

I am convinced that the measure is necessary, not only to further rural expansion in the State, but also to ensure that the bank will be controlled by the type of men who will be available if the measure be passed. As the member for Toodyay said, very small expense will be attached to the arrangement. A sum of £270 a year is all that would be required to give to two officers a status that they do not have at present. The chairman of commissioners has told me that very often he has to call upon officers of the department to take responsibility far beyond their status.

Mr. Nalder: Would you not have to appoint other officers to take their places?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; they would continue in their normal positions and, when the commissioners met, they would attend the meeting and take part in the general discussion on the formation of policy. That is the only time they would need to be relieved of their everyday work.

Mr. Nalder: You would probably appoint men from the central office.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

Hon. L. Thorn: They are available to the commissioners now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is so. The other applications called were State-wide, but in view of the present position, it would be better to recognise the fact that those who start on the lowest rung of the ladder should have an opportunity in time to reach the top positions, provided they have the ability to fill them, and this is a method by which that end may be attained. There is nothing funny about the Bill, and if there is something funny about the member for Toodyay, it has not been reflected in the debate on this measure. He is on the wrong track, and if members consider the position carefully, I am sure they will agree that the passing of the Bill will be in the best interests of the State.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	20
Majority for	3

Mr. Andrew
Mr. Brady
Mr. Graham
Mr. Hawke
Mr. Heal
Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Hoar
Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Lapham
Mr. Lawrence

Ayes.
Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Moir
Mr. Nalder
Mr. Norton
Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Sewell
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott
Mr. Ackland
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Court
Mr. Doney
Mr. Hill
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Mann
Mr. Manning
Sir Ross McLarty

Mr. Nimmo
Mr. North
Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Owen
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. Yates
Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.

Mr. Kelly
Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Guthrie

Noes.

Mr. Hearman
Mr. Brand
Mr. Cornell

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 4th November, 1953.

CONTENTS

	Page
Questions : Railways, as to shortage of trucks and effect	1486
Forests, as to tenders for areas	1486
Roads, as to condition, Dale Bridge-Beverley	1486
Assent to Bills	1503
Bills : Local Authorities, Royal Visit Expenditure Authorisation, 1r.	1486
Companies Act Amendment (No. 1), report	1486
Supply Bill (No. 2), £9,000,000, 2r., remaining stages	1486
Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment, 1r.	1503
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 2r.	1503
Fertilisers Act Amendment, 2r.	1505
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2r.	1508
Constitution Acts Amendment, 2r.	1511
Adjournment, special	1517

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS.

As to Shortage of Trucks and Effect.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is the Minister for Railways aware that much concern is being expressed at Norseman, because of the inconsistent supply of railway trucks for the loading of pyrites?

(2) Does the Minister know that the shortage of trucks is caused by the influx of motor bodies from the Eastern States?

(3) Is it correct that this State's proportion of freight received on these motor vehicles is £10 per body; also that only one motor body is loaded in each single truck and two bodies on the double trucks?

(4) Is the Minister aware that the Commonwealth railways are fitting racks to their wagons to enable 20 motor bodies to be carried?

(5) Can similar racks be fitted on the State railway wagons?

(6) What effect will the above have on the lifting of wheat and superphosphate in this State?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) This State's proportions are £7 11s. 7d. for a body consigned to Perth and £8 18s. 3d. for a body consigned to Fremantle. Generally, one single truck will hold one body but often three bodies are loaded into a bogie wagon.

(4) The department's information is that 16 will be loaded in wagons that have racks.

(5) No, due to the necessity of ensuring clearances for overhead bridges and station buildings.

(6) None.

FORESTS.

As to Tenders for Areas.

Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Chief Secretary:

In connection with the sale of forest areas 19/53 to 27/53, which were withdrawn and subsequently thrown open for resale, will he tell the House what were—

(a) the total number of tenders received and the names of applicants;

(b) the number of tenders received from objecting sawmillers, including areas and firms concerned?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(a) Area 19/53 was resubmitted after a substantial reduction of the original area involved.

Bunning Bros. were the only tenderers. Area 20/53 was not resubmitted for tender.

Area 21/53 was not resubmitted for tender.

Area 22/53 has only recently been re-advertised for tender and tenders have not closed.

Area 23/53 was resubmitted for tender in its original form. Bunning Bros. were the only tenderers.

Area 24/53 has not been resubmitted for tender.

Area 25/53 has not been resubmitted for tender.

Area 26/53 has not been resubmitted for tender.

Area 27/53 was resubmitted after substantial reductions of the original area. Tenders were received from the Kauri Timber Coy. and Bunning Bros.

(b) On areas so far resubmitted for tender, only one tender was received from an objecting sawmiller. That tender was for area 27/53 by the Kauri Timber Coy.

ROADS.

As to Condition, Dale Bridge-Beverley.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is he aware of the bad state of the main road between Dale Bridge and Beverley—particularly the section between Edwards Crossing and Beverley?

(2) Is he aware that this is portion of the route to be taken by Her Majesty the Queen during her visit next year?

(3) Is it the intention of the Main Roads Department to resurface the bad portions of the road before March next?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) This is not portion of the route to be taken by Her Majesty.

(3) Yes.

BILL—LOCAL AUTHORITIES, ROYAL VISIT EXPENDITURE AUTHORISATION.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary and read a first time.

BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £9,000,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central) [4.37]: I do not propose to say very much on this Bill but I asked for the adjournment because of the statements

made by Mr. Murray last evening. I thought that the House was entitled to have some explanation from the Minister and I knew that he would not have the facts at his fingertips last night.

This is an emergency measure and Standing Orders have been suspended to enable it to be passed through all stages at one sitting. But, in common with other members, I would like to hear the Government's reply to the statements made by Mr. Murray about the Conservator of Forests. If there is no reply to those statements then the position sounds rather bad because the man concerned holds a responsible job as Conservator of Forests. So I think we should have some explanation, from the Government's point of view, as to really what took place.

There is only one other matter I wish to raise and it concerns complaints that have been made by a number of people whose land has been resumed either by the State Housing Commission or some other Government department. There is one case—and the facts were presented to me—where the Housing Commission resumed five acres of land at Scarborough which were owned by a widow. A sum of £300 was paid for the land in question. I understand that the commission permitted the woman to retain two blocks after the area had been surveyed, but she had to pay for the survey and transfer costs.

It seemed to me that it must have been very poor land, but on making inquiries, I found that blocks in the locality are selling for as much as £200 and £300 a quarter-acre block. While the departments have a right to resume land, they should at least be fair to the people, more particularly those who are not in the habit of transacting business deals. I know, of course, that very frequently we have the spectacle of people trying to extract money from the Government, but in the instances to which I have referred, I think we are going to the extreme in the other direction.

There are also other cases of departments resuming land and not being prepared to pay reasonable prices for the areas taken over. The trouble facing anybody whose land is resumed is that he has to go to arbitration to determine its value. If it is over £1,000, the matter must be dealt with by the Supreme Court. A person who has paid £300 for five acres of land can go to a magistrate, but unless he employs a lawyer or somebody else qualified to express an opinion, he has no chance of putting up a case.

I hope the Minister will look into these cases and see if the reputation which the Government of Western Australia enjoys regarding the fairness of its dealings can be maintained. I do not blame the present Government; past Governments have acted similarly. I hope the Minister will

draw the attention of the officer dealing with these resumptions to the facts I have mentioned and tell him that after all he has a responsibility to the individual as well as to the Government in seeing that a fair price is paid for this land.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [4.42]: I want to take the opportunity on this Bill of mentioning a matter which concerns some of the electors of the province I represent. I direct attention to the position regarding electricity extensions to a suburb known as Riverton, just up the Canning River and some six miles from Perth. During the time I represented the Canning district in another place, the Government of the day, upon representations from myself, made certain extensions of electricity and of water in this particular district. As a matter of fact, the previous Administration was the originator of the Riverton water scheme.

It can well be visualised that in a district such as Riverton where a water scheme has been laid down, land values continue to rise and the consequent demand for blocks there becomes more keen. As a result more people have come to live in that particular area. I do hope that when the Minister replies he will give me at least some sort of answer to the requests I shall make in this regard. When I spoke on the Address-in-reply and directed certain remarks to the House on the question of the rentals of the Commonwealth-State rental homes, I explained how those rents had been increased over recent months.

Although I mentioned to the Chief Secretary the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement as being the reason for those increases and addressed a number of allegations to him on that occasion, when he got up to reply to the House on certain matters that had been raised by members, the Chief Secretary completely and utterly disregarded any mention whatever of the allegations I had made against the Government in this matter. I do not think it is fair for any Government to disregard completely as my remarks were disregarded, the contentions of a member of this House.

I am sure the Minister will realise that in placing these matters before the House and before him, as the representative of the Government, I am drawing attention to a set of circumstances under which people who are the occupiers of Commonwealth-State rental homes in many places are not at all happy about the increase in rents they have had to pay. I take very strong exception to the fact that the Minister did not see fit to even endeavour to make any reply.

Of course we know that in the short time the present Government has been in power rentals are not the only charges that have been increased. We know from

the Budget speech delivered in another place by the Premier a few days ago, that the people of the State can expect even greater and further increases in other directions than those they are experiencing at the present time. The request I want to make to the Chief Secretary is that some consideration be given to the people who live in Riverton concerning their water extensions, and also to the request that has been made to the department for the extension of electricity supplies. The people have been told that electricity extensions in the Riverton district are uneconomical, that they involve an outlay of too much capital cost and therefore the people cannot expect to receive electricity extensions in the near future or perhaps in the distant future.

I draw the Chief Secretary's attention to the fact that at least some of the people who live in that district are not similarly minded as those responsible for neglecting to give them power in their district. They are not minded in that way, and I have two particular cases. One concerns a woman who invested her savings of £1,000 in the last State Electricity Commission loan; and another, a man who invested his savings of £800 in that loan.

These people have sufficient faith in the district in which they live, and in the State generally to subscribe to a loan of this description amounts which, I am sure it will be agreed, are considerable. Then for them to be told that the department says there is insufficient money to permit of the extension of electricity supplies to the district is not reasonable. People respond to the advertisements that appear in the paper calling upon the public to invest money in their own State, only to be told afterwards that they are not even to receive the common amenities of electricity and water supplies! In this instance they are to be denied electricity in a suburb which is situated approximately five miles from Perth.

In another place I spoke a good deal about this matter, and the previous Government saw fit to give those people some of the amenities to which I have referred. During its term of office, electricity extensions were made in the district and a new school was built at Riverton. Shortly the present Minister for Education will open a further wing of that school. The whole district is growing, and I see no reason whatever why the people living there should not receive some satisfaction of their demands.

There are many other matters I could discuss at this stage, but I do not intend to take up the time of the House in doing so. I support the second reading; but I would like to say to the Chief Secretary once more that I hope he will give some satisfactory reply to the points I have raised. If he cannot do so in connection

with this debate, I hope he will obtain such reply and make it available later, especially with regard to electricity extensions. I would also like him to give me some answer concerning the matter of the Commonwealth-State rental homes.

When he sat down after having replied to the Address-in-reply debate, I said I was not surprised that he had not made any attempt to refute the charge I levelled against the Government in connection with Commonwealth-State rental homes; and I repeat I am not surprised, because I think the statements I made were irrefutable. However, it is the Chief Secretary's bounden duty to endeavour to satisfy the House and not completely ignore the remarks made by members.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [4.53]: I wish to take this opportunity to thank members who supported my motion for an addendum to the Address-in-reply. There are only two matters I wish to bring before the Minister's notice on this occasion. First of all, I want to refer to the terminus of the bus that runs from Victoria Park to West Perth. The bus at present makes its journey along St. George's Terrace, and the terminus is on the north side of Parliament House grounds opposite West End Motors Ltd. If the bus is running on time or a little ahead of time, people who live in West Perth have to sit in it until it moves off, and pay an additional fare to travel from the terminus around to Parliament House, or else walk up the hill to the Parliament House stop.

My suggestion is that the terminus should be on the south side of Harvest Terrace, by the pines, so that the bus will move off from there and turn the corner down into Malcolm-st. That would more satisfactorily meet the convenience of passengers than is the case with the present arrangement. There are at times two buses parked parallel to each other in the main thoroughfare of Hay-st, and there is general confusion amongst traffic when the bus from West Perth turns left into Hay-st. Passengers would receive a better service if seats were placed in the shade of the big pine trees in Harvest Terrace and there would be general satisfaction for all.

Hon. H. Hearn: It would popularise Parliament House, too.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: It might serve members who travel by bus to Parliament House, because at present the bus stops for perhaps five minutes at the present terminus before proceeding to the Parliament House stop. I trust that the Chief Secretary will bring that matter before the notice of the Minister.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is the pipeline from Wellington Dam. Over the years I have taken a good deal of interest in the construction of that line from Wellington Dam, first to Narrogin

and then north and south of Narrogin to Pingelly and southwards to Katanning. The rate of progress of that pipeline has been very slow. When materials were not available there was plenty of money; but now that materials have become more plentiful, money is not available. In consequence people in Narrogin, Pingelly and towns southward to Katanning are still awaiting a reticulated supply.

It is fortunate that, owing to an abundant rainfall this year, Narrogin and Katanning will face the summer in a far better position as regards water supply than has been the case for many years. But in view of the increase in the population and the growth in the number of houses, it is doubtful whether by the end of early summer the supply of water will be very much in excess of what has been available over the last few years unless there is further rain.

The water catchment at Narrogin has been considerably improved. One of the last actions of the previous Government was to establish a system to provide for a larger quantity of water to be impounded. At Katanning a greater area of bitumen has been put down, and that has enabled the dam to reach its highest level—an all-time record. I would like to quote from the report of the Department of Public Works and Water Supply which has this to say concerning the raising of the Wellington Dam wall—

Preliminary work on the raising of this weir commenced in August, 1951. The present structure is a concrete gravity wall 50 ft. high impounding 8,500 million gallons. The new structure will be 50 ft. higher and will impound approximately, 42,000 million gallons. The additional water will provide for the Southern portion of the Agricultural Areas Great Southern Towns Water Supply, and for new Irrigation areas to be developed in the Capel-Boyanup Districts.

Progress at June, 1952, comprised married and single camp accommodation for staff and workmen, erection of stores, offices, etc., preparation of site for construction plant and transfer of plant from Mundaring Weir to Wellington Dam. A new offtake pipe and access road were constructed from No. 1 Pumping Station downstream of the wall to the existing off-take system from the dam.

Instructions were received at the end of the financial year that work would cease temporarily in the raising of the wall owing to the restricted amount of loan funds available.

That is bad enough; but the work in connection with the laying of the main from Wellington Dam to Narrogin has practically ceased. If only a small amount of loan funds is to be made available,

I am of the opinion—and so is the Narrogin Municipal Council—that the pipeline should be completed before further money is spent on the raising of the wall of the dam. It is better to continue with the pipeline—only 30 miles of which has been laid and is serving no useful purpose—so that a connection can be made and the people of Narrogin can be supplied with the water they need. At a later stage the dam wall could be raised.

I believe a huge quantity of water could be drawn off because it is banked up for many miles, and there are several streams feeding into the dam in the upper reaches. Until such time as the last pipe is placed in the connecting link between Narrogin and the Wellington Dam, no one will gain much advantage because for some reason unknown to me the laying of the pipes was commenced at both ends at the same time. If the 30 miles that have been laid had come direct from the dam to Narrogin, water would have been much closer to that town and so could have been availed of by the railways instead of their still having to haul water 70-odd miles from Collie. I hope this matter will be brought to the notice of the Minister for Works and that he will use all the money that is available for the early construction of the remaining portion of the pipeline. I support the second reading.

HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East)

[5.21] I wish to speak first of all on the possibilities of the Esperance Downs, which some members saw last week-end. Those who visited the district in company with the Minister for Health and me must be convinced that there is a great agricultural future for that part of the State. The Minister for Agriculture said that he was very impressed with what he saw and that he would form a committee to look into the possibilities there. The 18 farmers who were with me had very high qualifications in the farming industry, and they looked at the land from all angles and went to a lot of trouble to analyse the soil. They said there were big possibilities at Esperance and that something should be done with the land. The acreage for holdings is now given as 2,500.

Hon. L. C. Diver: That figure is wrong.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: This area is considered to be too much, and it should be reduced to about 1,500 acres so that there would be more population within a shorter distance of Esperance where we have one of the best seaports in the State. I can imagine—not in my time, but it may be long after—that there will be freezing works at Esperance and that from there stock will be exported to all parts of the world. At one farm that we visited the wool clip was 19lb. on the average. That is something out of the ordinary.

Hon. L. Craig: Was it 19lb. per sheep?

Hon. G. BENNETTS: It was 19lb. Mr. Diver saw some of the stock on Mr. Button's station. The farmers who were with me took some samples of the wool. They were very impressed. The clover was cutting 30 cwt. to the acre in the second or third year of its being laid down. In addition, we can grow potatoes and onions in the district, although the potatoes this year were not as successful as in previous seasons.

I am concerned about the water supply to Norseman. I have previously made mention here of the Coolgardie-Norseman pipeline which was laid 17 years ago, and I said that when the booster pumps, that are now installed, were put in, we would have trouble on the line. There is one booster pump at Coolgardie, one at Widgiemooltha, one at Higginsville and one at Norseman. These pumps have to be staffed continuously, and on Sunday, when I came to Perth, there were three bursts in the main. When the pumps are in operation, the pipeline will not take the pressure and so it becomes damaged. Oxy-welders had to be sent from Coolgardie to within six or eight miles of Norseman, and this is an expensive matter because on Saturday and Sunday overtime rates have to be paid.

The Norseman people are concerned because they feel they will be short of water this summer, the same as they were last; they might possibly be worse off than ever because of the extra pressure of water going into the main. Before the pumps were put in, the department should have taken an outside engineer from one of the mines in the Norseman area to see just what was wanted and the best way of supplying the water. It is bad luck that the boosters have been installed. They cost a lot of money and I should say they will be expensive all the time they are there. They have to be worked on shifts, so I take it their upkeep will be quite substantial during the year.

I have written to the Minister asking him to look into the matter to see what can be done. I do not say that at the present time we can lay down a new main, but some provision will have to be made in the future for a new one. In "The West Australian" this morning I read that one of our State members spoke about things that have taken place since the Labour Government has been in power. He mentioned the increase in water rates. I think that before the present Government came into office, certain officers were in the Kalgoorlie area assessing properties with the idea of increasing the rates.

No matter what Government was in power today, I think it would have to do something about rail freights, water rates and the other increased charges that have taken place. We know that with the increase in the basic wage, and one thing

and another, these extra charges are necessary. My third point is that at the present time there is at Merredin a change-over from the air force to the military. A large barracks which was used as a mess is suitable for a hostel to house the children at the high school. I hope the Minister will give consideration to acquiring this building, because Merredin is a growing district and many of the children who attend the high school there come from miles away, and they have to be accommodated by being housed with the local people, if possible.

I am also perturbed about the need for our aged pensioners on the Goldfields to get optical and dental treatment. When I was in South Australia recently I noticed a rail clinic there. It consists of a coach which is taken out to all parts of the State so that children and others who need optical or dental treatment can receive attention. I think the only way that we could, on the Goldfields and in other outlying centres, overcome the problem of ensuring that our aged pensioners received treatment would be to come to some arrangement with the local optician to test their sight, on authority from the Medical Department, and then to send to Perth to have the glasses made up.

Personally, I do not think there are any of the opticians on the Goldfields who would not fall into line with that idea. Many attempts have been made over the years to do something about dental treatment, but they have not been very successful. The Medical Department may try again, perhaps, and possibly the members for the district could help. I hope the Minister will refer these matters to the various departments concerned.

HON. H. HEARN (Metropolitan) [5.13]: In rising to support the second reading of the Bill, I wish to refer briefly to a matter mentioned by Mr. Bennetts when, on the 22nd October, he asked the Minister these three questions—

(1) Is the Minister aware of the proposed new rail freight service, known as the Freightex system operating between the Eastern States and Western Australia?

(2) What effect will this system have on our local railways and local industry?

(3) Will the Minister have investigations made in this connection, to ascertain whether the same system could be introduced, with advantage, within the State railways?

Characteristically, the Chief Secretary replied—

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Yes.

Since these questions were addressed to the Government it has been my good fortune to get some details of this new Freightex system. I am sure this information will be of intense interest to members, particularly Goldfields members, because this session we have heard a lot about increased freights and the undoubted burden they have added to the primary industry, the gold mining industry, and industry generally in the metropolitan area.

I shall quote one or two passages from the "Kalgoorlie Miner" of Saturday, the 17th October, 1953, because I feel that the Minister, if he was quite honest in his replies, should advise the railway authorities to look into this phase, seeing that most certainly it is going to be of benefit to the Goldfields district, and will provide food for thought to the people who are engaged in industry in the metropolitan area, and throughout the other districts of the State. In addition, it is of interest to our primary producers. The report in the "Miner" read—

New Rail-freight Service from Eastern States.

Express Delivery Promised Direct to Consignee at Cut Rates.

Private Transport Company's Offer to Mines and Local Wholesalers.

A new express rail-freight service from the Eastern States to Kalgoorlie, backed by an Australia-wide private transport company, was announced yesterday by a representative of the Commonwealth railways, Mr. T. W. Mower.

Offering a formidable counter to the State railways' recent increase in freights, the system is a door-to-door freight service based on passenger train timetables and operating at cut rates through special contracts with the Commonwealth and Eastern States railways.

The article continues—

Comparing freight rates, Mr. Mower said that the contract rate between Adelaide and Melbourne, a distance of 450 miles, was a flat charge of £6 per ton capacity of each van, regardless of what quantity or type of goods were carried in the van. On the Western Australian railways the charge was £14 5s. 6d. per ton for Class 2 goods, which included such items as hardware, clothing and drapery, and £11 0s. 6d. for Class 1 goods, which included groceries.

An approach has been made to the Chamber of Mines, which is investigating the scheme in the light of mining costs, and to Goldfields wholesalers.

In another part of the article, the following was mentioned—

From the Commonwealth railways' point of view, the new service was ideal, Mr. Mower said. The lower rates offered to the company were offset by the extra business it brought to the railways, less administration work and no necessity to handle the goods.

Further on, the following appears—

Endeavours by the Thomas Transport Co. to extend their contract system beyond Kalgoorlie to other parts of the State—a move which should be to the benefit of the State railways and obviously to the general public—were not acceptable to the commercial agent of the West Australian Government Railways, Mr. W. Maher, when the scheme was put to him by Messrs. Martin and Mower.

This is difficult to understand, in view of the backloading it would have offered between Kalgoorlie and Perth, a section which has little demand for carriage of goods in comparison with the Perth-Kalgoorlie run. As the empty trucks must be returned to the metropolitan area, it would seem to be more profitable to accept an offer likely to induce back-loading.

I have quoted that newspaper article because I feel that the time has arrived when we must consider very seriously the railway operating costs when rendering a service to the primary producers, to the goldmining industry and to industry generally. I think that this scheme is certainly a novel innovation and is worth some consideration. I commend it to the Minister for Railways because I consider that in a scheme such as this there is at least something that would help us to keep our freights within due bounds, although I am sure Mr. Loton would dispute that because he believes that they are beyond due bounds now.

The reason why I have passed this information on to the House is that such a scheme could extend and, from the point of view of local industry, the competition from the Eastern States prewar and postwar has been very considerable, particularly in the Kalgoorlie area, because of the very favourable rates charged by the Commonwealth railways in transporting goods from Adelaide to Kalgoorlie. I support the second reading.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [5.20]: I support the Bill. In doing so, I wish to bring before the House, and Ministers in particular, the fact that many of us consider the existing position of the Department of Agriculture is extremely alarming. It is generally known and accepted by every member of Parliament, and also by a great number of influential people

throughout the country, that agriculture is the life-blood of the State. Yet, from the Treasurer's Budget speech, we find that the Department of Agriculture last year spent £50,000 less than it did the previous year.

To me, and I am sure to all members, this constitutes an alarming state of affairs because we look to the Department of Agriculture for assistance in raising the productive capacity of our State. The reasons given by the Treasurer for the lessened expenditure were that officers could not be procured for service in the department and that the estimated expenditure on agricultural research farms throughout the State had not come up to expectations. Why, I do not know.

Perhaps the machinery they need is not available, and perhaps the necessary labour for the extension work on those farms was not forthcoming. However, no reasons were given for the drop in expenditure and, in fact, only a short paragraph covered the subject. I hope that the Ministers in this House, when they meet their colleagues again in Cabinet, will stress the way we feel in regard to the falling off in the number of officers in the Department of Agriculture and the drop in expenditure.

I believe the State Government is doing everything possible to entice new officers to join the department but, nevertheless, only recently three more men left its service. Therefore, the present policy is not having the desired effect. When I made my maiden speech in this House some four years ago, I stressed the need for the Department of Agriculture to be made the chief department in Western Australia. I am still of opinion that this should be done because an industry that produces practically 90 per cent. of the wealth of the country should have its activities administered by the premier department of Western Australia.

Yet we still find that last year a little less than £700,000 was spent on that department. During my maiden speech, I said I felt that the remuneration paid to officers in that department was not sufficient to keep them in this State, because they were continually being offered greater inducement by other States and from other parts of the world. We have produced, and are still producing, excellent officers. Without fear of contradiction, I say we have some of the best agriculture officers that could be found anywhere in Australia. Dr. Teakle, who was in charge of the Soil Conservation Branch was attracted to another State because of an offer of £400 more per annum than he was receiving here.

It seems to me to be foolish to encourage young men to study and complete their University courses with a view to joining the department and then have them,

after a short period of service with the Department, leave for other parts because we in this State cannot pay them sufficient salary to keep them in Western Australia while at the same time we are crying out for more officers to be engaged on extension work in the department. As I have always maintained, the only solution is to increase their salaries.

Surely a man who spends four or five years of his early life studying, and who passes out of the University with a degree, is entitled to a greater remuneration than a youth who goes to work when he leaves school and does not serve an apprenticeship, but is merely engaged on unskilled manual work. Very often such a lad receives more return for his labour or as much as a young man who holds a University degree and is an officer of the Department of Agriculture. It is not impossible for a youth of 15, 16 or 17 years, particularly if he works in a shearing shed, to earn anything up to £16 per week.

We should do away with the existing system of fixing salaries for these officers, which, I believe, is the responsibility of the Public Service Commissioner. The Government should review the position, which should have been done by the Government in office four years ago, and make more money available for departmental salaries so that the services of these men can be retained. Over the last few years, and particularly since the recent visit by members to the Salmon Gums research station in the Esperance district, the need for further extension work in agriculture has been more generally recognised.

The departmental officers have shown what that district and many similar areas in the State, especially in the safe rainfall belt, can produce. However, more developmental and research work is required before they can be brought into production. The Soil Conservation Commission, working in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, has a mere handful of men and very little equipment to give attention to the problem of soil conservation in Western Australia.

Already, in some parts of the State, the country has been devastated to such an extent that it is beyond repair, but it is impossible for a handful of men to give close attention to our huge areas in an endeavour to try to prevent the erosion of the soil by wind and water. As I said four years ago, I believe that if we granted £2,000,000 to the Department of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Commission, portion of which could be spent to increase officers' salaries and to attract more men to the Department, it would be money well spent. If we allow soil erosion to continue unchecked, it will cost the State many millions of pounds to make the eroded land suitable for cultivation again.

I had personal experience of soil erosion some years ago when farms to the north of my property were abandoned and were left at the mercy of the elements. The banking up of the soil began partly to cover my fences and the time came when I thought that the only solution was to buy the block adjoining mine to see if I could do anything with it. It cost me £3 10s. an acre to bring that land back into production.

Had the previous owner, when clearing and working the property, obtained advice from departmental officers—if they had been made available—possibly there would have been no need for him to abandon his holding. Under the guidance of, and with the advantage of information obtained from officers of the Soil Conservation Commission and the Department of Agriculture, I have tackled the problem in the correct manner and some of the land that I have cleared since is now under cultivation with no possibility of being damaged. Land which cost £3 10s. to bring back to production could have been saved in the first instance if sufficient staff had been available.

It will be readily seen how the position can get out of hand in Western Australia and result in heavy expenditure which can be avoided by spending several hundred thousand pounds at the right time. I trust that the two Ministers present will request the Government at every opportunity to expend more money. The only way to induce good men to remain and to retain those raised and trained in Western Australia is by increasing their remuneration. Steps should be taken to increase the salaries outside of the general method of wage increments. These officers are specialists and should be paid as such. Until that is done, the Agricultural Department will not be as effective as it ought to be. I support the motion.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM (South-East) [5.32]: I want to touch on one subject which concerns my electorate very much; that is, the recent imposition of railway freight increases. Questions have been asked in this House by country members on the staggering increases. Those increases have an immediate impact on industry, in particular on mining. But in this regard the full impact has not yet been felt. Ministers in this House should be aware of what the increases will do, and I am giving the Chief Secretary not a warning but information.

The Chief Secretary: Just a friendly threat.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Not even that. One large mining company is very concerned about the increases. The effect will be so great that the mine may have to close down. That is how close to the borderline the increases have brought the company. The Premier in answer to a question, said that if a

company was so greatly distressed, consideration would be given to affording assistance. That would result in a full inquiry into the accounts and activities of the company, and no mining company would tolerate such an inquiry. This company is predominantly American-owned, and business men know what steps it will take when the company shows a loss.

Americans usually cut their losses. They do not carry on, hoping to improve; they discontinue operations immediately. It has been said that country districts are receiving consideration because of their distance from the metropolitan area. A lot has been said about the telescopic effect of freights and I refer to the interpretation of the word "telescopic" in the Oxford Dictionary, as meaning "distant or small objects appearing larger or nearer". In the country we are apparently looking through the telescope from the wrong end.

I asked two questions in this House and the answer to the first I describe as irresponsible. In view of the large number of questions asked on this subject, mine may have appeared frivolous, but since then the Railway Department has realised what will result and how the increases will affect the State. The answer to a subsequent set of questions was rather astonishing. I asked for the working loss of the Esperance branch line over approximately twelve months and it was given as almost £212,554. The main work of this line is carting fuel oil to one mining company. I do not believe this to be a freight loss. Mining timber might be, but the freight for this commodity is from £18,000 to £20,000. The rest of the freight is made up of pyrites carted under the heading of "Miscellaneous", which, if not marginal, at least is a borderline freight.

Increase in freight of 35 per cent. will mean another £40,000 pay-out. The Government has sunk a tremendous amount of money into this pyrites mine to encourage an industry which it so desperately needs, and just when the company is reaching key production it is faced with a £40,000 increase in freight. The immediate reaction when the company realises the significance of the freight increase will be to reduce staff and cut down production so as to avoid extra cost.

The ultimate result will be that the mining of pyrites, which is so badly needed, will come dangerously close to being completely neglected because it cannot compete with imported sulphur. At least one super works has been equipped to burn pyrites entirely; with increased cost of freight the burden will fall on to the producer. Alternatively, the works will have to switch over to imported sulphur and the industry in Norseman will languish for lack of sales.

An alternative to counter the increased freights is to reintroduce the running of an intra-State shipping service or to give some inducement for ships to call at Esperance. When the s.s. "Koomilya" called at Esperance there was not enough freight. Members of this House have visited Esperance and the district, and they can bear out the stories told about the rich land. That area is potentially a second South-West, and the yields of the land are fantastic. Some examples are:—

50-lb. lambs killed.

15-in. mats of clover on virgin bush and on which a plough had not been over for years.

There is a property scrub-rolled and burnt but not touched by plough which in the second year yielded £3,000 of clover burr.

Hon. L. C. Diver: Your language is misleading.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I did not intend that, but the member himself is a farmer and would understand these instances given. Even on the research station these results could not be achieved, and hand-ploughing would not produce the same results on the experimental plots. Mr. Reigert of that district proved that it can be done.

Another matter relating to the railways was a reply to a question on the use of trucks on the Kalgoorlie line. That line generally is referred to as a losing proposition. I asked if rail trucks used for coal haulage were suitable for the haulage of pyrites, and the reply was in the affirmative. The answer to my question whether trucks used for haulage of coal to Kalgoorlie were used for the haulage of pyrites from Norseman on the return trip, was "No."

The brevity of the answers led me to believe that I was being tempted to ask another question. I have not done that, but I am seeking further information. I want to find out why the trucks taking coal to Kalgoorlie do not return with back loading. I can hardly believe that empty trucks are sent to Kalgoorlie to bring pyrites back, or that full trucks of coal going to Kalgoorlie return empty; but if that is the case, the loss of £250,000 is understandable. Kalgoorlie and other mining towns are deeply concerned with any increase in freights and the effect of the increases on industry.

With that burden, and the prospect of a further one, the industry is feeling very gravely concerned. That is the only matter I wished to bring before the House. Although members have asked that certain matters be given consideration, particularly those affecting this industry, and have received by way of answer a brief and blunt "No", I hope that the Chief Secretary will convey to the Minister that the concern being felt is very real and very sincere. I support the second reading.

HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [5.46]: I support the second reading of the Bill and wish to acknowledge the opportunity afforded by the Minister for Justice of accompanying him to Esperance last week-end and seeing a part of the State which visit was to me, as an agriculturalist, very enlightening. I was greatly surprised to find such an area of land available in what is commonly known as the Esperance Downs. It is unquestionably a huge area and the possibilities were amply demonstrated to me, not only at the Government experimental station, but more so by the efforts of private individuals who are operating in the district.

The longest period for which pastures have been established there is five years and the owner of the property was carrying 1,100 sheep. Mr. Bennetts mentioned the wool clip and appealed to me to confirm his statement. I cannot confirm or deny it as I did not ask the owner how much he had cut, but I would be surprised if he had cut 18 or 19 lb. His flock consisted of cross-breds and some merinos.

Hon. L. Craig: You would not be convinced by that.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: Well, I should like to see the wool weighed before accepting the figure.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: What is the area of that property?

Hon. L. C. DIVER: The owner has 600 acres of pasture, and it would carry two sheep to the acre, especially where good farming practice is carried on. The owner is conserving meadow hay and, if a dry pinch occurs towards the end of the season, such as is experienced in most farming areas, he will be able to hand-feed his stock.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You saw it in the flush period.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: If after a lifetime of agriculture I have not an appreciation of country when in full bloom, it is time I got out of the industry. That farm I would describe as being not a good one, but a remarkable one, and I say here and now that the only things holding the district back are, firstly, the attitude of the Esperance people; and secondly, the isolation of the area.

According to the records I saw, the rainfall is remarkably consistent and its incidence is of such a nature that only two months out of the 12 can be considered to be dry. I am told that the district enjoys exceptionally cool conditions throughout the year, and this can be well believed as it borders right on to the Southern Ocean. The underground water supplies appear to be reasonably good. In places it may be necessary for farmers who go there to bore for water, but in many parts there are surface waters in the lagoons. The land 16 or 18 miles east of Esperance, I thought, was considerably better than that close to Esperance for surface water.

There is tremendous scope for further exploration and inquiry regarding the land east of Esperance.

To the west of Esperance, we went to Fanny's Cove where Mr. Noel White has a property. Between the property of Kirwan Brothers, east of Esperance, and Fanny's Cove, the distance would be 70 miles, and there is land of similar type throughout that stretch of country. It may be only a relatively thin strip 15 to 20 miles wide, but if the area is calculated in acres, and an allowance is made of 1,000 acres for each farm, I figure that the day will come, though I may not see it, when that country will be carrying in the vicinity of 3,000,000 sheep, and that is country which is producing comparatively nothing today.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Do you think that 1,000 acres will be enough?

Hon. L. C. DIVER: That is a very difficult question to answer, as this is clover country and the pasture will undoubtedly grow much more heavily if the land is properly manured with super and trace elements. What will happen is that certain stock diseases will appear; there is nothing surer in the world than that. With the fodder that will be grown in that climate, red mite and lucerne flea will make their appearance in the pastures. In the sheep some foot rot will probably occur and they will also suffer from internal parasites.

These pests will demand a lot of attention on the part of farmers who settle there, especially if we are going to grant holdings larger than 1,000 acres. There will be not only the work of repairing fences and buildings and ordinary maintenance, but also the extra work of looking after the stock. The granting of larger areas may prove to be quite satisfactory, but we do not know what the future holds as regards farm labour, and if a man has to rely upon his own energy to carry 1,500 sheep on his property, where the blow-fly pest will definitely be bad, he will have a fulltime job on 1,000 acres.

Hon. L. Craig: You will be frightening people off that area.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: It is of no use telling people one thing and meaning another. I repeat that the area has extraordinary possibilities, but I feel sure that those troubles will occur. Of course, if a man did not want to run sheep, the land would be suitable for rearing baby beef.

There is another strip of land running parallel to one I have been mentioning, but further inland, that may be developed in time. The rainfall there may be only 15 or 17 inches, but the country would grow mid-season clover, and there is no reason that I can see why settlers should not grow barley and wheat, not on the same land every year, but as a spec crop. When that is done, I see no reason why that country should not carry a lot

of pigs. I have been told—and I understand the information is correct—that the people in this area have known only one frost in 16 years. I do not know of any other place that has such a congenial climate. Potatoes and tomatoes could well be grown there. We saw excellent clover and the best naturally grown lucerne I have seen anywhere.

Reverting to Mr. Craig's interjection, I do not wish to see people rushing there and thinking it an El Dorado where a fortune may be made. Settlers must realise that they will have to work and that a lot of capital will be required to develop the country. Given these requirements, coupled with a reasonable knowledge of farm practice, that part of the State has a great future.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Isolation is a disadvantage.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: Yes.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: What about providing a scheme like that arranged for ex-servicemen?

Hon. L. C. DIVER: I should not like to commit myself on that point. My opinion is that there is too much departmental interference in such schemes. If possible, we should endeavour to get experienced men to go there—men with a knowledge of what is required and willing to accept responsibility for financing development. Under such an arrangement, Esperance would benefit greatly.

Hon. G. Bennetts: They should be given relief from taxation.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: We have to keep our feet on the ground. Once a precedent is created by granting taxation concessions, where is it going to stop?

I have dealt fairly extensively with that part of the trip, but there is one point that should be emphasised. The Works Department, through the Main Roads Board, could surely do something to help the Esperance Road Board to construct a few developmental feeder roads. Such roads would be of great assistance to new settlers. On Sunday morning, the Minister took a party of us east of Esperance and the journey of 16 miles in a modern motorcar occupied 1½ hours. From this members can visualise the dreadful state of that road; and the settlers using it carry 70 or 80 tons of super over it.

Dealing more particularly with the Bill, in 1952-53 Welshpool Industries were assisted by the Government to the extent of £23,097. During the current financial year, it is estimated that they will need £24,188. I take it that Welshpool Industries consist of Chamberlains, and this being so, I should like to know what steps the Government takes to ensure that the establishment of the industries is carried out on sound business lines.

What makes me a little unsettled on this point is that I heard recently a story about that firm machining a lot of cogs. The machines were set up and before the work commenced, an inspection was made by a man to check the gauging. After the machines had been operating for a considerable time, another man came along and asked the workmen, "What size are the machines set at?" They told him and he said, "That is the size at which they are to finish, after being polished," and the whole lot had to be melted down and recast. I understand also that the output of many of the parts is only a fraction of what would be considered a reasonable day's work.

I do not think anyone can accuse me of being a slave driver, but the man whom I heard relating this story is an experienced mechanic and he said that they were turning out 36 of these particular cogs per day and that an experienced worker could, under a stop-watch, turn out one in four minutes. We should be very careful in the expenditure of public money. I am afraid that in this instance, as in many others where an industry receives a bonus, it may ultimately turn out to be nothing but a premium on incompetence.

Perhaps the Chief Secretary will make a note of what I have said and see whether a check can be made of the efficiency of this establishment before any further contribution is made. There is no question that the machinery turned out by the factory is remarkably good, and especially the tilling machines. I will not mention their tractors, as I have fixed views on that subject, but their tilling machinery is second to none manufactured anywhere. I congratulate the Government on its decision in regard to the Burakin-Bonnie Rock railway.

The Chief Secretary: This is refreshing.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: I congratulate the Government on the decision it has reached. "The West Australian" for years has printed articles that are most un-Western Australian about our railways, and I think the present Government showed good judgment in sending the Minister for Railways to the area concerned to see for himself its potential and confirm what I and other members of the Country Party have told this House time after time of the difficulties which for so long residents of that area have been endeavouring to overcome. The Minister went there and I feel sure that the statements made in this House were confirmed by his own observation.

Now that Cabinet has decided—I take it that "The West Australian" was correct in its statement that the Government proposes to spend £27,000 per year for a period of five years in re-sleepering that line—to take this action, it rests with the people of that district to prove to the

world what members in this House have said: that that area has the necessary potential. I have no doubt time will prove that is so, and that at the end of five years there will be no further mention of pulling up the line. I support the measure.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [6.5]: I have only one or two old friends to talk about—

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Both of them?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I desire first to refer to the reply of the Chief Secretary to some of the remarks I made regarding the situation of the Royal Perth Hospital when speaking to the debate on the Address-in-reply. He referred to the fact that the Commonwealth Government needed for its immediate use the properties of Macfarlane's and Vetter's Garage in Murray-st.

That interested me considerably because my knowledge of the position is that the only use to which the Commonwealth desires to put Vetter's Garage is the housing of some of its own vehicles. I understand that it paid the colossal price of £60,000 for that property and I believe that figure is not far out as the price of the land and business. That shows the unwisdom of looking at things from a parochial point of view when dealing with an organisation such as the Royal Perth Hospital.

Macfarlane's property had been under offer for years. It was first offered to the Royal Perth Hospital when I was on the board of management. I have not been on that board for six years. No use has yet been made of the land and so the words "immediate use" rather surprised me. I often wonder whether in replying to members—this applies to all Governments and not only the present one—Ministers simply get some phrase that they think will satisfy the member concerned for the moment and say to themselves, "Well, that is answered."

I would be astonished if we saw any immediate use made of this land by the Commonwealth Government, but it is apparently going to mean that the State Government is to make no further effort to obtain the land and in that event we will have two nurses' homes, one in Murray-st., and one in Wellington-st. I have been told that the area covered by Vetter's and Macfarlane's properties is small. Of course it is—much smaller than the area that we persuaded the Perth City Council to hand over to the Royal Perth Hospital, but it would have been all that was required for the purpose of nurses' homes and then the whole of the 11 acres on the other side would have been left vacant for the natural expansion that will take place around the hospital.

Personally, I do not care whether or not we build a small clinic or hospital near the University—the need for land around the Royal Perth Hospital will continue to grow and we will require considerably more than the 11 acres that are available if we are to make any real use of the £4,000,000 which we have already spent on that hospital. I repeat that the Government would be wise to examine the whole position of the land in the vicinity of the Royal Perth Hospital and satisfy itself and everyone else as to whether it now has sufficient land set aside for the purposes of that institution. I do not believe that it has nearly enough and am sure we will find ourselves, as have so many big hospitals elsewhere in the past, completely blocked in by industrial buildings so that our progress will be completely stultified.

Again I ask the Government to give this question serious consideration and make a further approach to the Commonwealth in an endeavour to have those two pieces of ground made available to the State. I, also, was one of those fortunate enough to be in a position to accept the generous offer of the Minister for Health and visit the Esperance district. I am not an agriculturist and will not speak with regard to the agriculture of that area except to say that I was surprised at what I saw there. There are many much more qualified to speak on agriculture than I am, but there were things apart from agriculture that interested me in that district.

I looked at the district from the point of view of the future of the residents with regard to services and, in particular, medical services. I am convinced that for many years to come that will be one of the most isolated areas from a medical point of view—isolated by at least 250 miles from a major hospital. It will be, in the main, a one-doctor country town except, possibly, for short periods in the summer during which a second doctor may be required. For some years to come the nearest doctor will be 120 miles away and I think that members will all regard that as a position of isolation.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Which major hospital have you in mind—that at Kalgoorlie?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The nearest point would be Norseman.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: But were you referring to Kalgoorlie as the nearest major hospital?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Would you class Lake Grace as a major hospital?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No. Lake Grace is an isolated area and the hospital must for a considerable time be regarded as being in a one-doctor country town. When the land around Lake Grace is fully taken up there will possibly be need there for a second medical man, but I believe that for

the next 10 years Esperance and Lake Grace will each have room for only one doctor. Having been to these places the point that impresses me at the moment is the work that is being thrust upon people who have not been trained for it.

I refer to the use of nursing staff as anaesthetists. To call an anaesthetist from Dumbleyung to Lake Grace costs the patient 20 guineas for his services and therefore it would not seem practicable to call an anaesthetist from Norseman to Esperance, even though the need were great, and yet such circumstances must be met. I have not yet placed before the B.M.A., the thoughts I am now expressing but I shall do so. I suggest that there should be a number of highly qualified nursing sisters trained in the giving of anaesthetics.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I was pointing out the need, in these one-doctor country towns as they have come to be known, for nursing sisters trained in general anaesthesia so that they can assist doctors with their urgent surgery work. It is not my intention to suggest that they should be trained in every branch of modern anaesthesia, but that they should be trained sufficiently in order to ensure that surgical and emergency work can be carried out by the doctors in these isolated areas. There will always be instances in which patients will be sent from these areas to the larger centres, and there will always be emergency cases which call for immediate attention. I think that on such occasions the services of a nurse, trained in anaesthesia, would be of great value.

I know that in one or two towns, in which the doctor has been practising for many years, he or she has actually trained the nurse to give an anaesthetic when required, and I am told that in a number of cases the nurse so trained makes a most conscientious anaesthetist. That may be quite in order; but it is extremely difficult, I think, for a nurse who has never been trained to give an anaesthetic to be suddenly called upon to do that work under the control of the surgeon who is operating. At present the only way nurses can be trained in anaesthesia is by this method. It might be all very well for the established doctor who is able to teach in such a manner, but it is difficult for the young doctor, in any country district, who may not feel capable of instructing a nurse in anaesthesia, or at least instructing her so that she is capable of giving an anaesthetic while he performs the necessary surgical work.

Thus I make the suggestion that a limited number of chosen trained nurses be trained in anaesthesia as well, in order to assist in these one-doctor country towns. I would limit their services to

those towns, and I would not suggest that they work in competition with a practising member of the medical profession. I think the situation would be easy to control because certain towns could be listed as being the ones in which these nurses could practise, and the whole position could be controlled by the Medical Board and the Nurses' Registration Board. In this way we would not transgress the ordinary ambit of professional practice. These nurses could be adequately rewarded for their services; they would have to be rewarded because they would have to be chosen for this work and would have to be highly skilled in the ordinary nursing duties as well.

When one realises how far apart many of our country towns are, one can appreciate why it is impossible for a doctor to call upon the services of the doctor in the neighbouring town. Let us take for example Mr. Jones's province, where the average distance between each town would be 50 or 60 miles. In his area there are about five hospitals in each of the major country towns, but they are all about 50 or 60 miles apart.

Hon. C. H. Henning : How long would it take to train these girls?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: At a guess, I would say a nurse could be trained in anaesthesia at the Royal Perth Hospital within a period of about six months—that is in addition to her ordinary nursing training. But let us now look at the hospitals in the North-West, where the centres are hundreds of miles apart, and the doctors are without any trained staff to carry out the work of anaesthesia while they are practising their surgical skill. The services of a nurse trained in anaesthesia would be most valuable in towns like Roebourne, Broome, Wyndham and Derby.

A good deal of surgery is being done at the moment at Carnarvon, and I should say that the anaesthetics are being given by nurses who have been trained by the doctor at Carnarvon. Almost invariably in places like Carnarvon the matron of the hospital is the person who gives the anaesthetics, and in these country towns the matrons are trained by the doctors to carry out this anaesthetic work. That is the only way they can learn; and so, for the protection of the public and in order that the doctor may do skilled work under better conditions, the training of a limited number of nurses in anaesthesia would be of great benefit.

That is my suggestion to the Minister, and if he will place the matter before the Government and the appropriate authorities, I will undertake to discuss it with the professional body concerned. It is probable that no one has ever given much thought to it before, and maybe some agreement could be reached. Throughout the United States of America nurses are trained in this work, and they

have proved their worth in many isolated districts. There is an example we could well follow. Now let me return for a few moments to a subject that I discussed during the Address-in-reply, but to which I did not receive any reply.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: You too?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I realise that it is impossible to reply to all the suggestions put forward, and the questions asked; though there have been Ministers in this House who have attempted to reply to everything put to them, and as a result long speeches were made. However, I admit that there are some matters that members bring up that must inevitably escape reply. But I am still on my old theme of parliamentary standing committees, particularly the necessity for one dealing with subordinate legislation. I press the Minister for a reply at some stage of the session as to whether the matter has been considered by the Government.

There is no doubt that the suggestion that there should be a committee on subordinate legislation, composed of members of both Houses, meets with the general approval of all members; whether it meets with the general approval of members when they become Cabinet Ministers is another story. But I think members must realise that, for the good of Parliament, we must see that Parliament retains considerable power if it is to remain the instrument that we desire it to be. I would remind the Minister that there are members in this House who are very keen to see the appointment of such a committee, and so I ask him to advise us as to whether the matter has been considered by the Government.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Some of the ideas you have given us about hospitals would be worth adopting.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I hope they will be. I support the second reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply) [7.42]: In replying to this debate, I would advise members that I have a few lumps on my back from the caning that members have endeavoured to give me over the last few days. However, I do not intend to take all the blame for not having replied to everything that was said during the course of the Address-in-reply.

Hon. H. Hearn: I do not blame you.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perhaps I have a different idea about it. The Address-in-reply dragged on for week after week; and in the closing stages of the debate an amendment was moved to the motion for the adoption and, as a result, the debate was still further dragged out. Eventually I felt that it was time we got down to business, and had it not been for the amendment moved, members would have received replies to all the queries they raised.

Hon. A. L. Loton: I bow my head in shame after that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: So members must take some of the blame for not having received a reply to every query they raised. But I have carried out the promise I made when I replied to that debate, because all the queries that members raised have been sent to the various departments concerned; and as the information becomes available, it will be given to members. Mr. Hearn has already received a reply to the queries he raised.

Hon. H. Hearn: That is correct.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will not say that members wasted time; but when they take as long over a debate as they did with the Address-in-reply, my reply must be cut down accordingly. So that I will not be accused of not replying to all the queries that have been raised on this occasion, I will endeavour, as quickly as possible, to reply to some of the speeches, if not all, that have been made on the second reading of this Bill. To reply to the six or seven speeches that have been made, I must rely on my memory for the main points that have been mentioned and that appeal to me—members, of course, may have other ideas about that—and endeavour to give some information in connection with them.

Firstly, Sir Charles Latham said that there was dissatisfaction over the valuations on resumptions that had taken place. If there is any dissatisfaction, it must be in the Legislature. The officer who does that type of work is a very fair individual and endeavours to assess the real value of property being resumed. Of course, we always get complaints from the person from whom the land is resumed because, in 99 cases out of a hundred, that person has two different prices on his land: the one at which he wants to sell it; and the other on which he wants to pay rates. Members will agree that that is true. The officer is not concerned with either of those valuations, and he considers what is the true value of the property and assesses on that. If the person concerned is not satisfied after he has assessed that value, then there is a right of appeal.

Hon. G. Bennetts: I had one or two recently.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: They do not get any consideration on appeal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If they do not get any consideration, it is up to the hon. member to suggest some better method. I have never heard him suggest one. It is no use complaining if some suggestion is not made to rectify a situation which is not considered desirable.

The railways were mentioned by Mr. Cunningham. We all know that everyone will complain about railways and about water, because of the fact that there has been an increase in rates in both

those categories. All that has happened, of course, is that this Government is prepared to stand up to its responsibilities as a Government. If it had not raised railway freights and water rates, I could quite understand members growling, because then it would not have done its duty. But it has done its duty. We were faced last year with a deficit of over £5,000,000 in the railways. Were we going to sit down and let that £5,000,000 deficit continue during this year?

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: You promised reductions at election time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Never mind about what happened at election time; I am dealing with facts, not fiction. The facts are that there was a £5,000,000 deficit on the railways last year. Suppose we had let that go on, and had had another £5,000,000 deficit this year, would members of the Opposition have cheered us? Of course they would not! They would have complained because we had not done our job; and they would have been thoroughly entitled to do so, particularly if we had not stood up to our responsibilities. Do not let us forget that they were the people who should have faced up to the position last year, or the year before. They would not do so because an election was approaching.

Hon. G. Bennetts: They knew a Labour Government would be returned.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Those are the true circumstances. The hon. member knows that we approved of water rates being raised, but I think some other members were responsible for an increase not being put into operation previously. Is not that so? The hon. member will not answer. Just as I am accused of not answering on occasions, so I accuse the hon. member now.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Your party political platform was reduction, not increase.

Hon. H. Hearn: That is another matter.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We were faced with a deficit of £5,000,000 on the railways; we were faced with a deficit of £132,000 on water supplies. Were we to sit down and let that state of affairs continue, or were we to use a little business acumen, as some members have done, and meet the situation?

Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have told us about business acumen before.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We are getting complaints now. I know it is all political capital, and everybody assesses it as such. So if the hon. member can get some political advantage because the Government is doing its job, he is welcome to it. Mr. Diver and Dr. Hislop have joined with Mr. Bennetts in pressing the claims of Esperance. I can endorse the remarks they have made. So, after many

years, we find Mr. Bennetts, Mr. Cunningham, and Mr. Boylen gaining a number of supporters for the contentions they have put forward during the years.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You and I will have to take a trip there some day.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I was there 20 years ago.

Hon. H. Hearn: There is a big difference since then.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I was there five or six years ago, when the first inspection was made.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Some day I will be looking at the North in the same light.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I was there when the late Mr. Wood was assisting that area and opening it. I know something about the area, and am pleased to see that members are going down that way and are satisfied that there is a good portion of the State in that district. I am trying to look around to see what other suggestions have been made.

Hon. L. C. Diver: What about the Welshpool industries?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Welshpool industries were encouraged to come to the State, and I think members will agree that the move was well worthwhile. It was as worthwhile as the bringing of other industries here. One of our big deficiencies in the past has been lack of industries. Until recent years, we have had too many brass plates and not enough chimney-tops in this State. I do not blame the Government that endeavours to bring industry into this area. Down through the years, that has been the policy of every Government, irrespective of its political colour. Chamberlains were brought here after a hard fight. They have been as successful as we expected. There was a risk, and it was taken, in bringing new industries into the State.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: For how many years will we subsidise them?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know; I am not a fortune teller. But I believe they are now getting on to a more solid basis. There are any number of other industries, including mining projects, that have been subsidised by the Government. What about the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.? It is costing the Government £10,000,000, and we are lucky to get out of it at that figure.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you think the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. and the others will return to the State?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know; but let us consider the question of group settlement. There was no more colossal failure at the start than that, but today it is worth its weight in gold to the State. I nearly forgot one or two things that Mr. Griffith mentioned. The hon. member always spoils a good case

by bringing in party politics; he must have that little dig. He talked about Riverton and the non-supply of electricity there. We have been in office only nine months, whereas the Government he supported was in office for six years and did nothing to give electricity supplies to the people of that area. But he is endeavouring to make political capital out of this.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister is wrong; the previous Administration did give them supplies, but your Government will not carry it through.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member said they were given water, and that now they wanted electricity. It is not a new district; it has not sprung up during the last nine months; yet the hon. member is complaining that we have not given them electricity. His Government did not give them electricity, and it was in office for six years.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: The previous Government did, but you will not extend it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member can put up a good case, and there is no necessity for him to bring in party politics.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do not want you to forget the promises you made.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We will honour every promise we made, and that is more than I can say for the Government which the hon. member supported. I want to deal with things as they are, and I do not wish to enter into that phase. Let us put those petty things aside.

I think I have replied to most of the points raised by members. There is one further matter on which I wish to touch. Mr. Griffith asked me a question without notice and I gave him an answer, with which he was not too pleased; and he thought that the Minister from whom I obtained the information was holding something back. Yesterday I supplied him with a letter from the Federal Government on the instructions issued to the War Service Homes Department. I read him a letter from the War Service Homes people stating why our local Minister was not permitted to put the matter on the file. I have further information to add.

The Federal Government was so concerned about keeping secret that instruction, that because some member in the Eastern States asked a question in the Federal House in connection with it, the security police are now investigating the matter in this State, and, I believe, in other States, to see where the leakage occurred. I hope that will satisfy the hon. member and convince him that the Minister who supplied the information was genuine in the answer he gave.

The only other members to whom I have to reply are those who spoke yesterday. The debate having been adjourned,

I had the opportunity of referring the matters they raised to the departments concerned. Here are the comments sent to me in connection with Mr. Simpson's remarks about the chord line—

Mr. Simpson referred to the resumptions already effected along the route. As he is aware, very shortly after Kwinana came into the picture resumptions along the chord line were suspended. In actual fact, approximately 260 resumptions would have been necessary. Only 39 were finalised, and it is anticipated that in a number of these cases the original owners will retain their ownership. The total amount paid was approximately £53,000 and the final loss to the Government will be small.

Mr. Simpson referred to certain estimates with which he dealt as Minister. A number of outline schemes were prepared when the effect of the opening up of Cockburn Sound was being studied. These included location of marshalling yards at Midland Junction, Belmont and Welshpool. The estimates and other considerations indicated that location of the yards at Bassendean had material advantages. In the report submitted by Messrs. Dumas and Brisbane a figure of £3,100,578 is given. This estimate embraced the total cost of a number of the Railways Commission's proposals which were under review. These were the marshalling yards at Bassendean, the Welshpool-Bassendean chord line, transfer of steam loco sheds from East Perth to Bassendean, transfer of P.W.D. Plant Depot from East Perth to Welshpool and construction of goods terminal at East Perth. The proposed chord or link line from Rivervale to the south-western entrance of the Bassendean yards is much shorter and cheaper than the original chord line and will effect the same purpose.

Mr. Simpson referred to the proposal in the report that entry should be made into the marshalling yards at the south-western end. This has been made possible by the redesign of the Brunswick Junction yards to permit the reversal of wagons as compared with present practice. The wagon couplings on the south-western system would otherwise be in reverse to the couplings on wagons entering the marshalling yards from Midland Junction or Fremantle.

Mr. Simpson referred to the route of the proposed Rivervale-Bassendean chord line following the foreshore of the river, which should be preserved for the use of the people. The length concerned is approximately one mile and if Mr. Simpson would walk along this section he would

see that the banks are very steep, rising rapidly to approximately 30 ft. above river level and that it is not conceivable that the construction of a railway will deprive the public of any future amenity or playing area.

Mr. Simpson requested that the Government adopt no hard and fast policy at this stage. That is the very thing which the report recommended and which the Government has adopted.

In view of the unknown factors associated with the development of Cockburn Sound the report has recommended that no decision be made regarding construction of a railway from Midland Junction to Cannington or from Cannington to Cockburn Sound until traffic warrants in each case: that the transfer of the steam loco sheds from East Perth to Bassendean marshalling yards be deferred until experience has been gained in the use of diesel locomotives; that the transfer of the goods terminal from the Perth yards be deferred for a number of years, but that Burswood Island be reserved as a possible goods terminal site, a decision to be made as to its location when the time for its transfer arrives.

The report endorses the Railways Commission's original proposal for marshalling yards at Bassendean, but has recommended the shorter connecting link line from Rivervale rather than the Commission's proposal for a chord line from Welshpool.

The distance to be travelled from Cockburn Sound via Cannington and the Rivervale link line to Midland Junction is only approximately half a mile longer than via the Welshpool chord line.

I have one other note on this subject, as follows:—

Obviously Mr. Simpson has not read the report submitted.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: I asked for it to be tabled.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am sorry that the only other member who spoke on the Bill is not in the Chamber at the moment. In fact, I am very sorry he is not here.

Hon. L. A. Logan: He will be here in five minutes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am sorry I cannot wait for him.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Go and get him!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I sent to the Minister for Forests the comments made by Mr. Murray concerning the Conservator of Forests. I am not going to

make any reply to those comments, but will read the one submitted by the Minister, which is as follows:—

It is obvious that Mr. Murray is thoroughly enjoying the publicity surrounding his many outbursts on forestry matters. He has assumed the role of an authority and does not hesitate to vilify anyone who differs from him, whether it be the Government, the Minister for Forests, the Conservator of Forests, the Public Service Commissioner, the Forestry Advisory Committee, or anybody else. False and distorted statements have become his specialty; and even when official documents are tabled, his suspicious mind will not allow him to believe what is revealed. He has gone to such excesses that even the sawmilling firm with which he was, until recently, associated, has hastened to dissociate its name from any suggestions contained in his utterances.

The Government most certainly adopted the proper course in referring applications to the Public Service Commissioner who submitted a panel of names to the Government for decision. Full consideration was given to the applications and it is a complete misstatement for Mr. Murray to assert that the appointment was decided before the position was thrown open.

Mr. Murray stated that the Forests Department had no advice relating to that parcel of timber land bought by Mr. Harris and his associates, and his insinuation is that Mr. Harris improperly refrained from bringing the area under official notice. The facts are that ever since October, 1923, official records show that the Forests Department has known all about this block of land.

On the 30th October, 1923, it was offered along with other adjacent properties, to the Government for purchase, and the State Saw Mills had inspected the areas. The purchase was not proceeded with. On the 23rd September, 1931, the Forests Department was asked for detailed information on the timber resources of this block by a prospective purchaser in England. In reply, considerable information about it was supplied by the Conservator of Forests on the 5th November, 1931.

By February 1935, Millars' Timber and Trading Co., who had acquired the timber rights over the block, arranged with the Forests Department to make a survey of the area for them and this was completed in March, 1935. Thereafter Millars' Timber and Trading Co. cut sleepers and beams there for years, and subsequently Mr. E. Loynel operated a sawmill on the

same area after the sleeper cutting ceased. It was then abandoned as being cut out.

When timber close to Perth became scarce after the war, fresh interest in it was taken by many sawmillers, but the property was not available for purchase. State Saw Mills carried out an assessment of the area and placed a value of £3,000 on the timber, prior to 1948. Because rates and taxes on it were long overdue, the land was put up for auction on the 2nd April, 1948 by the Taxation Department at a fixed price of £2,600 plus outstanding rates and taxes.

There were about 50 people present at the sale including representatives of State Saw Mills and other sawmill organisations, but the Forests Department took no action to be in it, although it knew of the proposed sale in advance. The purchaser was decided by drawing lots, and it could have been any one of 50 people. For years the Forests Department had shown no real and effective interest in re-purchasing timber lands and privately-owned timbered areas all over the State have been snapped up by sawmillers, through inaction and apathy at the top. In this case there were many other similar areas in this same locality, totalling some 60,000 acres, about which the Forests Department has been well informed for over 20 years, but did nothing.

It did nothing towards acquiring the far more valuable Hedges property in the same district which was eventually bought by State Saw Mills. In 1947, another large area of 8,000 acres of good forest country on the Beverley road had been bought up by a city sawmiller under the eyes of the Forests Department. If fault lay anywhere, it was in the top policy-making of the Forests Department which showed a shocking lack of business acumen. In this case the area was not acquired by Mr. Harris and his associates until nearly two years after he left the Forests Department in 1946.

From the outset, Mr. Harris made a full detailed statement to the Government of his previous interests, and these details have been sighted by some members of the Opposition. They were also stated by Mr. Harris in evidence before the Royal Commission on Forestry in 1951, and have been publicly and widely known for years.

The Forestry Advisory Committee was not appointed to stand in judgment over the late Conservator, but to advise primarily on some factual matters concerning areas put up for tender, and also what could be done

to prevent mills from closing, due to lack of logs during the present shortage of timber. Its report was objective, conservative, and practical, and not critical of the Forests Department, even where it suggested a different approach to some of the problems referred to it, and some alternative solutions. The complete answer to any criticism of the Forestry Advisory Committee is to be found in its determinations wherein Dr. Stoate from the evidence adduced by the Committee, was compelled to agree to their recommendations almost entirely and which resulted in a considerably lesser area of forest country being thrown open.

The office of Conservator of Forests calls, in the main, for high administrative capacity and business ability, backed by adequate technical training and field experience in the practice of forestry. No one who really knows anything about Mr. Harris' career and the man himself could fairly question that he possesses all these attributes. High academic degrees are not necessarily any warrant of administrative capacity, and frequently indicate an outlook which militates against good administrative performance, due to over-emphasis on research. The view that this has been the case in the Forests Department has been widely held, both in Government and outside circles for a number of years.

The Forests Department has become a big semi-business organisation, and its head must be a good administrator. If need be, he can rely on the advice of other specialists in research and various technical matters, which, however, he, as a professional forester, can readily comprehend. Mr. Harris is a fully qualified professional forester of high standing in his profession. It is, in my view, reprehensible for a member to make vile suggestions concerning the integrity of high public officials and generally to create an atmosphere of suspicion when there is no warrant or evidence to support the extreme charges.

I had not wanted to add anything to that statement; but after having read it through, I feel that there is one point that I should make, and that is in reference to Mr. Murray's statement that Mr. Harris had been appointed to the position of conservator before it became vacant. As a member of Cabinet, I can give that allegation a flat denial, and I can honestly tell members that all the applications were referred to the Public Service Commissioner for a report. The Public Service Commissioner reported fairly and squarely on every man who applied and Cabinet considered the quali-

fications of all the applicants; and it was Cabinet, and not the Minister for Forests, and not the Public Service Commissioner that made the appointment. I, as a member of Cabinet, will take my full share of responsibility for the appointment made. My own knowledge of that phase of the matter prompted me to add those remarks to the statement handed to me by the Minister for Forests.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act Amendment.
- 2, Industries Assistance Act Amendment (Continuance).
- 3, Noxious Weeds Act Amendment.
- 4, Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment.
- 5, Associations Incorporation Act Amendment.
- 6, Vermin Act Amendment.
- 7, Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Act Amendment (Private).

BILL—RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [8.17]: I asked for the adjournment of the debate yesterday because I wished to check some communications I have received in connection with the Bill. As a result of the Chief Secretary allowing me the adjournment, he has now an added supporter. The Bill aims to bring the term "dental nurse" within the scope of the Nurses Registration Act, and the purpose of the measure was explained to us when it was introduced into the Chamber.

There is quite a demand for trained dental nurses, but I have received several communications from private dental practitioners, some of whom are friends of mine, who held certain fears concerning the Bill. Some of them thought that it would mean that none other than a registered nurse could be employed in a dental

surgery. However, I read the speech of the Minister for Health, who introduced the Bill in another place, and I found he went to great pains to explain that any dental surgeon who desired to employ in his surgery a person other than a dental nurse, would be able to do so.

This was a justifiable fear by the dentists from two or three points of view. One is that we can expect that a trained dental nurse shall receive a greater amount of pay each week than one who has not been trained. Today I was informed by the matron of the dental hospital that a certificated dental nurse in her first year would earn £9 3s. 3d. a week under the award. During the period of training she would receive in the first year £3 15s. 5d.; in the second year £6 5s. 10d.; and in the third year £7 5s. 10d. These figures are, I think, reasonably accurate. A girl would enter the dental hospital at the age of 16, come out at the end of her three-year training period at the age of 19, and would then go into a dentist's surgery and receive £9 3s. 3d. per week. As against that, the over-19, un-qualified person, who was employed by a dentist, would receive approximately £1 a week less. The unqualified person—by way of not having a certificate, at any rate—is governed by the dental mechanics' award.

The fear I think some of the private practitioners had was that they would be obliged to employ trained nurses in their surgeries, to the detriment of those who had been employed by them for, perhaps, quite a number of years. Members will appreciate that throughout the State there are probably many women employed in dental surgeries who are not qualified, or will not become qualified within the terms of this measure. I have advised the dentists who have made inquiries from me that they are under no obligation whatever to employ a trained person, but may continue to employ people that they have themselves trained over the years. Many dentists prefer to keep the women they have trained themselves rather than employ someone else, even though she may be a certificated person. I support the second reading.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [8.25]: I agree with what Mr. Griffith has said that those in dental circles all say there is a great demand for trained nurses. The Bill is supported by the Nurses' Association and by all other medical bodies with whom I have come in contact.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: What are those medical bodies?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I have contacted individual doctors, the Nurses' Association, and the dental hospital, and they all agree that there is an urgent need for this measure, and that the curriculum laid down is not far fetched. After all, the

people who run the dental hospital and train these nurses should know what qualifications are needed by a trained dental nurse!

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: We have managed for many years without them.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: That is no reason why we should continue in that way. Does not the hon. member think we should have the best we can get in this profession?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: We have had the best in the past.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Does not the hon. member think the nurses are entitled to a status so that they will be recognised as dental nurses?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They have it now.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: That is all the Bill sets out to do. It is to give them that status.

Hon. L. C. Diver: There were dental nurses in 1918. I have fillings that have been in for 25 years.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: There were people following the hon. member's occupation 25 years ago, but they have gained in science through the years, and these nurses will also gain with modern training. The Bill is for the protection of the public.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No, it is not. The dentists do not have to employ these nurses.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Of course they will employ them! All the dentists in town are waiting for the trained nurses. As fast as they come out they are snapped up.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is quite incorrect to say that all the dentists are waiting for them. Some of them may be, but not all.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I beg to differ. I do not think any one of these nurses will fail to get a position after completing her training.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not what you said in the first place.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: All those who have been trained so far have been snapped up by the best dentists in the Terrace. When the Bill is backed up by the Nurses' Association, the professor at the university, and other qualified people, I do not see why we should say it is useless and throw it out.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: What would the professor at the university know about it?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I think he would know more than the hon. member.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: He may not have as much common sense as I have.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: He may not, but I shall not discuss the point. The Bill is aimed at something worthwhile. It will

give the community something that is needed. We shall get from it an efficient service from the nurses that we do not get today.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That is an unfair thing to say.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: They will be highly trained and skilled in their work. I support the second reading.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.30]: Like Mr. Griffith, I wanted to satisfy myself on certain points, so I visited three dentists, who, by the way, were not practising in the Terrace. The information that I wanted from them was whether, if these girls completed their training and obtained their certificates, employment would be offering for them. Without exception, all of those dentists assured me that there would be ample employment for each and every one of the girls so trained. That information is sufficient for me to support the Bill. I do not agree with Sir Charles Latham that what was good enough 50 years ago is good enough now. I support the Bill on the score that these girls will be able to sit for an examination and thus make themselves fit to obtain employment in dentists' surgeries.

On motion by Hon. G. Bennetts, debate adjourned.

BILL—FERTILISERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [8.32] in moving the second reading said: The Bill proposes to amend the Fertilisers Act, 1928, by inserting new provisions to provide for the sale and manufacture of super. The first amendment proposes to give the Minister power to make regulations from time to time to limit the maximum moisture content in super. The second amendment proposes to provide that it shall be an offence to sell super with a greater moisture content than that prescribed by regulation. The third amendment proposes that super manufacturers shall supply a sample of super to an officer of the Department of Agriculture as such officer may desire from sacks, bags, or containers which are ready for despatch to purchasers. I might mention here that the original clause, as drafted, was amended in another place.

The Bill provides that the Minister shall also determine by regulation the quantity of super to be forwarded as a sample, and shall cause such sample to be analysed for the purpose of ascertaining the moisture content. If such an analysis discloses that the moisture content is in excess of that prescribed, the Director of Agriculture shall report accordingly to the Minister, and he will determine what action shall be taken.

The next amendment provides for a penalty should there be any breach of the section which provides that the super shall contain only that moisture content prescribed at the time of delivery to the purchaser. It is also proposed to add a provision to that section of the Act which enables regulations to be made, so that the Minister may be given power to make regulations to prescribe the amount of super that is to be supplied as a sample in order that the moisture content of the super may be determined.

For the information of members, I will now trace some of the history of this subject in order to explain why this amendment to the parent Act was introduced. When super was manufactured in a small way in this State, the quality left little to be desired. The super was bought early in the season and was stored by the farmers in their sheds. At that time it was found to be always free-running and caused little concern to the users. However, during the war years, when the supply of phosphate rock from Nauru was limited and rock from West Africa was used to supplement the supplies, considerable difficulty was encountered. Super users complained that the bags deteriorated, that the super did not seem to have the same beneficial effect when applied to cereals or pastures, and also that super was not free-running when applied. Producers and users of super realised that because of war conditions they had no alternative but to take delivery of an inferior article and little complaint was made. They anticipated that when the war was over the quality of the article would return to the high standard that prevailed prewar.

However, that has not proved to be the case. With the advent of higher prices for produce, the demand for super increased and it was found that the manufacturers were not able to keep up with the demand. Consequently a rationing system was introduced whereby a farmer was given only a portion of the total amount that he required. During the last few years the position has deteriorated still further, and members will probably recall that as a result of questions asked in this House I was able to ascertain from the Minister the maximum and minimum moisture content of various samples of super that had been supplied to the Department of Agriculture for analysis.

In 1950-51 three samples were submitted, and it was found that in percentages the maximum moisture content was 4.2 and the minimum 2.4. From another batch of samples analysed in 1951-52 it was discovered that the maximum moisture content was 11.4 and the minimum 9.2. In 1952-53, 10 samples were submitted and the maximum moisture content was 8.5 and the minimum 1.5. That shows the variation that can occur between different samples, and the large

quantity of moisture that is contained in super. Consumers of super were led to believe that the product delivered in the early portion of the season, that is, from about November to December, would be matured and would not harden in the bag, and that when taken out of the sheds to be used it would be free-running. That has not proved to be the case and last year many farmers were greatly inconvenienced because they had to employ labour, or spend the time themselves, to erect a temporary crushing plant to break up the super. The position became so bad that eventually we considered legislation was necessary to fix a limit for the moisture content.

Hon. L. Craig: What harm does the moisture content do?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: It causes the super to pack hard in the bags and as a result, they cannot be taken from the shed in which they are stored for immediate use in the drill.

Hon. L. Craig: That is, if you left it for some time.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The hon. member knows that a farmer must take 25 per cent. of his total super requirements before Christmas, and has to store the super in his shed before he is ready to use it. As a result, it packs hard in the bags after being stored. In many instances, the super delivered in the latter part of the season, from March to April, was green. If two bags were put into the drill, it would clog the stars of the drill.

Hon. L. Craig: It would pack up?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Yes, it would stick to the stars and to the machine, which causes the chains and the stars to break, and also a general deterioration of the machinery, which is extremely expensive today. The hopper boxes on the drills have been increased to cope with the quantity of super used by tractor farmers. Fifteen years ago, drill boxes that held 1½ or two bags of super were used, but today the boxes hold a minimum of five bags, which saves considerable delay. The machine is so large that it will carry five bags without any trouble so long as the super is dry and does not pack. However, because of the moisture content in the super that is delivered to farmers at present, the super develops into a pasty mass which causes the stars of the machine to clog and cause breakages.

The fact that there is such a great variation in the minimum moisture content, from 1.5 to 9.2 per cent., indicates that the average moisture content can be reduced. The Minister has told us that various authorities claim that the excessive moisture content in the super is as a result of hygroscopic reaction. Those authorities tried to tell us that if super left the works in a dry condition in Novem-

ber or December, and was conveyed in rail trucks during the summer months when the temperature was as high as 120° or 130°, that moisture would be absorbed and would set up hygroscopic action. That might be true in theory, but it does not work out in practice.

Hon. L. C. Diver: That was the eighth wonder!

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Such a reaction may have taken place during the May to June period to a certain degree if the super contained excessive moisture when it left the works, or absorbed additional moisture, because during transit the rail trucks ran into a heavy thunderstorm. No farmer thought he would be inconvenienced by super setting in the bags, and that additional labour would have to be employed to break it up, because the only way it could be broken up was to set up a temporary crushing plant. Some farmers would place a chaffcutter on its side and feed the super through it. In other cases, it was broken up by a flat shovel or with a 15-lb. hammer, and then rebagged. That meant that the farmer had to waste many hours which he could ill afford.

As a result of agitation in another place, a departmental committee was set up at the end of 1952 to inquire into the super question. I will read a few extracts from the report of the Superphosphate Inquiry Committee of Western Australia which was made in 1953. That committee consisted of the following members:—

Mr. R. P. Roberts, Rural Economic Advisor, Department of Agriculture, Chairman.

Dr. L. W. Samuel, Deputy Government Agricultural Chemist, Government Chemical Laboratories.

Mr. G. B. Lancaster, Economics Research Officer, State Treasury Department.

Mr. J. W. Smith, Department of Agriculture, Secretary.

Those men made a very comprehensive report, and they took evidence from Mr. Sewell; Mr. Noakes, president of the Farmers' Union; Mr. Meadows, personal service officer, Farmers' Union; Mr. Batty, manager of Cuming Smith; Mr. Parkes, assistant manager and secretary of Cuming Smith; Mr. Brodie, Chief Traffic Manager of the Government Railways; and Mr. Mathea, the Prices Commissioner. Paragraph 24 on page 10 of the Committee's report deals with storage, and the committee made this observation—

The most objectionable feature of farm storage for a period of several months is the "setting" of the superphosphate with the need for subsequent reconditioning and, to a lesser extent, rotting of the jute sacks. Information supplied by the Farmers'

Union contained few complaints that superphosphate rotted the bags—in deed one farmer complained because it did not rot the bags, claiming this as evidence of lack of strength of the superphosphate. According to information supplied to the Committee by the Farmers' Union, complaints were widespread of "setting" of some of the superphosphate delivered early in the season and stored on the farm for several months. Another major difficulty encountered by a number of farmers and which seemed to be more prevalent in deliveries late in the season, was that the fertiliser stuck to the stars of drills and built up into hard cakes within a short time. Damage to the drill and delays in seeding operations frequently resulted.

That bears out what I said earlier. In paragraph 25 the report goes on—

So far as the Committee could ascertain, the popular belief that both these troubles were related to the moisture content (immaturity, greenness) of the superphosphate is correct, and some of the difficulties are due to the change over from Nauru to Xmas Island rock phosphate.

Paragraph 29 on the same page states—

Since the setting in the bags and the clogging of drills is considered to be caused by relatively high moisture content of the superphosphate, which may be due to immaturity, the question arises of fixing a maximum moisture content for superphosphate under the Fertilisers Act, 1928. This is not a simple straightforward question as such maximum could only apply to the superphosphate at the time of despatch and not at the time of use and in no State of the Commonwealth or in New Zealand is a maximum moisture content specified for superphosphate. Furthermore the experience of the past few years shows that much of the superphosphate required for despatch in April to June could not have complied with a maximum moisture content based on that of mature superphosphate. Under these circumstances the Committee is of the opinion that a maximum moisture content for superphosphate should not be fixed under the Fertilisers Act, 1928, until conditions are such that superphosphate manufacturers have sufficient stocks to ensure that all orders can be filled with mature superphosphate.

Hon. L. Craig: That is contrary to the provisions of the Bill.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: That is why I read the latter portion of paragraph 29. I draw attention to that because the committee might advise that it is not

necessary to make additional storage space. Until such time as there is enough storage space on hand, the maximum moisture content cannot be fixed. In paragraph 69 on page 18, the report states—

No Government action appears necessary regarding storage problems.

This is in opposition to the previous statement. Unless there is adequate storage space, there cannot be mature superphosphate.

Hon. L. Craig: You know what it would cost to put up storage bins today.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: No approach has been made to the Government or anyone else to provide additional storage space. The report goes on—

However, the Government Chemical Laboratories might usefully undertake a study of moisture changes in stored superphosphate to determine whether the establishment of moisture and other physical standards under the Fertilisers Act, 1928, could serve any good purpose.

Although it was not prepared to recommend that the Fertilisers Act should be amended, it is obvious that the committee did point out that the superphosphate works had made no claim to the Government for additional storage space. The committee made no recommendation that the works should establish additional storage space so that mature superphosphate could be made available at all times of the year. Yet it agreed that, on the evidence submitted, the earlier deliveries of superphosphate, which it said had been in store for months, caused the greatest trouble to the consumers. It would appear that most of the superphosphate going out has excess moisture content.

I wish to refer to the question of analyses and to elaborate on the notices setting out those analyses. Years ago when superphosphate was sold to consumers it was sent out with a copy of the analysis, which was made by a chemist at the works. In latter years the system was changed and a printed form went out. That does not comply with Section 12 of the Fertilisers Act, which states that on the sale of any fertilisers an analysis in the prescribed form shall be sent.

In the last few years, for superphosphate sold and delivered prior to Christmas, the analysis has not been sent out until March or April following. That again is a contravention of the Act. The various brands of superphosphate—super and copper, tobacco fertiliser, potash or anything else—do not indicate an analysis at all. All that is shown is the minimum content of the fertilisers. It is now proposed that the distributor of the superphosphate shall send out the analysis on or before delivering of the superphosphate, so that a consumer, if dissatis-

fled with it on arrival, would have the right to take action. Those are all the points I have to make, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. R. Jones, debate adjourned.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [8.56] in moving the second reading said: This Bill aims to relate more efficiently to present monetary values the benefits paid under the parent Act, and to bring other provisions of the Act into line with modern standards. I think all members of this House, whatever their opinion on individual items in the Act, will agree that the ever changing economic standards and living conditions of our times warrant the careful and constant review of our workers' compensation legislation. There is no doubt that a fair and honest provision for the payment of compensation to injured workers and their dependants is a principal contribution to industrial stability and to domestic happiness. In these comparatively enlightened times the relationships between employers and their staffs are, on the whole, excellent, and quite a deal of the credit for this is due to our workers' compensation legislation and to the improvements made in adjusting it to prevailing conditions.

The first amendment in the Bill deals with the retrospective provisions of the Act. Members will recollect that, in 1948, Parliament approved of increases of benefits made in that year being applied to subsequent weekly payments for injuries received prior to the increases becoming effective. The following year, Parliament agreed that all payments made after the 8th April, 1949, whether by weekly sum or otherwise, for injuries received prior to that date should be at the increased rate.

The Bill seeks to repeal this provision and to replace it by another which will ensure that whenever the Act is amended to provide for altered payments these will be applicable to all payments after the date of alteration for injuries sustained prior to such date. It has been argued that the amount of compensation payable should be determined by the rate prevailing at the time of the injury. This view cannot be justified. It has no application in respect to a common law claim.

There are often long delays in settling claims of persons injured in motor vehicle accidents. As a matter of fact, there are still seven or eight claims outstanding against the Motor Vehicle Trust in respect of persons injured during 1949-50, the first year the Trust came into being. When these claims are finally determined by the

Supreme Court, judgment will be given on the present-day value of the pound, and not on its value at the date of the injury.

One judge stated in court that he would consider that aspect when arriving at his judgment in the case then under his consideration; and, from recent judgments given, it is obvious that they are all based on present-day values. That, in itself, is a strong argument why injured workers should be compensated on a similar basis. It would be most unfair for a worker injured when the maximum compensation was, say, £4 a week, to receive that payment today, or a lump sum by way of redemption of weekly payments on that basis, in respect of a true recurrence of his injury, when the basic wage today is much more than it was at the date of the injury.

The reciprocal provisions in the Act relating to the payment of compensation, following the death by accident of a worker, to his dependants living in another country, have not proved satisfactory. At no time has the Governor been asked to approve of a reciprocal arrangement under Section 6 of the Act, and it is therefore considered wiser to delete this provision. In a number of cases it has been found that statutory declarations have been prepared in this State, sent to the dependants for signature, and sworn before the mayor or some other dignitary in their native land. In these cases it was strongly suspected that the deceased worker had been sending little, if any, money to his relatives, but in view of the declarations, this could not be proved and full compensation had to be paid. The Bill provides that, in future, statutory declarations or affidavits will not be accepted unless supported by some documentary evidence of complete or partial support by the deceased worker, such as duplicate bank drafts or certificates from a bank.

At present the definition of "worker" under the Act is limited to a person in receipt of not more than £1,250 a year. It is proposed to follow the course set in the Eastern States and to increase this maximum to £2,000 per year. A number of employees in Western Australia receive up to this sum. I would instance some miners engaged on contract or piecework. For shearers, the award rate is £6 11s. 3d. for each 100 sheep shorn, and they are sometimes paid more than this.

An old acquaintance in the Bill is the proposal to cover workers travelling to and from their employment, or while travelling to attend a trade, technical or training school, or to obtain a medical certificate or to receive medical, surgical or hospital treatment or compensation. Adequate protection to cope with possible abuses is included in the Bill. I am aware of the fate that this provision has met

previously in this Chamber, but I maintain its inclusion in our legislation is long overdue. We and South Australia are the only States that have not adopted these conditions, which are also included in the Commonwealth legislation.

The Bill seeks to increase the maximum benefit payable from £1,750 to £2,800. New South Wales has no maximum limit; Victoria's is £2,800, while Queensland, and Tasmania's are still £1,750, but I am informed that those two States are contemplating substantial increases. I feel sure that members will agree that £2,800 is not too generous a payment to a man who is permanently and totally incapacitated during the course of his employment and who may have many hopeless years of misery to face.

It is proposed to make employees in the iron and steel industry eligible for benefits following the contracting of silicosis or pneumoconiosis. In other parts of Australia where the iron and steel industry is well established, the incidence of silicosis has been high. With the establishment of these industries in this State, it is obvious that employees should have the same protection as those engaged in other silica industries.

Section 9 of the Act lays an obligation on every employer to cover his employees with an incorporated insurance office approved by the Minister. It may be that there are approved insurers who are not necessarily incorporated insurance offices, this probably applying to the State Insurance Office. For that reason the Bill proposes to replace the words "incorporated insurance office" with the word "insurer."

It has been found that certain insurers select a section of the business of an employer, but are not prepared to accept the more hazardous risks. For example, cases have occurred where wood-carters have been accepted by an insurer who has refused to accept the wood-cutters, the consequence being that the more hazardous risk has been taken by another insurer, who, at the time, was unaware that the better risk had been placed elsewhere. That has happened on a number of occasions and is an unfair selection of business, which is most undesirable.

The Bill provides that the whole of the risks of any one employer must be accepted by the one insurer, but provision is made that such acceptance need not apply to the industrial diseases of silicosis and pneumoconiosis. Obviously, the insurer who is prepared to accept that risk would expect to receive the general accident risks of the same employer also.

Although it is a fact that the Premium Rates Committee determines premiums for each particular class of risk on the experience of such class, it is also a fact that insurers very often refuse to write

the more hazardous types of business because one or two fatal accident claims, or claims from seriously injured workers, could materially affect the individual office.

Often a worker is put to considerable cost, sometimes as much as £50 and £70, in having his case stated before the Workers' Compensation Board. That was never anticipated or intended, and it should be possible to reduce those costs by having questions of fact determined without the need to employ solicitors to act for the parties. Where the employer engages a solicitor, it is natural that the worker would feel at a disadvantage unless he engaged one also.

Where questions of law arise, it is obvious that the services of solicitors should be sought. In other cases, the worker and the employer should be represented by agents unless both parties agree to solicitors being engaged. If both parties so agree and the worker loses his case, he cannot complain if the costs awarded against him are somewhat substantial. The Bill, therefore, seeks to ensure that one party to any case before the board cannot employ legal representation without the consent of the other party.

It has been suggested that the lack of legal representation could lead to numerous appeals against the board's findings. This is, however, wrong, as no appeal can be made against any determination by the board on a question of fact. Applications to the board can be lodged in respect of any question of law, in which case it would be wise for the worker to engage a solicitor. Applications on questions of law however, are very seldom made and in the large majority of cases, applications are on questions of fact.

The Act provides that the maximum premium rates to be charged shall be determined from time to time by the Premium Rates Committee. This committee consists of the Auditor-General as chairman, the three members of the Workers' Compensation Board, the manager of the State Insurance Office and a representative of the other insurance companies and of the non-tariff companies. An amendment to the Act made last year specified that no alteration should be made to premiums rates for silicosis, pneumoconiosis or miner's phthisis unless on the recommendation of a duly qualified actuary or on the approval of the Minister. This has not been found to be satisfactory.

Members will appreciate that, unlike general accident insurance, it is very difficult to determine what premium should be charged to ensure that an adequate fund is maintained to meet the potential liability which always exists in respect of the industrial disease of silicosis or pneumoconiosis. Very substantial reserves must be created so that, should the mining industry in particular experience adverse conditions, the reserves would be strong

enough to meet claims which might arise later. Any decline in the industry would mean that the amount received by way of premiums would be substantially reduced, while many claims would arise from those who had for some years suffered from such disease, but had refrained from claiming compensation.

As the State Insurance Office is the only insurer authorised to handle this type of business so far as the mining industry is concerned and the Chamber of Mines represents a large majority of employers, it is felt that the premium should be adjusted only on the recommendation of an actuary, which could be obtained at the request of the Minister or the Chamber of Mines. It is possible that the Minister and the Chamber of Mines may obtain recommendations from different actuaries and that such recommendations may vary.

On the other hand, it may not be possible to obtain a recommendation from an actuary. In either case, the two parties may then agree on a rate to be fixed and the Premium Rates Committee must give effect to any rate agreed to by those parties. It is considered that this procedure will be far more satisfactory than allowing the rate to be determined by the Minister upon the recommendation of a body of laymen. The amendment should also act fairly in the best interests of both the employer and the employee.

The next amendment deals with amounts of compensation payable. The Act at present provides in the event of a fatal injury, for the sum of £1,500, plus £50 for each child under 16 years, to be paid to the dependants. From this lump sum is deducted any weekly or other lump sum paid to the worker as a result of the injury. I am sure that all members of this Chamber will agree that, on present money values, £1,500 plus £50 for each child, is far from adequate compensation to a family for the loss of its breadwinner during his employment.

In comparison I could instance the very much greater sums awarded by the courts to dependants of persons killed in traffic accidents. Many of these awards have exceeded £4,000, and I feel that the sum provided in the Act should be more closely related to modern conditions. The proposal in the Bill is that the dependants of a fatally injured worker should be eligible to receive £2,400, instead of £1,500, and £75 in place of £50 for each child under 16 years of age.

The Bill also provides that weekly payments in regard to the injury, made to the worker prior to his death, shall not be deducted from the lump sum payment to his dependants. If any other lump sum was paid to the worker before his decease this would be deductible from the final payment. I maintain that it is eminently reasonable not to deduct weekly payments from the amount payable

on decease. Such a deduction detracts to a large degree from the principle of a lump sum payment to assist the dependants to place their finances in order following the death of the breadwinner. The decrease in money values has also occasioned the proposal in the Bill to increase the minimum amount payable to a wholly dependent widow or mother from £500 to £800.

Another proposal dictated by the cost of living deals with the maximum amount of weekly compensation payable. This at present is 66⅔ per cent. of the average weekly earnings. In view of the increase in the basic wage and the high cost of living, it is submitted that 80 per cent. is at the present time a reasonable basis for determining weekly payments. The allowances to a dependent wife and dependent child have also been increased from £1 10s. to £2 per week and from 10s. to 15s. per week respectively.

The Act at present provides that the weekly payment shall not exceed the average weekly earnings, or £10, whichever might be the lesser sum, and the total liability to the employer shall not exceed £1,750. It is evident that this provision also is out of gear with modern conditions. The maximum of £10 is considerably less than the present basic wage of £12 6s. 6d. and a family, on compensation, should not be forced to endeavour to exist on such a sum.

The Bill therefore seeks to provide only that the total compensation payment shall not exceed the average weekly earnings; also that the total liability to the employer shall be not more than £2,800, instead of, as at present, £1,750. To avoid the necessity of continually approaching Parliament, it is proposed that the weekly payments to workers shall be adjusted, up or down, by basic wage adjustments for the metropolitan area as declared by the Arbitration Court.

Another provision is to increase the minimum weekly compensation to junior workers from £3 to £5. This, too, is more in keeping with current values. At the present time, a worker who is required by his employer or his medical adviser to travel from the place of his residence to a hospital or other place for treatment, medical examination, etc., is entitled to receive a living away from home allowance of 13s. per day, with a maximum of £4 per week. It is proposed to increase such payments to £1 and £6 respectively. This also is more in keeping with present-day costs.

The Second Schedule to the Act is also proposed to be amended in order to bring the rates of compensation for the various types of injury on to a basis similar to those in the other States. This increases the maximum compensation payable from £1,750 to £2,800, and compensation for lesser injuries is increased proportion-

ately. It has been claimed that the increases in benefits provided by legislation subsequent to 1948 were based on the "C" series index. An examination of the position indicates that that was not so, but that the increased benefits were based on those provided in the Workers' Compensation Acts of the other States and, in any case, it was an effort to bring our legislation more into line with that existing elsewhere. The same policy is pursued in the Bill now before the House.

As this Bill is likely to be more fully discussed in Committee than on the second reading, I shall content myself with those remarks, and reserve any further comments until I reply to the debate, or until the discussion in Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. Hearn, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [9.15]: This Bill seeks to amend our Constitution in a way that has been presented to this House on many previous occasions. Its main provisions are that the franchise be extended to the husband or wife of a person who has a legal or equitable freehold estate of the value of £50, and also to the wife of a householder occupying a dwelling with a rental value of £17 per annum. There is also in the measure a provision which prevents a person from having a vote in more than one province, although he or she may have the qualifications in various provinces. The Bill lays down that in such an event the person with qualifications for the franchise in several provinces shall elect in which one he desires to exercise the vote. There are one or two other minor provisions with which I need not deal for the time being.

The pros and cons of this legislation have been debated fully over the years, and each time such a measure comes before this Chamber it is defeated. If one allowed oneself to be pessimistic, it would appear that the Constitution which has existed for so many years in regard to the franchise for this Chamber is to continue for all time. I think the reasonable assumption to draw from what has transpired in the past is that it is futile to bring forward any measure that seeks to extend the franchise for this House.

It has been pointed out from time to time that the present qualifications result in approximately one-third of the adult population of this State having a vote at elections for this House. Facts have been submitted to establish that of that one-

third of the population only about one-half exercises the right to vote. In actual fact, if 50 per cent. of the people on the roll vote at elections for this Chamber that is regarded as a fairly high percentage. I reiterate that we have about one-third of the adult population of the State on our rolls and about one-half of that number exercises the privilege of voting. And so it seems that we represent only about one-sixth of the adult population of the State.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: From the number of requests that I receive in my electorate, I imagine that I represent them all.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is probably so. I have had the privilege of being a member of this Chamber for over 16 years now, and I say advisedly that my experience has been that every member who has occupied a place in this House during that period has been capable and conscientious and has rendered good service to the State. I make that statement without qualification, and I believe that a second Chamber elected on a generous franchise can serve a most useful purpose. I feel that this House justifies its existence and its retention, provided the franchise is broadened, can be justified. I have touched on this note before. We are living in times when the democratic system of government is being tested to the fullest extent. Alternative forms of government which are abhorrent to us are being offered to and adopted by people in various other parts of the world.

I believe that the best form of government so far devised is the democratic form, and I hope I will not live to see any other type imposed upon this country. Forms of government, like everything else, must keep abreast of the times and must improve. The democratic form of government must keep its house in order. The greatest threat to democracy is the indifference of the people who have the right to vote. That indifference indicates a most unhealthy state of affairs. It is unfortunate that I can stand up and with absolute authority state that of the people entitled to record votes for this Chamber only one-half exercises that right.

Hon. H. K. Watson: It is not that they have not any say, but that they do not exercise it.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The hon member can make excuses, but the fact is that two-thirds of the adult population of Western Australia have not any vote at elections to this Chamber.

Hon. H. K. Watson: That is not true.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I made the statement at the outset, and facts have been quoted throughout the years. I have not them before me now, but last year I quoted from statistical records which showed

clearly how many people in this State were on the roll for the Legislative Assembly, and that one-third of that number were on the roll for this Chamber.

Hon. L. Craig: Many more are entitled to enrol but will not bother.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is quite true.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: The position would be the same with regard to another place if voting there were not compulsory.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is another sorry fact. It is our bounden duty to do what we can to remedy that state of affairs. If people living in democratic countries continue with their present attitude, some other form of government will take over and run affairs for them. That is what has happened elsewhere, and history will repeat itself. We know that at union meetings sometimes only a few attend and take charge, and espouse policies with which the great majority of the members do not agree. Being the majority in attendance, this real minority can therefore take control and dominate the others. The theme I am trying to develop is that we must educate the people of Australia as a whole to take a far greater interest in their parliamentary and democratic institutions. It is a truism that during recent years there has been a growth of this indifference which must cause members the greatest concern.

Hon. L. Craig: The indifference comes from prosperity.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: May be. It is a sad state of affairs if we are forced to admit that the present franchise for this House is to remain for ever. For a number of years I have spoken on measures of this kind, and I have taken a great interest in the subject. I have studied the Constitution Act, and I have taken an active part in enrolling people and subsequently in elections. The problem has caused me the gravest concern, because I think the second Chamber can do a good job and could be preserved. But if we go on as we have been doing for years, and the public becomes even less interested in our elections, this Chamber will fall into desuetude altogether.

Hon. L. Craig: It is looking all right now.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Some people have used the argument that there has been no outcry from the public about this state of affairs. Over the years each of the three big papers circulating in Western Australia has advocated a liberalisation of the franchise. From time to time "The West Australian" has written leading articles about it.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Do not forget that they advocated pulling up some of our railways.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I cannot see the analogy.

Hon. L. A. Logan: If their policy was wrong on that occasion their policy could be wrong in the case you mentioned too.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It could be, but I am making the statement that over the years "The West Australian" has written leading articles about the liberalisation of the franchise for this Chamber. The "Daily News" also has advocated a liberalisation of the franchise.

Hon. L. A. Logan: That is the opinion of the leader-writer only.

Hon. G. Bennetts: They are not Labour papers.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The "Sunday Times," too, has advocated a liberalisation of the franchise. Forgetting about the Labour Party for the moment—and this party represents a large section of the community in Western Australia—other organisations such as the R.S.L. and various women's associations in Western Australia have asked for a liberalisation of the franchise. One women's organisation recently wrote to the paper on this subject, and letters have appeared in the Press from time to time. But most people seem to be giving it up as a hopeless task.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: I do not think the R.S.L. took their resolution seriously.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Parliament of South Australia extended the franchise to include returned soldiers; it takes the view that a person who served overseas, fighting for his country, earned the right to vote at Legislative Council elections.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Here he has the right to consideration in regard to taking up holdings.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: In this State we do not adopt the view of the South Australian Parliament.

Hon. J. McI. Thomson: We do not debar them if they have the qualifications.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Getting back to the Bill, if the people understood all the qualifications and exploited them, many more could be enrolled. The provision to extend the franchise to the wife of a householder would cover a large number of women, and I do not think any political party would gain any great advantage. I agree with Mr. Simpson when he says that the definition of flat dwellers should be extended to cope with modern tendencies. There are a number of buildings in the city where people pay high rents for flats; but apparently through some legal technicality, those flat dwellers are not classed as householders. I think that position should be rectified, and I also consider the time has arrived when we should give serious consideration to extending the franchise to the wife of a householder. We want a responsible vote, but what more responsible unit is there in the State than a housewife and mother? She has one of the greatest responsibilities of any

individual; she has to care for the house, work out her budget and handle the money. She has to look after and educate her children.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: There is a great deal of truth in that. If the people of Western Australia were told that anyone who paid a rental amounting to £17 a year, the wife of that person, any person who owned a property with £50 a year and the wife of that person all had a vote at Legislative Council elections, the people would understand the qualifications. Those simple qualifications would cover leaseholders, freeholders, equitable freeholders, and Crown leaseholders and so on, and thus many more people would understand the qualifications and take an active interest in these elections. Of course, the class who dwell in boarding-houses or hotels, or young people who live at home would not be included, but the section of the community which really counts would be entitled to vote at elections for this Chamber.

I think there is a good deal of merit in the proposition, and I hope that on this occasion something can be done about it. I do not think it would be inappropriate to refer this Bill to a select committee. Members of this House could give the matter careful and conscientious consideration in the light of evidence which would be readily available to them. It would not take long for a committee to sit, take all the necessary evidence and submit a proposition which would be the middle course for the two protagonists. I make that final submission. The attitude that we must never do anything about the franchise cannot be substantiated, and I think there is a real danger in it. A number of thinking members must admit that the time has arrived when something at least should be done including the framing of a new definition of flats.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Generally speaking they are paying more rent than the householders.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The provision about having a vote in more than one province should not cause anyone much concern. I do not think anyone wants more than one vote, and if I own property in Mr. Parker's province or in Mr. Craig's province, I should not be entitled, and I would not want to have a vote at both elections. I should be permitted to vote only for the province in which my family interests lie, and I do not think there can be much argument about that point.

The only provision about which there can be any division of opinion is in Clause 3. This provides for a reduction in the age of a candidate from 30 years to 21 years, and I claim that a person of 21 years

should be eligible to stand for election to this Chamber. On the other hand, I can appreciate the arguments that could be raised against that contention. I do not think the Bill should be thrown out simply because some members want that clause to go by the board.

I hope that we are not just going on from year to year introducing a Bill of this nature and then defeating it. I will be interested to hear what other members say about these provisions; but I put forward the proposition—in all sincerity, with a view to getting out of the impasse that we have apparently reached and in the hope that something might be accomplished—that this Bill be referred to a select committee of members of this House. Inside two or three weeks evidence could be taken and in the light of that evidence some rational proposition put forward which would at least get us somewhere.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central) [9.46]: This has become a hardy annual in this House. For six of the seven years I have been here we have had a Bill of this nature introduced. The most remarkable thing to me is that when we have introduced a Bill here, and it has passed through this Chamber it has been rejected by another place. We could understand the necessity for a Bill of this description if there were any sort of clamour for it by the people concerned; but nothing has been mentioned to me about the franchise for the Legislative Council. There was a time 25 years ago, when I was in another place, when I might have joined in criticism of the Legislative Council when Bills were rejected by this House. But on the whole this Chamber has treated legislation very generously, and has always met the wishes of the people. The most liberal Workers' Compensation Act ever passed in Australia was passed by this House.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Surely that is beside the point at issue.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We cannot improve the lot of the people; it would be different if we could. Under the original Constitution, the people were just as wise as we are today, and they made a very great distinction between the two Houses. They gave a liberal franchise to another place, but they felt that as this House does not initiate legislation it should be a House of review.

Hon. E. M. Davies: You assert your rights on opening day.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That is true; but the hon. member knows as well as I do that that has been handed down to us so that there would be no alteration in the Constitution governing the two Houses, inasmuch as we should have the right to reject, amend or introduce legislation with the exception, of course, that

we cannot make a demand on the purse of the people, that being controlled by another place.

There is no real justification for this Bill. We may do a lot of talking, and say that people here are badly treated. But I would like to draw Mr. Heenan's attention to the Constitution of New South Wales. The electors have no privilege there at all in regard to the Legislative Council; they have no vote for the Legislative Council in that State. In the interests of the public, let us retain what we have and let us not revert to the system in New South Wales. Over there the House meets, and some friend is chosen for a position who will follow the desires of the party. If the hon. member wished to extend the franchise over there, I would agree with him. But there are no complaints in New South Wales, and there has been a Labour Government there for many years. Accordingly that discounts the argument about there being a public demand. I cannot see any justification for making this alteration.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What about dealing with my point concerning the extension of the franchise to the wife?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Let us examine that. I have done a little more electioneering than has the hon. member, because I have probably been more in the field. For nine years I was Leader of the Opposition, and for three years I was a Minister. It requires a great deal more political work.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Before you proceed, let me remind you that you were a member of the Government that promised an extension of the franchise.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Oh no! I was never on the hustings with it. The hon. member will know very well that if a man is asked to accept a portfolio in a Government, he is not likely to say, "I disagree with this, that and the other." Those decisions were made prior to the time I joined the last Ministry. When we have introduced measures in this House, and improvements were included what has been the result? They have been rejected by another place. If there is to be any alteration, let it be initiated in this House.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: I thought you were going to deal with the wives.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have not forgotten the wives. I have gone out and almost begged women whose names were on the roll to go out and vote. But with all my persuasion and eloquence—and when I was young I had some—I made very little progress. Many times I have put in half an hour trying to persuade them and have been refused.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: That was too long.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: For that reason I feel sure that to give a wife the vote will be to duplicate the husband's vote. It may not be so in every instance; there are some dominating ladies who rule their husbands. I have not been unfortunate enough to be associated with that side of the matter. I am sure the hon. member has had the experience of his female relatives saying, "Who are we going to vote for?" Can any man say that he has not been asked for advice in this direction?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would you not give them a vote?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I would; but I have had a lot of abuse for it. The trouble is it would not give us many votes of any value; though it might give us a few. Today there are many men and women who are entitled to have their names on the roll, but they will not enrol. I have had a look through a number of dwellings and have found that, on an average of 1½ to a dwelling, there are many people who would be entitled to put their names on the roll.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you think they understand the qualifications?

Hon. H. Hearn: They should not have a vote if they do not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have gone a long way to try to have their names placed on the roll. The hon. member represents a very politically-minded section of the community. But even on the Gold-fields he will have difficulty in getting men and women on the rolls. I venture to say that for the past 30 years there has been more talk about this matter in this House than there has been outside. Now and again at Labour conferences and R.S.L. conferences the matter has been brought up and discussed, but there has been no real activity after the discussion. I would say that we should leave things as they are. We have done very well with a conservative party in this House. It would be better to continue as we are than to tinker around and try to get people on the roll who have not a sense of reasoning. There is no franchise for the Legislative Council in Queensland and none in New South Wales.

The Minister for the North-West: None in the Senate.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Let us examine the Senate. It is very much in the minds of members, because we all know that it duplicates the work done by the House of Representatives.

Hon. E. M. Davies: People have the right to vote if they want to.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Why force them to place their names on the roll if they do not want to?

Hon. E. M. Davies: We are not forcing them.

Hon. L. Craig: Does not this House work better than the Senate?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: There is no duplication here. We find that the divisions we have are very mixed. I think we should leave things as they are. Let us give further consideration to the matter when there is outside demand for it.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you not think we should give a lead if there is a demand?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If the Bill had been initiated in this House it might have been worth a little more consideration.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What about a select committee?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We have had so many select committees on these matters. I do not think we could do much about it. We had a select committee to see if we could not merge the Federal and the State rolls, but it never got us anywhere.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: When did we have a select committee on franchise?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: As far as I know we have not had one on the franchise. It might be worth giving it a trial next session. If the hon. member will withdraw his support of the Bill when it comes to the division, we can then perhaps promise to consider referring the matter to a select committee. Let us introduce a Bill to enable us to have a select committee next session; but let us initiate the legislation in this House. Our qualifications and outlook are totally different, and we are a non-party House.

I have tried to get some names on the roll, but I find it is very difficult to get the people to return the cards; and that applies also to the male voters. We have heard by interjection that prosperity makes people indifferent. There is no criticism of this House. Now and again "The West Australian" comes out with an article and talks about politics, and it has the right to do so. But the men who run that paper have not the political education that members of this House have; they know very little about the inside working of politics.

Hon. L. Craig: You want to get into the news, do you?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I will not get into the news for that statement. I will get no publicity from that angle. If one wants publicity, one must pat them on the back. However, they have the right to publish their views, but that does not mean to say that those views are correct. I do not intend to support the Bill. If a similar Bill is initiated next session in this House, and it is proposed to refer it to a select committee, I will be in favour of that move.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.2]: Members could probably look up speeches they have made on this subject in this House and say, "I repeat what I said on such an such a date, as reported on such and such a page." One speech would probably resemble what has been said on each occasion on this subject for the last six years. The Chief Secretary stated that constant dripping wears away a stone. I can assure him that this stone is a pretty hard one!

The Chief Secretary: I know that.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Chief Secretary also stated that we should consider this Bill on a non-party basis.

The Chief Secretary: On an all-party basis, I said.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Then he said that because it was promised on the hustings, we should support it. The fact that political leaders have a bad habit of going on the hustings, and making very rash promises that are very often not in the best interests of the State or the people of the State, is all the more reason we should consider this Bill on a non-party basis. The Minister also said we should give very good reasons for not supporting the measure.

I consider that the Minister started the wrong way round. He should submit arguments as to why we should alter the present set-up, but I have not heard any. I may be hard to please, or a little stubborn, but the Minister should remember that others can be like him when he does not agree with anything and chooses to be obstinate. I read the Bill and found that in one respect it seeks to do away with plural voting. Then it endeavours to promote plural voting by giving the vote to the wife or the husband of a householder.

Hon. L. Craig: That is a very good point.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: On one hand the Government wants to take away plural voting, and on the other hand to provide for it. The Government wants it both ways. I do not think there is any need to support the measure. We must never lose sight of the original reason for granting the franchise which was to provide for some sense of responsibility. Over the years it has been in existence, this House has proved that it has that sense of responsibility, and nobody can point a finger of scorn at anything it has done.

Last night when a measure was being discussed, it was said that because certain things had been done since 1907 there should be no alteration. But because our set-up here has been in operation for some time it is now said there should be an alteration. Again the Government wants it both ways. Mr. Heenan said that there was only a 50 per cent. vote in connection with this Chamber. But when 50 per cent. of the people who

are on the Legislative Council roll go to the poll, that represents a responsible vote on the part of folk who take an interest in the affairs of the country. A 50 per cent. responsible vote is better than a 92 per cent. irresponsible vote.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Would you say that 50 per cent. would still vote if you did not go out on election day and take them to the polling booth?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have not yet been guilty of taking my car out on polling day and bringing people in to vote.

The Chief Secretary: You have organised others to do it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What is the difference?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In the two elections I have fought, no more than 20 people have been taken in to vote on my behalf on polling day. I make that statement here and now.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It would take a lot of believing.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The hon. member can disbelieve it if he likes, but it is a fact. I have not given money to men to take motorcars out to bring electors in to vote. I have not many supporters so generous as to do it for me, either.

The Chief Secretary: You will have fewer now.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am willing to take that risk. As for creating the interest that Mr. Heenan is trying to bring about, let me tell the hon. member this—and I do not want a pat on the back for it. Over the last six years since I have been in this House, nobody has visited the province he represents more than I have. Never in the history of this State have the people of the areas of which I am one of the representatives been visited more by their Parliamentary representatives than they have by me, in conjunction with Mr. Simpson and Mr. Jones from this House, and the two Assembly members for that district, Hon. D. Brand and Mr. Ackland.

But how many of the people of that province have asked to be put on the Legislative Council roll? They could be counted on the fingers of both hands. That is the position, despite the fact that we have visited those areas more than any other member of Parliament in the past. I do not say that derogatorily. Previous representatives did not have the motorcars or the roads that exist today. What is to be done to create interest, if what we have done has not succeeded?

Hon. L. Craig: There is not the slightest interest on their part in getting on the roll.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: One fellow wrote to me and asked, "Am I entitled to be on the roll, or have I got to enrol?"

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Did he express himself in the way you have?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I can imagine the expression on his face from the tone of the letter he wrote. I told him that if he had certain qualifications, which I enumerated, he was entitled to be enrolled, and said I thought it was his duty to be on the roll in order that he might exercise his franchise. Mr. Heenan referred to the "Sunday times," the "Daily News" and "The West Australian" as having advocated a change in the franchise for this House. I have already said that the opinions of the Press are not necessarily correct. What is more, they represent only one man's view, and I do not think they are worth very much. We should be jealous of what we hold in this House. It is all very well to talk about the Senate. Let us remember that the Senate has been reduced to what is almost—I do not know the right word to use.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What is your objection to extending the franchise to wives?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think it is extending plural voting, and I do not see any need for it whatever.

The Chief Secretary: You do not think that a woman has a mind of her own?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We would have a couple recording the same vote.

The Chief Secretary: Not necessarily.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think 97 per cent. of them would.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would you say that they should not have a vote for the Assembly?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No, that is entirely different. They have been granted the adult franchise for the purpose, but the franchise for this Chamber is restricted and responsible.

The Chief Secretary: Why would there not be duplication of voting there?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If voting were not compulsory, there would be the same effect with regard to that Chamber. Do not think I have no regard for women.

Hon. L. Craig: We know you have. You are a ladies' man.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I wish I could be as sure of that as Mr. Craig is, but I am not so sure. The franchise was given to people in respect of this House for a purpose, and I do not believe we should change it.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Never!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Not until we find that this Chamber is not doing its duty. If we start changing the status of this House now, it will probably lose its good record, and we should be very jealous of the record that it holds. I oppose the second reading.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [10.11]: I support the Bill. A lot of irrelevant matter has been introduced this evening. The Bill does not propose to make voting compulsory. The whole debate on the part of some members has been based on fear of what will happen in this Chamber if the franchise is extended to a responsible section of the community. Sir Charles Latham referred to the fact that a Bill was introduced in this House and failed to pass another place. If he casts his mind back, he will remember that that was a sectional measure. It contained a definition that applied only to people who lived in certain types of flats. If the Bill had provided for a vote for other people, there would have been no objection in this Chamber or in another place.

The definition provided that a flat must contain separate cooking and bathing facilities. A number of people were compelled to live in flats because of the shortage of housing that did not meet this requirement, and they would therefore not have been entitled to vote, because the flats contained community cooking and bathing facilities. If that definition had been altered, the Bill would have become law.

Hon. L. Craig: By the rejection of that Bill, 90 per cent. of flat dwellers were denied a vote.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: There was only one block of flats in Perth—perhaps a few more in some suburbs—that would have complied with the definition at that time. The definition could have been altered, but that was not done.

There has been a lot of irrelevant debate, principally concerning what would happen in this House to legislation if the franchise were extended. Who is asking for anybody to alter any legislation? All members are asked to do is to extend the franchise to an important section of the community, namely, the wives of freeholders or of householders. What evidence have we that if this were done there would be any difference in representation here? The women would be eligible to vote if they so desired.

Hon. H. Hearn: No one said there would be any difference.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: That is what the debate has been on. We have been told that the dignity of the House has to be preserved, and we must consider what it has done in the past. How are we going to alter what takes place here by giving women the right to vote? Will it affect the dignity of the House or detract from its prestige? Of course it will not, and members know it. Reforms, particularly throughout the British Commonwealth, have been taking place for years. I can remember when, many years ago, I heard of the suffragette movement in England. Women there had no say in the govern-

ment of their country, so they banded themselves together in a movement which caused a great deal of trouble to the authorities, and got themselves so disliked by certain people that eventually they were recognised.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: It was their splendid service in World War I that gained them recognition.

Hon. H. Hearn: That is what did it.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: They played their part when required, the same as the women in this State have played theirs, and will play it in future, when required. The fact is that they are the homemakers, and the home is the very basis of the nation. It is of no use people talking about owning land or a house; that gets us nowhere. What counts is the rearing of the family and bringing up the children to be citizens of the State. The women are the homemakers, because no man will make a home on his own. The Bill has been sidetracked by a lot of extraneous matter tonight. Let us debate it on its merits and not bring in irrelevancies.

If members want to support the Bill, let them say so; and, if not, let them do what they have done before. Similar measures have been brought down by various Governments in the past as non-party Bills, and the principles involved have been advocated on the hustings at election times. When, however, the legislation comes before the House, it is not passed because of the stubbornness of some members who do not believe in the extension of the franchise, or any other reforms.

This was the first House of Legislature in the State. Originally, it was a nominee Chamber, and from that it became one of elected representatives, who were elected on a restricted franchise. How many years ago was that? Are we to go on without recognising other sections of the community? Are they not to have a vote for this House if they so desire? We do not say they shall be compelled to vote; all the Bill seeks to do is to allow them to be enrolled if they so wish. I hope justice will be done on this occasion because members in the past have not, in my opinion, treated similar measures, as they deserved to be treated, on their merits.

On motion by **Hon. C. H. Henning**, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

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

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 10th November.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.