this Chamber.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: NINTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 22nd August, on the following motion by The Hon. A. R. Jones:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator in reply to the Speech he has been pleased to deliver:—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [7.32 p.m.]: Before I speak in regard to His Excellency's Speech, I would like to join with other members in welcoming our three new members to the Chamber. When I first came here 11 years ago, I realised I was amongst a body of people who had been elected by the electors of the State to represent them and I resolved I would endeavour to give of my best service all the time. I feel the three members, Mr. Dolan, Mr. Dellar and Mr. Heitman, who have just joined us would not be here unless they had already given some service to the community to which they belong. For that reason, more than any other, I am very pleased to welcome them amongst us; and I know that I can learn from them. I also know that time will prove them to be men suitable for the position to which they have been elected.

I listened very intently to the Speech of His Excellency and I was able—no doubt this applies to other members as well—to anticipate what was going to be delivered, because all such Speeches on the opening day of a parliamentary session relate what the Government has done during the previous year and what is anticipated for the future. However, there were some things which I thought should have been in the Speech that were not included. It is about one or two of those things that I wish to speak tonight.

Before I do, I wish to refer to a matter that is very dear to my heart—and I make no apologies for it. Since I have been a member of Parliament I believe I have always tried to be reasonable in my outlook and reasonable about what goes on around me, both in the political sense and in the sphere of friendship of members of Parliament. Apart from a little chit-chat across the Chamber, I think it can be said—and I am being an egoist if you like—I have tried at least to be ethical and pay

the respect to which a member of Parliament is entitled when we meet outside Parliament.

With that in mind, I am very concerned about an attitude that has been adopted, particularly over the last 2½ to three years, when members of Parliament attend public functions in their districts. I think it can be said that the Legislative Council conducts itself with a high standard of decorum. On your behalf, Mr. President, and other Presidents before you, I have a dignity to uphold as a member of the Legislative Council and as the representative of my constituents. Of late, when we attend public functions and the chairman, whoever he may be, whether a—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: President?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I know the Minister is trying to help me. It could be the Lord Mayor, or the Mayor of Fremantle, at a civic reception. These gentlemen when speaking mention the people who are in the protocol before them. They mention them by name, and that is correct. I remember quite vividly a function that took place two or three years ago at the South Perth Community Centre Hospital when there were in attendance the member for South Perth (Mr. Grayden); the member for Canning, whose electorate takes in part of South Perth (Mr. O'Neil); and two Legislative Council members for the district (Mr. Jeffery and Mr. Griffith)—Mrs. Hutchison was overseas at the time. Also present were Mr. Davies, M.L.C., who has passed on, and Mr. Ron Thompson, and myself, who are members of the Legislative Council for the West Province, which includes the Canning electorate. The president introduced the Minister for Health, and when the Minister rose to speak he used this expression—and I am going to elaborate on this because I want something done about it as it is one to which I object—

Mr. President—

That was a Mr. Robinson—

the Hon. Mr. Griffith, and parliamentary colleagues.

Mr. Griffith was entitled to that courtesy, but it must be remembered that we were the members for the district. The other members that I have just referred to were present also; and we all should have been addressed by name. A couple of Sundays ago I visited another district to attend a function and Mr. Robinson, M.L.C., who was president, welcomed me at the door and showed me every respect. I appreciated that very much.

The situation about which I complain has grown up over the last 2½ years or so while this Government has been in office; and I do not know whether it is of political intent to put these fellows to the bottom.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: It is a lot of ignorance—that is what it is.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am not going to say that. It is not ignorance when it comes from educated people; it is either deliberate or accidental. I could mention a number of occasions where this has happened. I will refer to one at which I was not present—the opening of the works for the trans-continental railway near Toodyay which occurred a few months ago. I know the members for the district were there. They included you, Mr. President. On the official stand were the Minister for Railways; the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Opperman, M.H.R.); and Mr. Paltridge; and Mr. Nalder, the Deputy Premier, was on the side. I do not know whether he was on the platform or not, but he was close to it. When Mr. Court commenced his address he mentioned the names of certain members present, but he did not mention the Deputy Premier! Surely the Deputy Premier has some standing in the community. This has happened several times in my own district.

I have to speak plainly. One function was the opening of the nurses quarters at the Fremantle Hospital, quarters which are as beautiful as any building in Perth. Mr. Ross Hutchinson, who is Minister for Health, was introduced as such by the president, Mr. Wauhup, and again it was the same thing: "Parliamentary colleagues." I believe we have some standing in our own electorates, and it is incumbent upon members of the Government—who hold a higher position than do we backbenchers—to make a new approach to this matter. I believe that if Mr. Ron Thompson, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Stubbs, or Mr. Lavery is present at a function in his own district, the persons in charge should at least use the names of the respective members when addressing the congregation or gathering, or whatever one likes to call it. Furthermore, the member for the district should be present. It is quite simple to ask him.

If ever there was a gentleman in this State, it was Sir Ross McLarty, who has now passed on. While he was Premier of the State, when he paid a visit to Rockingham he used to inform me, as well as the other members of the district—Mr. Fraser and Mr. Davies at that time—that he was going there and the purpose for which he was going.

Let us look back at some of the older people of the past, whether they were from this House or from another place. If a local member of Parliament were in the audience while they were speaking, they would not dream of ignoring him. Since I have been in Parliament, I have gone to functions at which Mr. Brand has said to the audience—and here I am referring particularly to the opening of an aged

centre in South Perth—"I know this platform is very small and we cannot all be up here; but I see among the audience The Hon. George Jeffery, with his wife. He is just around the corner. Come up here and let's have a look at you. And I can see The Hon. Fred Lavery also."

How much nicer that is, than for us to attend a function and hear someone say, "Mr. President and parliamentary colleagues." We know we are colleagues, but the public does not always know. My electorate has 25,000 people on the roll, but over 90,000 people live in the area.

This matter should be brought to the attention of those in high places. Often I have felt insulted. Let us consider Kalgoorlie. At the opening of a big power plant in Kalgoorlie a few weeks ago it was not known that Mr. Evans, the member for Kalgoorlie in another place, was among the audience.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: He wasn't invited, either.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Yet he is the member for Kalgoorlie. I hope no-one will take personal offence at what I am saying, although I have myself taken personal offence when I have attended meetings. If I have known that a member was present in the audience on occasions when I have spoken, I have made sure that the person's name was mentioned. At a naturalization function just a few weeks ago I missed a member's name who was present, and immediately I publicly apologised.

I wish now to speak on the Police Force. At the bottom of page 7 of His Excellency's Speech it says—

The Police Force is to be increased by an additional 20 men for a more effective police coverage. New Police Stations will be erected at a number of country and metropolitan centres, and a commencement will be made on a new Police Headquarters site near the Causeway.

I am very happy about that; but I would like an answer to this question: There are 20 additional men who are going to be added to the Force during the period of this Parliament. But nothing has been said about how many men retired. How many men retired by age? How many men died?

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Nine.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: We were not told that the population of the metropolitan area had increased during the last three or four years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am glad you agree on that point.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I was able to find out, by reading the Press and *Hansard*, what is the strength of the Police Force. I am as concerned as is the Lord

Mayor of Perth that the city is not being policed at night. For what reason? It is not being policed, because the officers are not there to do the work. I have the following on good authority. A group of men were pulled out of the office to make a show for a photo which was being taken for television. This was only two or three months ago. They were marched around the Perth Police Court building; and as soon as the photo had been taken five of the group continued on to the city and the rest went back into the office. Why? Because the Commissioner of Police was put in the position that he had to make a show.

I now wish to protest against the amount of hooliganism which exists within the city block between 8 p.m. and 11 p.m. at night. When I refer to the city block, I mean the area from the Esplanade to, say, Wellington Street, and from Irwin Street to Milligan Street. A report has appeared in the Press about the number of vehicles which race up and down the city at night, when the drivers of those vehicles frequently accost passing girls.

On three occasions I purposely stayed in Hay Street at night, and took note of the license numbers of several vehicles. Some vehicles went round the block something like 20 times between 8 p.m. and 9 p.m., blowing their hooters and with loud exhausts. They were racing up to the sides of buses, and I saw a brand new white Ford pressed against the side of a bus because the driver of the bus was unable to get away. I took the license number of that vehicle and I walked around trying to find a policeman. I was unable to find a policeman in 2½ hours.

There is a man who writes letters to the Press. I am referring to a Mr. Vivian James. Whether we believe what he writes is another story. This man earns part of his living in Hay Street at night, and he could tell us stories about what goes on. The hooligans concerned know what time the police come on duty, because there are so few police. The Commissioner cannot do better because, in my opinion, he is understaffed.

The Lord Mayor of Perth drew attention to one unfortunate incident. He did not lie about what he had seen, because that sort of thing is going on all the time.

Our city is growing, and the number of vehicles on the roads is increasing. We are reaching the stage where young fellows can buy a Holden car—a 1952 or 1953 model—for as low as £200. They pay £40 or £50 deposit and away they go, five or six of them in the car, using insulting language—and I am not referring to swearing, but language worse than that. These fellows are getting away with it, and when they come up before the courts they are getting fined about £5. I would take their licenses away from them for two years or more.

Another portion of His Excellency's Speech reads as follows:—

Legislation will be introduced to provide for a system of probation and parole of adult offenders.

One of the things which disturbs me is the fact that over 50 per cent. of the people who are in our gaols today are young people under the age of 21 years of age. I believe the figure is 61 per cent., but I would not like to say definitely. It is over 50 per cent. and around 60 per cent. There are people in our gaols today who are no worse than many people outside who are getting away with it.

An organisation has just been formed in Perth called the Civic Rehabilitation Council. The executive officers are private citizens and men representing our gaols. The council includes Mr. Yates from Fauldings. I hope the Minister will give this council whatever help he can. If the cases of a number of prisoners were analysed it might be found that the prisoners could rehabilitate themselves by working, and thereby become useful citizens.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: There is no work for them outside.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I know of a man who was given four years gaol. The sentence was reduced to 2½ years. He had a family of four daughters, and after I had applied on his behalf to Mr. Watts, the former Attorney-General, the man was allowed out of gaol. He went back to his former employment and he is now foreman over 60 men. This has taken place over a period of from twelve to fifteen months.

Many of these men could be brought back into civilian life, without their having to seek social services assistance as soon as they leave prison. A job should be found for them before they come out. I am sure the Minister will receive great help from the new organisation which has been formed.

I have read the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech from one end to the other, and there is not one word in it about unemployment. I admit there are one or two projects suggested. It is proposed, for instance, to build a greater number of homes, which will employ more people; but there is nothing in the speech about the unemployed.

We know that in all communities, whether in Australia or in countries overseas, there is a percentage of unemployable people. But when a person is ready and willing to work, he should be able to find work. It is particularly hard on men with families. All my talk; all the talk of other members—all the Premier's talk, for that matter—gets us nowhere unless we can find some sort of work for these people. It is most discouraging to read that in a few

months time we are going to have somewhere around 8,000 school-leaving children on the labour market. Some of them will be of a higher standard of education than others.

I do not know what to do about it. I have people calling on me to see what I can do. Already in the last month nine people have been to see me. Often the children are receiving a very good education, and they are wondering whether they will be able to find employment in January or February.

Many parents are trying to beat the gun. They are going to insurance companies, Government offices, and even to hospitals, to try and get their children employed. I do not know where we are going to place these children. We already have 6,000 unemployed in the State. The percentage of unemployed, whether it be ½ per cent. or 2½ per cent., is so much cold figuring. It is rather like the fellow who says, "I have an account at the bank, with one shilling in it." He has an account, but what good is it to him? A figure of 2½ per cent. may sound all right for a nation like Australia, but it does not give a person who is unemployed the wherewithal to buy a meal, or, if he is unfortunate enough to be paying rent, the means to pay his rent.

The Federal Government is lacking in its duty. The State Government has to go cap in hand to the Federal Government and say, "Please may we have £6,500,000 to do such and such a thing?" The Federal Government receives the taxes, and surely the States, with their large areas and small population, deserve better consideration. I represent the working people of my district—I represent all the people of my district—but I am now speaking of the trade union movement. Surely, for the amount of work we do to keep men in employment we should get some support from the Federal Government. I have always supported immigration.

When I was overseas a year or two ago I visited Japan, Singapore, Malaya, and Penang, and I was surprised at what I saw in those places. The people are becoming westernised, especially in Japan, since American interests have moved in. Industries have grown and the standard of living has risen. I am happy about that because I believe some of those people lived in a world of the past and were misunderstood for a long time. But right here at Fremantle, and as far as Gosnells in the area I represent, the present Government is not doing its job sufficiently. It should be making representations to the Federal Government to make more money available for it to provide employment.

I do not want people to get the dole, I want them to have work. We find that the capital expenditure under the State Housing Act amounted to £10,800,000. Out of these funds 2,200 new houses were erected through the State, a further 1,200.

projects through war service, and a lesser number through building societies. Out of the £1,126,000, 1,838 people purchased their own homes, and the State scheme encouraged a further 200 families to become home owners. Housing has played an important part in attracting migrants from Great Britain.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Additional funds are being provided for migrant housing.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: They are being provided, but at what rate? It is nowhere near the rate the Minister for Housing stated. I think he would agree that if he had another £5,000,000 he could use every penny of it to advantage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Of course I could!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am not attacking the Minister on the present set-up. The Federal Government is not making sufficient money available to the State to provide employment. What better employment could there be than building homes for people?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are attacking the basis of the Commonwealth-State financial arrangement.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Yes, that is what I am doing. During the last fortnight I have had a lot of people coming to me to see if I could help them, but the houses are not available. The Housing Commission has a special formula under which it works, and it is one with which I have no quarrel. My quarrel is that insufficient houses are being built for aged people, especially units for single people.

I commend the Minister and the previous Government for the job they did in erecting places like Graham flats and the flats the present Minister will open at Claremont in a few days' time.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Why did the Labor Government build so many more than this Government?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This Government had £10,800,000 but only provided 3,000 houses.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Tell us how that compares with 1958-59?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I can tell the Minister that in 1957, 7,000 houses were built.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why pick that year?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister picked one year and I answered with another. I do not want to play that one.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Of course you don't!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: If the Minister wants me to go on I am only too happy to do so. I have here a file showing that many people are trying to purchase homes from the State Housing

Commission. Some people have been waiting two years and two months for rental homes. Other people are trying to get homes for the aged single women—people who are ex-schoolteachers, ex-matrons of hospitals; people who have never had a home of their own because of the type of work they have done. I have all those people on my list and do not forget—being very political—they are not all Labor people either.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And for the first time on record something is being done for them.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Not the first time; what about the Graham flats?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are they for single people? How many single people are there in the Graham flats?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: How many people did the Minister get applications from for the flats he will be opening at Claremont shortly?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That has nothing to do with the question I asked you.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am led to believe there are some hundreds applying for the 75 flats that are available, which is proving my point. The Minister challenged me on what was required, and I say, more of them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As I said, it is the first time on record it has been done.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That does not mean it has to stop there. In Fremantle we have 200 aged single women. The Minister would know because he has called applications for the flats. I am sure he was amazed at the number of applications he received. Perhaps a few are not suitable, but 90 per cent. to 95 per cent. of the people who applied were good citizens, well deserving of some assistance.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As a matter of fact, I was surprised there were not more.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: You will be getting more applications in the next month; I have seen to that. Getting back to town planning. At Spearwood there is a feeling amongst the market gardeners that town planning is running rampant. Those people feel that the best use is not being made of the food producing land. I might add that 1,300 acres at Spearwood produced £750,000 worth of food the year before last.

About 10 years ago, Miss Feilman, a town planner who was not tied to any Government department, and who was a good thinker and a good planner, drew attention to the fact that the food producing land at Osborne Park would disappear because that area was suitable for the erection of houses and factories. Miss Feilman said that at all costs the land at Spearwood must be saved

for food production to feed the people of the metropolis, which was growing at such a fast rate.

I give credit to the previous town planner, Mr. Hepburn, and the Minister, that a subdivision was never granted where food was actually being grown unless it was forced by virtue of the owner becoming aged and the family not being able to carry on; and in one instance that I know of, title deeds were available for the sons to build another home on the plot.

While that plan is adhered to, everything will be all right. The Cockburn Shire intends to use an old stone quarry, which is being filled in, on which to build a block of something like 700 houses, about which Mr. Ron Thompson spoke tonight. That particular area covers an outcrop of stone and is a good place for home building. But between the railway line and Spearwood, and going eastwards, there is a lot of food-growing land; and I understand from the residents there that the State Housing Commission has taken up a section of this land for houses.

The market gardeners there are beginning to feel that unless some attention is drawn to this, the food-producing land will be lost. I am not referring to the main valley where food is grown, but to the area of land between Newman Street and South Coogee which is open for public utilities. We feel that that land has to be saved for market gardeners. I will later point out to the Minister the area. The plan is on the Table of the House.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is nothing to stop that.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It is open for industrial development at the moment. There is another item I would like the Minister for Local Government to take notice of, and it affects the Melville Shire—with over 40,000 people in it—the Canning Shire, and to a lesser extent, the Gosnells Shire. It is a matter I think he may be able to take up with the Minister for Industrial Development; it concerns the supply of cement pipes for drainage.

I have been asked by two shires to bring this matter forward. The Melville Shire has a staff of over 100 employed on kerbing, drainage, footpaths, and the like. They are practically at a standstill because they require 200 lengths of cement tube per month, and the last few months they have been getting 20. The Canning Shire has even gone to the extent of buying second-hand tube, or cement pipes, wherever it can. Gosnells, to a lesser extent, will require a great number of cement pipes in the next two or three years.

Humes Ltd. are crowded for space in Subiaco and they should be offered land by the Minister for Industrial Development in the area of Spearwood or Cockburn where the Minister has access to

land. He could take this matter up with Humes Ltd., or any other company concerned with the manufacture of pipes. This would be better than seeing thousands of lengths of cement pipe coming off the ships from the Eastern States.

If we could open up another industry in that area we would have the cement works right at the back door and the cement would have to be carted a few miles only. Could not the Minister for Industrial Development, along with the Minister for Local Government, do something about opening up another new industry in that area? It is an industry that could not go wrong, because we require so many lengths of this cement piping.

I now wish to speak about motor drivers' licenses, and I preface my remarks by saying that when I lost my license it was because of speeding, and I do not object to losing it because I deserved to do so in the circumstances. However, that is not the point I want to bring before members' notice. There is a group of people in the community, to wit transport workers, who drive the trucks which carry the merchandise of the city. When I lost my license I was able to continue with my job in the same way as any person who works in an insurance office, a bank, or a firm like Boans or Foys, could continue working even if he lost his license. However, that is not so with members of the Transport Workers' Union.

Men who drive heavy-duty vehicles have an "A" and a "B"-license. I have held an "A" and a "B"-license since 1922, and if a driver loses his "A"-license, which is for driving a private vehicle, it is no hardship because it simply means that he cannot use his car for travelling to and from work or at the weekends. However, if a member of the Transport Workers' Union loses his license he is punished twice because, in addition to losing his "A"-license he also loses his "B"-license which entitles him to drive heavy-duty vehicles.

The union feels that instead of a driver having to appeal to a magistrate to have his license returned he should be able to appeal to the Traffic Department. We are not interested in the chap who loses his license and is fined for speeding while driving a motor truck in the course of his work, because he should know better; but we believe that some consideration should be given to the man who loses his license because he has transgressed while using a car for private purposes.

The union feels that where a man loses his license in those circumstances his "B"-license should come up for review before the Traffic Department and if, in the opinion of the inspector, the driver will be penalised twice—in other words he will lose his job as a transport worker; and some of these men have been working with

the same company for 15 or 16 years—the inspector should have the authority to allow him to continue to drive a motor truck, say, between the hours of 8 and 5, 7 and 4, or whatever his working hours are, but he should not have his "A"-license returned.

Whether anything can be done about the suggestion I do not know, but I hope the Minister will have a look at it and let me know because the union is particularly interested in the matter. The secretary of the union could give details of 113 cases where some men have been penalised to the extent that they have been unable to regain financial equilibrium.

When an amendment to the Traffic Act was before this House some years ago, I spoke in regard to the section of it which dealt with the person who lost his license for the third time and was fined £100. I was on the other side of the Chamber at the time, and I wish to discuss that particular section tonight. I think the time has arrived when the Treasury could find other ways of supplementing Consolidated Revenue than by imposing a £100 fine on the poor fellow who has not sufficient brains to stop getting drunk and driving a vehicle. If a man loses his license for life, surely that is sufficient penalty without imposing a fine of £100, because that has considerable effect on his family. I hope that before the end of the session something will be done about introducing legislation in this regard.

There are two other items on which I wish to speak. I am a member of the Good Neighbour Council and the council is particularly concerned about one aspect of publicity in the Press. This is not a complaint about the Press but an appeal to it. If I walk down the street and I commit some breach of our laws, and I get fined, as I did for speeding, it is reported in the Press that F. R. H. Lavery of such-and-such an address was fined for speeding. But if a Pole or an Austrian, or any of our other New Australian people committed the same breach we would find in the Press a statement to the effect that Mr. Davies, a Pole, a German, or an Austrian, was fined for such-and-such an offence.

The Good Neighbour Council is most concerned about the matter, particularly as such a large number of people are becoming naturalised and, legally, each of them is just as much an Australian as anyone in this Chamber. The council is asking the Press to give the matter some thought. I noticed in the paper today where a native chap had been killed and the Press mentioned the fact that he was a native. There is nothing wrong with that, but when people have been naturalised and in later years get into trouble and they are named deliberately in the Press as Mr. So-and-So, a Pole, a Czechoslovakian, or whatever it may be, I

think it is completely wrong. After all, once they are naturalised they are Australians, and we hope that having drawn the matter to the attention of the Press something may be done about it.

The council is of the opinion that the nationality of a person should not be published, and I refer particularly to defendants in cases which are taken to court. I think the Press should simply refer to the person as Mr. So-and-So of such-and-such an address.

Finally I would like the Government to do everything possible to see that the Minister for Town Planning does not allow himself to be completely taken in and overawed by the massive organisation that is being built up and which is known as the Town Planning Board. The Minister has been very good and when any matters have been brought to his notice he has done everything possible to rectify them. But there are times when, like other Ministers, he takes his lead from his advisers—in this case the Town Planning Commissioner. This organisation has now become what is known in the community as the absolute acme of bureaucracy. I have been in this House for 11 years and it is the one department—and the only one, and I have had dealings with all departments—where I have had to go back to the people I represent time and time again and tell them that I am getting nowhere. Why? Because we have a plan and that is it.

What Mr. Ron Thompson had to say earlier this evening in his resolution to disallow certain regulations is the sort of thing I am referring to, Mr. Minister. If this position continues we will have some very wealthy people making fortunes out of town planning and others who will go to the wall. We already know of people who have been refused certain subdivisions, etc., and who have sold out at low prices. Then, after a period of time, those properties have been subdivided and some of the big land agents have made fortunes out of them. I am referring to areas around the perimeter, such as Riverton and places like that.

The plan which is on the Table of the House shows us what the city and its environs will look like in the future. I accept what the Minister has to say, and portions of the plan will probably be changed in five years' time, but I am referring to the number of people who, by virtue of an organisation, or an office of the Crown, are so dogmatic in their deliberations that they allow some groups of people to make fortunes and other groups of people to fall by the wayside.

I could quote cases but I do not want to do so this evening because of the time involved. This will not be my last speech in Parliament, but it will be my last speech on an Address-in-Reply debate before the elections next year. Consequently I want to say thanks to everybody for being so

kind to me since I have been a member of Parliament. I can assure the new members that if ever they want to know anything, no matter what it is, they can go to any member of Parliament, no matter what his political affiliations may be, and they will get good advice. I have had that kind of advice and I thank everybody for it.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Midland) [8.27 p.m.]: At the outset, Mr. Deputy President, I would like to express my sympathy with Mrs. Simpson in the passing of her late husband, The Hon. Bert Simpson, who, as all members know, was a member of this House for a considerable time, firstly as a Liberal member and, for the past few years, as a Country Party member. During that time I feel sure he must have made many friends in this Parliament and contributed greatly to the workings of this House. He also made many friends in the agricultural province that he represented for so long. I feel that this House is all the poorer for his passing.

I would also like to thank all members for the way I have been received into this House and made to feel so much at home. I thank them also for the helpful advice they have tendered and the fact that everyone has greeted me so kindly. The staff are also deserving of my thanks for the help they have given me since coming to the House last Thursday. Nothing seems to be a trouble for them and any small request is immediately satisfied. I do appreciate it coming in as a new member and I say thank you very much to all members of the staff who have contributed so much to my feeling that I am really welcome in the Chamber.

Having read the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech delivered at the opening of this session of Parliament, I feel proud to be here as a Liberal member of the present Government. During the four years of office the members of that Government have contributed greatly to the advancement of this State as a whole, and to my province in particular. I am also very proud to be able to represent the Midland Province as it is one of the State's best wheat and wool growing areas. This Government has always done a great deal in the reticulation of water supplies throughout the State, but in many areas in the Midland Province there are still centres where a larger supply of water would make life reasonable for those who live there.

Towns such as Morawa and Perenjori are very badly in need of a better reticulated water supply; and I am hopeful that with the supply which has been found in the Arrowsmith area we will be able to get a better supply of water to reticulate the centres I have mentioned. I certainly hope that the Minister has set aside sufficient finance for this project. They are not the only towns in need of a better water supply.

Northampton and Geraldton also need improved supplies of water. Northampton has a reticulated water supply, but it is badly in need of a better type of water supply. More money must be spent in that area to ensure such a supply for that town.

Geraldton is growing very rapidly, and more water must be found to assist the people living in that area; particularly the tomato growers who, for the most part, have to cart anything up to 30,000 gallons of water a week to their tomato gardens to keep them going during the summer months. It is essential that these people be provided with a reticulated water supply. That is the only way to keep industry there on a payable footing.

The town of Goomalling has a reticulated water supply, but like Geraldton that town is also growing tremendously which, of course, means that more water is being used throughout the area, thus necessitating a greater supply. Kalannie is also in the same position, and a better water supply would help the people in that area no end. For the most part the people there rely on supplies from their dams, and as members know such a source of supply is very uncertain.

At the moment of course they have all the water they need, but we will not always have a season like the one we are experiencing now. It is essential that the overall water supply in the areas to which I have referred be improved if we are to create the same optimistic atmosphere that exists in other parts of the State.

I would now like to have a few words to say on agricultural high schools. I am proud that the Government has seen fit to assure us that the next agricultural high school will be built at Morawa. We should not stop there, however, because Wongan Hills and Geraldton should also be provided with this facility. Boys from both the country and the towns should be given an opportunity of an agricultural education to equip and prepare them for the life they will eventually lead when they become farmers, or farm workers.

One has only to visit the Cunderdin High School to appreciate how much is learnt by boys of up to 16 years of age. They are taught welding, blacksmithing, stock husbandry, shearing and the care of sheep. This education must prove of great benefit to them when they eventually own their own farms, or become farm workers.

Agricultural research also needs more money. The small amount of money that has been spent in the past has paid great dividends. The field officers of the Department of Agriculture contribute greatly to the wealth of this country by breeding new types of wheat, and by assisting farmers in the latest scientific know-hows. More money spent in this direction would enable field officers and agricultural scientists to pass on more knowledge.

It would assist in better types of wheat being produced; types of wheat which would be suitable to the differing rainfall experienced. In some areas the rainfall differs from as much as 9 in. to 26 in. In the past scientists have been able to breed some very good types of wheat, but they have only been suitable to certain types of rainfall. In the wetter areas a different type of wheat is needed; one that is not affected by black spot or other diseases.

It would be a great help if more finance could be provided for the breeding of legumes and clover to help build up the nitrogen content in the soil. The farmers are contributing a farthing a bushel towards this project, but I understand from those carrying on this great work that they need many more times that amount to help them speed up the breeding of legume and clover seeds, which in turn would create and build up better soil conditions.

People engaged in the fishing industry can, I think, also be considered primary producers. The new wharf that has been built for Geraldton is a great help to the crayfishermen in that area, and they are most appreciative of this facility. The Government's attitude in having a closed season for crayfishing is a very good one. The crayfishing industry has had rather a bad time this year; and perhaps one of the contributing factors is that too many licenses have been issued in the areas where crayfish are to be found, and possibly they have been outfished.

Like the seasons, the crayfish differ in their habits from year to year, and while this year the fishermen are having a bad season, last year conditions were very good and they experienced a bumper season. The Government is doing a great deal in the way of research in the fishing industry to help build up this great dollar earner.

I think some comment should be made on the road system, which has taken such a hammering during the recent rains. The engineers of the Main Roads Department deserve great praise for the wonderful job they have done in providing all-weather roads from Wyndham through to Esperance. I would like to pay a particular tribute to one of that department's engineers. I refer to Mr. Maguire who has just retired. No matter what part of the State one visits one sees roads which he has helped to build. He has been engineering roads since 1929, and they are still standing up to floods and seasonal conditions. The younger engineers are taking their cue from him, and the miles and miles of roads that have been built by the Main Roads Department are a great tribute to them.

A good deal more money should be spent however towards making the roads safer for the motoring public. They should be brought up to a standard where they can be regarded as all-weather roads. This

year a great deal more money was allocated to this important task, but due to the extraordinary season we have experienced we will be no better off at the end of the year, because more money will have to be spent in repairing the roads that have been washed out. I do think, however, that we should approach the Commonwealth Government for larger State road grants to enable our engineers to provide roads of which we would be proud.

In the matter of electricity, we in the northern areas of the State have in the past always just been so far behind the southern part of the State. This is possibly due to our lack of population. We will be pleased to see the S.E.C. take over the Geraldton electricity supply and link it with the State grid system. Not only will this provide cheaper power to small manufacturers in the northern areas, but it will also help the tomato growers who are at present without electricity.

Some of these tomato growers still use Tilley lamps or hurricane lamps, and anyone who works as hard as these people do should be provided with facilities in the way of electricity to enable them to pump water and drive the various motors they use in their industry. If this power is linked throughout the agricultural towns north and south of Geraldton it will provide better living conditions for the people in those areas. I consider it a great privilege to be able to push along these ideas in this House with a view to helping the Government further advance this great State of ours.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [8.43 p.m.]: Before making my contribution to this debate I would like to express my sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Hall, and also to the relatives of the late Mr. Davies and the late Mr. Simpson. I knew the late Mr. Hall many years ago in Kalgoorlie during his tram-driving days. When I met him here again he was most helpful to me, and went out of his way to do all he could for me. He was a jovial companion on our train trips to Kalgoorlie, and one would never have thought at the time that he was so ill.

I knew Mr. Davies when I was a small boy at Northam. He was a railwayman, and when I entered Parliament we often reminisced about our days together in Northam. Mr. Simpson was known to me in another organisation before I came here. We became firm friends in the short time I was here, and I regret his passing very much. I would like to add my congratulations to the three new members.

I knew Mr. Dolan only by reputation in the sporting field; but who did not? I used to follow his successes as a football coach, and except for actually seeing him I knew all about him. Dave Dellar I knew well. I used to work with Dave shovelling

sand and slimes on the Old Adeline Lead in Kalgoorlie in 1931, I think it was. Dave was a good sportsman and a champion cyclist, having ridden in nine Menzies road races, five from Beverley to Perth, and two from Warrnambool to Melbourne.

Mr. Dellar, Mr. Dolan, and now Mr. Heitman have shown they will be an asset to this House, and their contributions I am sure will be very worth while.

As a member of a province in which there are gold mines, it is fitting I should speak of the goldmining industry. It is a frightful shame to see towns going down such as Wiluna, Big Bell, and, more recently, Coolgardie, Bullfinch, and Southern Cross. People have to pull up their roots and move, and that is not nice. In the case of Bullfinch and Southern Cross it will not be so bad because they have agriculture to help them along. Coolgardie is not in the same situation because there is nothing else there.

I often wonder whether our goldmining industry could not do much better if it had a shot in the arm from the Commonwealth Government. I know there are all sorts of schemes to help the mining industry but with the resources available to the State Governments they cannot do enough to help the industry along. I had in mind that if the goldmining industry could get a subsidy of £5 an ounce it would put new vigour in the industry. That would not be a lot of money, because the dairymen have been subsidised at the rate of £13,500,000, and that has saved the industry. I agree with it. The Commonwealth Government is giving to farmers a subsidy on super at the rate of £3 a ton. Again I agree. However I fail to see why a decent subsidy cannot be provided for the goldmining industry to promote prospecting.

I believe the International Monetary Fund is to meet soon, and I hope pressure will be brought to bear on that body; but I say that more in sadness than in any other way, because I am afraid that America will not agree to the price of gold going up.

The industry has done very well. The mine managements and the men are efficient and that is the explanation why the goldmining industry has lasted so long. It would be an excellent investment in Australia if the price of gold were put up internally. I know the world price will not go up. In my opinion if the world price were the right one it would be 70 dollars, because the price of gold has not increased for many years, except for a few pence, but costs in the goldmining industry have risen.

Another matter concerning the goldmining industry which has interested me is in connection with the abandoned towns. I wonder if they have been completely prospected, because years ago various

towns were told they were finished. Geologists even said many years ago that Kalgoorlie was almost finished, but it is still going and is very healthy. I can also remember when Norseman was supposed to be finished.

The Norseman reef was exploited and it cut out and it was said that Norseman was finished. But when the gold boom started, the Mararoa reef was opened up and millions of tons of very valuable ore were mined from that reef. At one stage there were 750 men working in the mines. The Princess Royal was supposed to be finished in 1911, but it was opened up again and more work was done. The same thing occurred at the North Royal.

The Central Norseman Gold Corporation is treating 14,000 tons a month from those derelict mines, and it is averaging half an ounce. So I often wonder whether some work should not be done to make sure there is nothing left behind in these other mines. As I have said, the Central Norseman Gold Corporation is a very progressive company and has done an enormous amount of work and has spent a tremendous sum of money. It is drilling the complete town of Norseman. It is common to see drills around the place, and right in the town it is drilling plenty of ore which is valuable. If gold remains at the same price it is now, Norseman will probably be going for another 20 years. This just goes to show what has happened to those derelict mines which were abandoned at one stage.

I would now like to mention the miners' pension fund. I mentioned this subject last year and I ventured the opinion that miners would contribute to a pension scheme. During the recess I have gone out of my way to question miners wherever possible as to whether they would contribute to a pension scheme and whether they wanted one. I explained that it would cost them a lot more money but in almost every case the desire was expressed to have some pension scheme.

They know of course that unless they become silicotic they cannot get anything from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. The unions affected are the Australian Workers' Union, the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Union, the Boilermakers' Society, the Carpenters and Joiners' Union, the Plumbers and Sheet Metal Workers' Union, the Painters and Decorators' Union, the Federated Moulders (Metals) Union, and the Electrical Trades Union.

Men from these unions are employed around the mines and they contribute to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund with very little chance of ever getting anything out of it. Those men I know would contribute to a pension scheme, and I sincerely ask the Minister to look into this matter in

order that he might be convinced so that something might be done. The silicosis inquiry is on at present so I will reserve any remarks about that until later but I sincerely hope we do get something out of it for the miners.

I believe that over the years the Legislative Council has heard a lot about Esperance and its possibilities from members of the South-East Province. Emil Nulsen since 1932 almost yearly has been a great advocate for Esperance.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Mr. Bennetts gives us a word or two on it now and again.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes, I said members of the South-East Province. Incidentally, Esperance is celebrating its centenary next year and I believe that social and sporting gatherings are planned. I hope that members will attend. I believe there is to be a big yacht race to Esperance, and a naval ship will be there. They are trying to sell Esperance to the public.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Esperance is showing a lot of progress.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes, but it can show a lot more, I hope. Esperance has a power problem because it does not have enough power. Not only does this problem concern generation and distribution, but the price is 1s. 6d. a unit, which is pretty high. If a larger plant were installed I think the price would be reduced and leave a margin for the harbour equipment when it is started.

This shire also has problems in connection with its road system. There are now 1,000 miles of road in the district and that is worrying the shire council I know, because 1,000 miles of road takes a lot of upkeep and maintenance. The situation will become worse when new settlers go to Scaddan. There is a lot of land being opened up there and when it is allocated and the work commences more money will be needed to provide roads for the use of the settlers.

The reticulation scheme at Esperance is just about ready. There are mixed feelings about it but my personal opinion is that it will be very good. The reason I say that is that Esperance will then become a pretty healthy town. The people will be able to put in septic tanks and septic systems and make the place attractive to tourists, as well as making it better from a health point of view.

As it is now, it is not possible to put in a fresh-water well and tank within 100 feet of a discharge of effluent from a septic tank, and that is creating a real problem, because if a person puts a septic tank near the fence, the next door neighbour has to go 100 feet away from it. I think the reticulation and the rainwater tanks will help.

I believe that people who have provided wells and windmills, piping, and pipe fittings, should get some form of compensation, because some have spent up to £250.

A problem exists in Esperance in connection with wheat. This was accentuated last year by the breakdown in resistance of Eureka and other varieties of wheat which were supposed to be rust-resistant. I hope the research station will soon be able to cultivate a type of wheat which will suit the Esperance district. Last year a lot of farmers lost heavily.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: It is hardly a wheat-growing area though, is it?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I think it will be if the right variety is cultivated but now with the spring rains the ordinary type of wheat breaks down.

As I have said, new land is being opened up at Scaddan. I believe there are nine Belgians from the Belgian Congo amongst the applicants. The Belgian Government is assisting to the extent of £5,000 to each of these men to open up their farms. They are a very good type and most of them are working in or about the mines at Norseman waiting allocation of land.

A lot of young chaps in the Scaddan-Esperance area complain about the lack of finance for development. They find it hard to get money from development banks, and they are having quite a battle while waiting for their first payment for wheat. Some of them are badly hit by rust, which has put them further back. The banks should be a little more lenient and give them more money, because after all the world markets are good. There is no trouble in selling primary products; and, of course, we heard this morning that the world population is growing and further markets will be available.

I cannot see a better investment than the financing of young fellows on farms. I am a bit concerned about the Bathurst burr on the goldfields. It is quite a problem and has been for some time. I do not think we have arrested it very much. Some departmental officers came to the goldfields and advised grubbing, spraying, and so on, but the fact remains that there is still not much being done about the burr.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: It needs a major effort.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I agree entirely. Mr. Garrigan, Mr. Arthur Moir, and I went out along the trans.-line on the tea and sugar train recently, and that train stops at all sidings to serve provisions to the people, so we had plenty of time to look at the various places. The caltrop weed is prevalent out there, and we were concerned about its spreading to the adjacent pastoral properties. Should it spread, it will become a real menace. I

wrote to the Commonwealth Railways about it, and they just shrugged it off and said they could not do much about the matter. I wrote to our own department, and, strangely enough, I got a similar reply. So it looks as if nobody is going to worry about these weeds.

I agree with Mr. Abbey that we need a checkpoint on the Eyre Highway. As members know, I live out that way, and I have seen stock, sheep, and dogs, come through, and they would probably be carrying pests such as diseases and weeds from other States; and I really do think we should have a checkpoint out there. If we are free of certain weeds in this State, we want to remain that way.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: It would be a bit late for Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes, but there are other places. I am not dealing only with caltrop now, but with all weeds. The point I am making is that if there are some weeds we have not got, we should make sure that we do not get them. A few pounds spent now would save a lot of money later. I have seen as many as five or six Alsatian dogs a day come through. They are not allowed here, but still they are being brought in.

I was pleased to read recently about a T.B. eradication plan for beef cattle. I agree entirely with that scheme. Tuberculosis has been successfully eradicated from our dairy herds, because of 9,116 dairy cattle only 11 had T.B. infection. If a similar scheme is established in connection with the beef industry, it will help a lot. The metropolitan and country abattoirs figures reveal that the infection is 18.5 per cent. to 37.5 per cent. in 3,000 cattle in 11 affected areas.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: Beef cattle?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes. If tuberculosis can be successfully eradicated from dairy cattle, it will be a great thing if it can be eradicated in the case of the beef industry; and I am interested to read it is going to be attempted.

The Department of Native Welfare built houses at Norseman—four on the native reserve and two in the town. In Norseman we are concerned about the natives getting houses in the town. There is no question of colour bar there, and we are very tolerant of the natives, but we think if this is strictly policed a good turn will be done to the natives, because the people do not agree with their low standard of hygiene and their constant brawls; because I have seen houses shockingly damaged, windows broken, doors pulled off, and so on.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Floor boards used for firewood.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Yes. The point is: The people will not tolerate the natives if they do that sort of thing. The

whole trouble is that the natives have too many friends and relatives. They seem to come from everywhere, and they remain until they absolutely wreck the place. If the natives in the town are protected so that only they may use the houses, they would probably attain a certain standard, and people would tolerate them and would not mind if more of them came in. But while drunken brawls go on and their low standard of hygiene—or no hygiene at all—continues, the townspeople will not tolerate them in the towns.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There are white people like that.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I know, but I am talking about natives at the moment.

Over the years decentralisation has been loudly proclaimed, but few people have been able to offer an economic or practical solution to the problem. I know we can talk a lot about it, but it is a pretty complex subject and not too many can suggest a successful solution. I believe that in England an experiment was carried out. In one town a coalmine closed down and all the amenities were in the town area. Rather than shut down the town the Government brought a factory to the town, subsidised the freights, and so on, and I believe it was a great success. I know it would probably be easier to do that in England than here, but it is a thought.

The things that are against decentralisation are the costs of water, fuel, power, and freight. We have not got uniform rates. As I said before, power at Esperance is 1s. 6d. a unit. That would scare any industry away, for a start. In addition, petrol is 1s. a gallon more than it is in some other places; and that again would scare any industry away. Until we get uniform water, fuel, and power rates, in my opinion we will not achieve anything by decentralisation.

It is only natural that people with children will go to places where there are industries, factories, and apprenticeships. The children have to go away, from places where there are no jobs, and it is not long before the family follows. That is only natural, because teen-age children need the protection of their parents, and that is the reason they shift; and it is a bad thing for the town that they leave.

Mr. Dellar mentioned the conservation of water in Kalgoorlie for sporting facilities. We do that in the South-East Province. In Merredin, effluent from the sewerage system—that is effluent that has been treated by means of chlorination—is used for the oval. Some 20,000 gallons of effluent-treated water goes on to the oval at Merredin every day, and it is a very good oval.

Incidentally, Norseman made history this year by having football played for the first time on a grass oval. The water is caught in a dam. The seed was planted last November in the middle of a heatwave, and the football teams were playing on the oval this year. As a matter of interest, the men in the town raised £3,000 out of their pay packets to provide that grassed oval. So the people in the country certainly help themselves at times.

I am concerned about noise as an industrial hazard to health. Anyone who works in the mining industry will know that most men after a few years get what is called hammer ears and become deaf. It is an injury to the nerve of the ear, and if there is any background noise men who have that complaint cannot hear at all. I was pleased to hear, when the Minister answered a question the other day, that it was proposed to take a survey of the position at Kalgoorlie and Norseman.

Members can imagine the noise in a mine when there are two drills going at once—sometimes four, but not so much now, although it used to be the practice to have four drills going. The noise of the drills and the compressed air machines is terrific. That is why a large number of men who work in a confined space suffer from loss of hearing; and I think it is nearly time we decided to compensate them for that loss. I, and the other members of the South-East Province, wrote to the Minister to get a clerk of courts at Esperance on a full-time basis. I wrote on the 12th March, and the other members wrote before I did. Just prior to the last by-election for the North-East Province, a member of the Liberal Party (Mr. Stead), made an announcement in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 25th June. I assume he made that announcement on behalf of the Government, because—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You assume incorrectly.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS:— he got the information.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He got it because he wrote and asked, the same as you did.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The letter I received from the Minister was dated the 28th June, three days after this announcement appeared in the *Kalgoorlie Miner*.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is natural.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The Minister's letter was written on the 28th June, but I did not receive it till the 15th July. The point is that the Minister wrote to me after the announcement appeared in the *Kalgoorlie Miner*; and it is significant it appeared in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* just before the election and was released by Mr. Stead, a Liberal Party member.

I now wish to deal with a Federal matter, and in this regard I support Mr. Dellar. He spoke of the bad radio reception up in the north country. I know that radio has nothing to do with this Government, but still I am voicing my protest here. The reception we get in the mallee—the Salmon Gums-Esperance area—is shocking. As a matter of fact, there is virtually no reception at all at times from the Western Australian stations. We get interference from Eastern States stations, which come in pretty powerfully and block out the Western Australian stations. The same thing applies along the trans-line. About 150 miles out one cannot get any reception from Western Australia at all. While this is not a State matter, I agree with Mr. Dellar that something should be done about it; and, like him, I am voicing my protest. I support the motion.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [9.15 p.m.]: I support the motion for the Address-in-Reply, and I join with other members in congratulating Mr. Dellar, Mr. Dolan, and Mr. Heitman on their election to this Chamber; and I would like to congratulate Mr. Heitman on the maiden speech he delivered to the House this evening.

I echo Mr. Heenan's wish that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator, who at great personal inconvenience opened Parliament in the usual manner, will soon be restored to good health. I think all members will join with me in expressing appreciation of the fact that this evening we are honoured by the distinguished presence of the British Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations. So far as I can recall, it is the first occasion when, with the House in session, we have had a distinguished member of the Mother of Parliaments sitting with us on the floor of this Chamber.

As one who has had the opportunity of seeing the House of Commons and the House of Lords in session, it is a matter of great personal satisfaction to me that we should have our distinguished visitor here with us this evening. It reminds me of 1934 and 1935 when it was my privilege to be received by the then Secretary of State for the Dominions—as the office was then called—and the occupant of the office on that occasion was The Right Honourable, and inimitable, J. H. Thomas. I well remember the reception we received on that occasion. The right honourable gentleman picked up the document and said something like this—

It will be my duty to present this document to His Majesty. I am happy to see you here and I hope you have a good time.

Then, laying the document aside he said—

If you want to see a good football match on Saturday go to Wembley, and if you want to see a good fight tonight go to the stadium.

They were stirring days. I still remember them. I well remember Winston Churchill—a lone hand—thundering on Indian rule. I well remember a meeting in the Albert Hall when that vast building was packed and the principal speakers were Winston Churchill and some of his colleagues fighting virtually a lone hand against the India Bill. In that year also the late Duke of Kent married Princess Marina.

Then, in 1952, it was my privilege to hear Mr. Butler deliver his Budget speech for that year, and again I well remember the dramatic moment when it was five minutes past four and Mr. Butler looked at the clock and said, "The bank rate has been raised from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent." With that a flood of probably 100 Pressmen rose from the Press gallery like a flock of birds.

As I stand here at this moment I cannot help but reflect on the contrast between then and now. On that occasion, in 1952, I well remember seeing that large number of Pressmen, experts in Parliament and parliamentary affairs, and now in our Chamber tonight, I see that the Press gallery is as bare as the President's gallery. In my humble opinion, in that respect, the Pressmen of this country, unlike the Pressmen of the United Kingdom, have not absorbed and followed, as they ought, with an active and deep interest, and a knowledgeable interest, the affairs of Parliament and its proceedings.

It was one of the wisest men who said—though he did not always shape his own actions by his own precepts—that to everything there is a season and a time for every purpose under Heaven. Following that injunction, I am prompted to mention and to remind you, Sir, that last year this Parliament passed a law modifying the rule of perpetuities and repealing the law against accumulations.

We appear to have made history for a second time throughout the United States of America. Perth achieved considerable notoriety a couple of years ago as the City of Light, and it would now appear that at the Harvard University and the University of California, the legislation which was passed last session has caused us to be given recognition among the legal luminaries of the United States who move, if not in the rare atmosphere enjoyed by the astronauts, in an atmosphere only a little less rare.

In the last issue of *University of Western Australia Law Review* there is an article by W. Barton Leach, Professor of Law, Harvard University, under this heading, "Perpetuities Reform: London Proposes, Perth Disposes." The learned author

then goes on to point out that in October, 1956, the Lord Chancellor's Law Reform Committee published its fourth report analysing defects in the rule against perpetuities and recommending legislative reform. Then he says—

Without wish to criticise our British brethren who face certain difficulties in finding a place for such legislation in competition with other matters of great import, it must be noted that in the intervening period of more than five years no Bill has been introduced in Parliament, and none has even been drafted. But Western Australia has done the job in the Law Reform (Property, Perpetuities, and Succession) Act, assented to 6th December, 1962. Bravo, Western Australia!

I may remind you, Sir, that when Captain Stirling founded this State in 1829, he brought with him not merely his proclamation with which to proclaim the State. He brought with him also the Union Jack, the common law of England, and the statutes of England. Not on stones of marble; he simply brought them with him. As I have said, he brought the common law of England, some of it good, and some of it not so good. Among those that could be described as not so good were the very intricate rule against perpetuities and the rule against accumulations. However, last year, this Parliament, in its wisdom, modified the rule against perpetuities, and I have no doubt that if it could be brought to the ear of the Lord Chancellor's Law Reform Committee that the Parliament of Western Australia has acted largely on the recommendations made by that committee, the operations of the Parliament of Western Australia could echo at Westminster.

I had not the slightest intention of speaking to this motion this evening. That would be pretty obvious by the disjointed nature of my remarks. However, perhaps I may conclude by assuring our distinguished visitor that in this Parliament and in this Chamber—particularly in this Chamber—the spirit which pervades all members, regardless of party affiliations, may be summed up in these words by Edmund Burke—

Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom for a great country, and little minds go ill together.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. M. Thomson.

House adjourned at 9.28 p.m.