

Ayes.	Pairs.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. Nulsen	
Mr. Burt	Mr. May	
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Kelly	

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Roberts): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Amendment thus passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Further report

Bill again reported, with a further amendment, and the report adopted.

Point of Order

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, has Standing Order No. 299 been suspended?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): So much of Standing Orders have been suspended as is necessary to enable a Bill to be put through all stages in the one day.

Mr. TONKIN: I submit with all respect to you, Sir, that that is in the ordinary course, and it makes no provision for a recommittal. So I am not sure it is competent to do what we have just done. A Bill can be recommitted for the purpose of making amendments, and I cannot find anything in Standing Orders which permits of the recommittal of a Bill to reverse a decision made in a previous Committee.

I submit that the motion which the Premier moved did not contemplate suspension of the Standing Orders with specific reference to the recommittal of Bills; and Standing Order No. 299 definitely provides that when a Bill has been recommitted a report cannot be taken on the same day. I heard nothing in the motion moved by the Premier which suggested that all Standing Orders were suspended. His motion referred to the introduction of Bills without notice and the passing of Bills through all stages in one day, that is assuming nothing untoward happened in the process. But surely that motion did not mean you could ride roughshod over all Standing Orders to enable Bills to be put through all stages in the one day!

However, if that is your ruling I accept it; but I submit with due respect that it is not the correct ruling.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and transmitted to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. today.

*House adjourned at 1.58 a.m.
(Wednesday).*

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 15th November, 1961

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Appropriation Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.; 2r.	2800
Com.	2801
Report; 3r.	2801
Companies Bill: Assembly's message	2788
Loan Bill, £21,762,000—	
Receipt; 1r.; 2r.	2785
Com.	2800
Report; 3r.	2800
Reserves Bill—	
Assembly's request for conference	2781
Conference managers' report	2784
Assembly's further message	2784
Town Planning and Development Act	
Amendment Bill—	
Assembly's message	2782
Council's alternative amendments:	
Assembly's message	2801
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment	
Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.	2777
2r.	2777
Com.; report; 3r.	2781

CLOSE OF SESSION—

Complimentary remarks	2801
----------------------------	------

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE:

SPECIAL—

Withdrawal of motion	2776
Motion	2805

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) resumed the Chair at 2.30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

Withdrawal of Motion

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [2.30 p.m.] On a point of information, I desire to have the situation clarified with regard to the motion which was moved prior to the suspension yesterday. That motion was not put and therefore was not carried or voted against. The motion to which I am referring was that "the House at its rising adjourn until 2.30 p.m. tomorrow." I am wondering whether this motion should be withdrawn or some action taken in connection with it so that there is no doubt about it. I am a little concerned about the matter.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [2.31 p.m.]: I thank Mr. Wise for his comment. Perhaps for the sake of the record it would be desirable for the Minister to withdraw that motion.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: According to Standing Order No. 115, the question did not have to be put because there was no seconder.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: An adjournment motion does not need a seconder.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): As a rule the presiding officer does not call for a seconder for a motion of this kind. I feel it would be desirable for the Minister to withdraw the motion.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.32 p.m.]: I have a very firm desire to have the record correct and I therefore ask leave to withdraw the motion. Perhaps you would permit me, Sir, to just briefly recount the necessity for this withdrawal.

Yesterday I moved that the House at its rising adjourn until 2.30 p.m. today. Then the question was posed as to whether I had the right to ask for a special adjournment of the House because there was actually no business on the notice paper. Whilst I have not asked for any legal opinion on this matter, I am still, personally, firmly of the opinion that with the suspension of Standing Orders it is not necessary for the House to actually have business on the notice paper, or even to have a notice paper, in order that the House might transact business; to wit, on the opening day we are called together without a notice paper, but we do transmit business on that day.

However, I have asked leave to withdraw the motion in order to put the record right in case a similar set of circumstances arises; and it could well do. But I would like an expression of opinion from you, Mr. President, when the motion to withdraw has been agreed to. I desire to know whether or not we were in order in what we attempted to do last night.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

President's Ruling

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [2.34 p.m.]: After giving this matter some very serious consideration I believe the Minister's motion was in order, and if circumstances similar to those which arose last night, again arise, I will allow the motion to stand.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Thank you.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I do not think it has anything to do with suspended Standing Orders just the same.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No, not strictly.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendment contained in this Bill affects a worker who is disabled from earning full wages by reason of his suffering from silicosis, pneumoconiosis, or miner's phthisis, due to the nature of his employment at any time previous to the date of his disablement. Similarly, the Bill affects the dependants of any person whose death has been caused by those circumstances.

It will be required, however, in these cases that it be shown to the satisfaction of the board—that is, the Workers' Compensation Board—that since such person was last employed in the State in any employment of that nature, he has not been absent from the State for a period, or periods, aggregating more than six months.

If he has been absent from the State for such period, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the board that the worker was not, during that period, employed in any work of a similar nature.

Upon these facts having been established to the satisfaction of the board, the worker, or his dependants, will be entitled to compensation in accordance with the Act equally as if the disease were a personal injury by accident suffered by the worker at the place of his employment, as covered by section 7 of the Act.

There is a further provision in the Bill, contained in paragraph (b) of clause 2, inserting a new subsection (1b) into section 8 of the Act.

This new subsection has the effect of bringing the new re-enacted subsection (1a) into operation on the 12th December, 1960, which was the day on which the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Act of 1960 came into operation.

This Bill is submitted to enable a small amendment to be made to correct an error in previous amending legislation. During the last session of Parliament, section 8, which deals with industrial diseases, was amended so far as to remove the time limit of three years in the case of silicosis.

Silicosis was excluded from subsection (1), which is the entitling section, when inserting therein the words "except silicosis, pneumoconiosis, and miner's phthisis," intending to deal with entitlement of silicosis separately in a new subsection (1a). The new subsection (1a), although it removed the time limit, failed in another important respect to replace silicosis in the same position as it was previously amongst industrial diseases,

and left the vacated worker with the almost impossible task of proving his silicosis to be an injury by accident in the ordinary way pursuant to section 7.

The proposed amendment, by substituting the new subsection (1a) rectifies this error retrospectively to the date of last year's amendment, and does nothing else. This Bill is submitted to correct the anomaly and the omission from the previous legislation.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North—Leader of the Opposition) [2.42 p.m.]: As the Minister has explained, the Bill rectifies a mistake which was made last session in the drafting of subsection (1a). It also contains another amendment which has a retrospective effect. This amendment will validate any payments that have been made in accordance with subsection (1a) since that subsection came into operation last year.

The Opposition had hoped to broaden to some extent the benefits for silicosis, and to ease the restrictions applying to a silicotic sufferer who is unable to earn full wages in employment. There are some types of employment that very sick men can confidently carry out. But that fact does not, of course, relieve such men from the malady from which they suffer.

It seems to me that the time has arrived when some easing of the position could come about, because Dr. Hislop explained to us only recently, when speaking on another measure, just how silicosis can affect a person without the silicosis becoming known to the medical profession until after the carrying out of a post-mortem. Well, it is rather too late then to discover the disease. But those are the facts which the medical profession has found, and the Opposition had hoped to extend the benefits in relation to the employment of silicosis sufferers.

However, in another place the Government has refused to accept any broadening of the benefits in that manner, and it is very unlikely, even if this House were to carry amendments to that end, that the Government would accept them in another place. Therefore it is not proposed to move any amendments along those lines.

It is interesting to note, however, that the silicosis fund is a very healthy one. There is, I understand, something like £1,750,000 lying to the credit of the fund, and that is quite an amount of money. That sum, when invested at bond interest rate, would earn more than enough to cover the annual payments from the fund. The total payments made under the fund last year were £60,339. The balance in the fund at the 30th June last, of about £1,600,000, plus the payments that have since been made to it, would, as I just remarked, if invested at bond rate, earn more than sufficient to cover the liabilities of the fund.

It can be said that the premiums could be reduced, and possibly they could. There should be a little bit of easement in both directions, I think. That is, the benefits could be more generous, and the premium could be reduced. The premiums have not been reduced since 1954; they have been 20s. per cent. since the 1st January, 1955, which means there has been no alteration since then in the premium rate, although the fund has built up to a very healthy figure.

While at this late hour in the session we cannot expect to do very much about the matter, I do hope that the Minister in charge of the Bill here will impress upon the responsible Minister between now and next session—that is, if the same Ministers are returned to the Treasury bench; because we have an election before next session, and of course one never knows what will happen, although we are always very hopeful—that the points I have raised should be seriously considered. I trust the Minister will do that, because the industry obviously can be relieved to some extent in regard to the premiums, and the sufferers can be more generously treated.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [2.47 p.m.]: One must support this small measure which seeks to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. But I regret we have not had as much time as we would like to give consideration to its brief provisions. Only yesterday we dealt with a Bill which amended the Mine Workers' Relief Act, which is a statute separate and apart from the Workers' Compensation Act; although, as I pointed out yesterday, the Mine Workers' Relief Act and the Workers' Compensation Act have several common attributes.

The Bill before us deals with the provisions in the Workers' Compensation Act as they affect compensation applying to persons who contract silicosis. I am interested in the amendment to section 8. Although I have not had time to read it and study it carefully, I find it makes more liberal provision in the matter of claims by silicosis sufferers. If my interpretation of the amendment of section 8 is correct, I am very pleased with it.

The other provisions in the Bill are not very far-reaching; they set out to correct a technical omission which occurred last year. The introduction of the Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment Bill yesterday, and this small measure today, indicates to all members that we must make a more comprehensive approach to this subject of workers' compensation, especially as it affects industrial diseases.

Whatever Government is in power next year, I hope serious consideration will be given to a consolidation of both the Workers' Compensation Act and the Mine Workers' Relief Act. Furthermore, I hope a new approach will be made to this vexed problem of what are termed burnt-out

miners. As I pointed out yesterday, and as other goldfields members and Dr. Hislop have pointed out, there are many miners, who, after working underground in the mines for years and years, find themselves in bad physical condition, due entirely to their long years of underground work; and the resultant effect of that on their general health, particularly their lungs, is extremely serious.

The constitution of such a miner is weakened, he becomes subject to colds and other chest complaints, and, eventually, he has to cease work on the mines; and in many cases he dies shortly afterwards. Unfortunately, such a man does not qualify for compensation as the Act now stands. We will have to give more serious consideration to the whole question next year. In the meantime, I am pleased that the amendments in this Bill have been introduced this session because they will affect a worth-while improvement in the present legislation.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [2.53 p.m.]: In rising to support the Bill, I consider that the suggestions made by my leader that the cost of this fund could be reduced are very sound. However, I also consider that that is not the only matter at stake. At present, there are many men in the Fremantle area who have moved there from the goldfields, and we have many cases to handle by acting on their behalf. These men feel that the time has been reached when this fund—which, I understand, has now reached the figure of £1,600,000 odd—is in a position to increase the amounts that are paid out to the beneficiaries under that fund.

It would be much better to increase the benefits payable to these men than to continue to increase the amount held in the fund, at least for the time being, because the sum of £1,600,000 odd is a good deal of money in anybody's language. Surely the interest, in itself, that could be earned on that amount would be sufficient to pay increased benefits to the men who are beneficiaries under the fund.

I am handling two applications which are now before the State Government Insurance Office; and all of these ex-miners are of the same opinion, namely, that the board controlling the fund should increase the payments to the recipients from it. I support my leader when he asks the Minister to give consideration to this matter in the coming year.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [2.56 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill, and to express my sentiments as to what should be done for those men who suffer from what used to be termed miner's complaint. I spent my early life as a child on the goldfields, and in those early years I saw many men existing only with

the help of their neighbours, and finally dying a miserable death without the payment of compensation.

In my opinion, a man who contracts silicosis has given his life in the service of an industry which has produced a great deal of wealth for the country. That was definitely recognised, especially in the early days. We now have laws which make the working conditions safer than they were in the days of which I speak. These men who are now of middle age, and who are suffering from silicosis, are dying a lingering death. They suffer untold misery. They are also subject to all kinds of chest complaints such as bronchial pneumonia, and inflammation of the lungs. All these complaints were brought on and aggravated as a result of their long years of contamination by dust to which they were subjected whilst working in the mines.

We are extremely backward in facing up to the plight of these men, because they should be adequately compensated, and the method of applying for compensation should be simpler than it is now. As I have pointed out before, I saw a miner who lived not far from me in Bedford die a lingering death. He had been working in the mines in this State and then left for South Africa, and it was in that country that he learned he had a shadow on his lung which had been contracted in Western Australia; because he had not worked anywhere else but in the mines before he left the State. It took him some time to return to Western Australia, and when he did return he discovered he was just outside the qualifying period of six months within which time he had to make a claim for compensation. As a result, his claim could not be recognised.

I saw that man suffering, and he died an unhappy man because he felt he had been badly treated by the State in which he had contracted this dreadful disease. I have brought these points forward because I, for one, consider that adequate compensation should be paid to these men, especially when we have a large sum of money lying idle in a fund from which payments could be made to them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How much is in the fund?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I do not know. When I was speaking on the Bill which was introduced previously the amount was pretty large. If the two funds were amalgamated the amount available would be larger still. The men I referred to just now are the sort who should be protected more than they are at present; and when they are dying from the diseases contracted in the mines, they should be given the chance to die in happier circumstances.

The particular person I referred to was medically examined when he worked in the mines in this State. He was advised to leave the mines, but he was not told that there was a shadow showing on the X-ray film of his lungs. He only found that out when he was in South Africa. I only wish the provision in the Bill was more generous.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [3.1 p.m.]: The measure before us is an improvement on what has been provided up to date under the Workers' Compensation Act. The time has come when there should be uniform workers' compensation legislation throughout Australia. Last night in this House we dealt with a uniform companies Bill which we hope will be passed by all the States in Australia. Last year uniform divorce laws were passed in Australia, so the time is ripe for a uniform workers' compensation Act to be adopted in this country.

In his speech Dr. Hislop indicated that it was necessary to appoint a Royal Commissioner from overseas to go into all the ramifications of miners' complaints. I whole-heartedly agree with him on that point. I trust that when the appointment is made and the commissioner's recommendations are presented to this Parliament, efforts will be made to bring together in conference the Ministers for Labour of all the States to draft a uniform workers' compensation Bill.

At present workers' compensation legislation differs from State to State. The anomalies which exist in Western Australia and in the other States could be ironed out by the conference I propose. Workers would then be able to transfer interstate knowing what they could expect in the other States.

I support this Bill. I sincerely hope that whichever party becomes the Government after the next elections will give serious thought to bringing forward a uniform workers' compensation Act to apply throughout Australia.

THE HON. J. D. TEAHAN (North-East) [3.4 p.m.]: The best I can say about the measure is that it deserves support. The more I read the provisions in the Bill the more I think this is an attempt by the Government to tinker with the legislation and to deal with it piecemeal. One provision in the Bill refers to a worker being disabled from earning full wages by reason of silicosis, pneumoconiosis or miner's phthisis. Yet, a miner can be seriously disabled and not be medically certified to have contracted any of the three diseases.

I trust that in due course an amending Bill will be introduced to extend the benefits to miners who become disabled as a result of working underground, with perhaps the limitation that such a person must have worked for 10 to 15 years as a miner.

The illustrations given by Dr. Hislop and others indicate that miners can be seriously affected by these three diseases and yet not be medically certified as having contracted them. Although I support the second reading, I hope that in the new year an amendment on the lines I proposed will be introduced.

THE HON. J. J. GARRIGAN (South-East) [3.6 p.m.]: I support this Bill as I have supported legislation of this nature on every occasion it has been introduced into this House. Only a few weeks ago I stated there were two ways in which miners can die—from a violent death, or from a long, lingering death. The compensation which the family of a burnt-out miner receives is very inadequate to support the family.

Should a miner die his family would receive £3,000. That is quite inadequate for the loss of a breadwinner. Let me compare this compensation with that received by the family of a person who is killed by a motor-vehicle on the roads. His dependants can claim and be awarded by the courts compensation amounting to £10,000. It makes one think that the family of a person who meets a violent death on the roads is treated much more fairly than the family of a miner who dies from these industrial diseases.

The miner who is suffering from an industrial disease and who dies a long, lingering death, has to be maintained by his family. The family has to supply the medicine and meet the hospital costs, and other costs, all of which have to be paid for out of the mere pittance which the family receives by way of compensation.

This Bill has been introduced into this House at a very late stage in the session. In 1954 or 1955 the Select Committee which was appointed to inquire into the Workers' Compensation Act did a very good job, and considerable improvements were made to the first and second schedules of the Act. I hope that in the next year another Select Committee will be appointed to go thoroughly into the ramifications of this matter. The truth of the position could be obtained from men like myself who have worked in the mining industry and who are aware of the suffering and disability experienced by the miners.

Under the existing legislation a miner may have worked for 30 to 40 years underground, but although he is burnt out he will not receive any compensation if silicosis is not present. If the company does not retain his services he will not be able to receive any compensation and he can only rely on the invalid pension, and, when he is 65 years of age, on the old age pension. That is not fair play. I trust that early in the next session of Parliament another Bill to amend the Act will be brought forward.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [3.9 p.m.]: I thank members for the support they have given the measure. It is no use trying to argue on the case submitted by Mr. Garrigan, because it will not stand up to examination. A comparison between the compensation for a miner who dies from an industrial disease, and the compensation for a person who is knocked down on the road by a motor-vehicle, cannot be made. They are different cases altogether.

If a miner is knocked down by a vehicle in the street he is entitled to the same compensation as the compensation received by any other persons similarly placed.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Not if a miner is killed underground. His family receives only £3,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member said that if a person was knocked down by a car he could receive £10,000 compensation, but that if a miner was injured in the industry he could receive only £3,000.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: A man was killed underground at the mine at Leonora, and £3,000 compensation was paid.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If a miner comes up from underground, and then gets knocked down in the street by a motor-vehicle, he is entitled to the same award as anybody else. Let us not argue that point any further. I say it is not comparable.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: It is comparable.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We will get nowhere on that point. In my limited experience in this portfolio I am aware that the claims made by members, particularly those with experience on the goldfields, are quite rightful claims. The difficulties which beset people in this industry are real ones. I am by no manner of means unsympathetic to the situation. I have thought for a long time that it might be well worth while to pursue the desirability of treating such Acts as the Mine Workers' Relief Act and the Workers' Compensation Act as one. However, if we do that sort of thing, or find it desirable to do so, I venture to suggest that it will only be after an investigation and consideration of other factors which may arise.

Let us take the compensation—which was given to us as a comparison—paid under the Mine Workers' Relief Act and that paid under the Coal Mine workers' (Pensions) Act. The two funds involved are entirely different. A portion of both funds consists of contributions from the industry, but in one fund the worker pays 1s. a week and in the other fund the worker pays 7s. 6d. a week. That is the sort of thing which will have to be taken into consideration.

On the point raised by Mr. Strickland in connection with the healthy state of the fund, I am glad to know that the fund is healthy; because where people are going to receive benefits from a fund, the first fundamental is to ensure that the fund is capable of paying the benefits.

Only today I received a note from the actuary—I had sent him a message to the effect that I wanted to know something about the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund—which indicated that the state of the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund is not, by any manner of means, as healthy as it might be. That is just a matter of the actuary's assessment of the situation.

In New South Wales the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund has got to a lamentably low state. I think it is almost impoverished, because the increases in compensation payments do not correspond with the increases in the contributions. Any improvement to a fund must start with the basic principle that the fund is sound financially. For us to know that we have such a sound fund is good news indeed.

I intend to draw to the notice of the Government the remarks made by members. I will pursue the possibility of inquiring into the desirability of seeing whether these two funds—the Mine Workers' Relief Fund and the Mine Workers' Compensation Fund—could be amalgamated. I say this with the reservation which is necessary that I do not know at this point of time whether such action would be desirable in the interests of those people who work in the industry—and that is an important consideration. If there were to be an amalgamation of the two funds it would have to be on the continued sound basis that the important thing is to keep the fund in a healthy condition in order that it can meet the commitments which it is obligated to meet.

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.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

RESERVES BILL

Assembly's Request for Conference

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference on the amendment insisted on by the Council, and notifying that at such conference the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [3.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to, that the managers for the Council be The Hon. R. Thompson, The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, and the mover, and that the conference be held in the Legislative Council committee room at 6.45 p.m.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendment No. 2 made by the Council, and had disagreed to amendment No. 1

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council's amendment to which the Assembly has disagreed is as follows:—

No. 1.

Clause 6, page 4—Delete this clause.

The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

It is very desirable that the law should provide clearly what are the responsibilities of subdividers in respect of roads giving access to those subdivisions and the provisions in the Bill are designed to make provision accordingly.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

I ask members to have second thoughts about this amendment because I believe they have accepted the principle which is in the Bill although they are somewhat frightened of its application. All I have tried to do is overcome injustices which have occurred owing to a lack of legislation in regard to this particular aspect of subdivisions. It is only right that members should allow justice to prevail when they possibly can; and they should not let injustices be carried on as they have been in the past. There is no way of getting around the position except by an amendment to the Act.

I would be quite happy if the clause were amended to take out that part dealing with roads made totally at the cost of the local authority, which would then leave only roads made by subdividers, or a subdivider together with the local authority. That could create anomalies here and there, but in the main injustices are

caused by individual subdividers. While it is hard on one subdivider, others are getting away with it.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: We have reached a rather interesting stage with this measure; because if we insist on our amendment it will in all probability mean that the measure will go before a conference of managers and six persons will be charged with the responsibility of amending the clause or throwing out the whole Bill.

Like other members I realise that in the Bill there are certain provisions dealing with the extension of the interim development order, and with other matters, which it is imperative should be passed in the general interest. Therefore I think the proper course for us would be to endeavour to amend clause 6.

I appreciate the Minister's offer to accept certain amendments concerning roads which should be the responsibility of local authorities, and I think that is one of the principal bones of contention; but I ask the Minister to go a little further and agree to listen during the year—by way of deputation or some other means—to those persons in commerce who are directly concerned with the subdivision of land so that they can present arguments to him whereby clause 6 can be further amended next year. I think then everybody will be happy. In my mind there is still no doubt that the clause is a fairly tricky one and it will require careful consideration to ensure that injustice is not done either to certain members of the public or to certain sections of the business community.

If the Minister can give us that assurance, and is prepared to accept certain amendments, I think we should achieve what we were after initially; because those members who spoke to the Bill and this particular clause were in agreement that the principle was acceptable but the machinery to implement it would not give the desired result.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I would not like Mr. Mattiske to move anything at this stage. The Minister's motion is a normal one under these circumstances, and as the one who initially pointed out the anomalous things in this clause, who stated that there was much merit in it, and who acknowledged that considerable attention had been given in the design of the clause to try to solve the many alternatives and difficulties, I say now that I think we must go much further than Mr. Mattiske's projected amendments. That is where my decision will rest either in support of or in opposition to the Minister's present motion.

For example, the amendments of which Mr. Mattiske gave notice yesterday do not suffice to cover all of the unfair aspects in connection with road construction as between subdividers and subdividers, and as

between subdividers and local governing bodies. In my view there must be in this clause a term specifying how long after the construction of a road a claim from any person shall be valid; particularly a claim from a municipality relative to a subdivider providing the cost or portion of the cost of a road. This should not apply to the inner city area because of the smallness of the subdivisions within the city proper, and the fact that the capital cost of the roads within that area have been met from loans, some of which are 20 or 30 years old.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Mr. Mattiske's amendment will take that out.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am not sure that it will. The third point refers to the person who I think is treated the worst of all by this amendment; that is, the original subdivider; because this clause starts off by dealing with the subdivider, meaning a person who subdivides an area whose lot or lots abut on a constructed road. But a man could subdivide land removed from constructed roads, and he would build and pay the cost of all of the roads of entry and subdivision. He is not provided for. Somebody can subdivide on to his roads and he is not provided for. There is nothing in the Bill to enable a subdivider who has provided roads at no cost to the municipality to get anything from the second subdivider.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What about paragraph (a)?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That does not cover it.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: It will have to be an arrangement between the two subdividers.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes. But we cannot arrange anything between them because it is not specified in this clause. It will be very difficult to amend the Bill in this Chamber off the cuff; because no amendments have been prepared. But it could be amended in a conference either of members of this Chamber or of both Houses. I am not at all fearful that this Bill will be lost on this clause, because as long as I can remember conferences have on occasion had the Parliamentary Draftsman visit them for the purpose of redrafting a whole clause or substituting a new clause for the consideration of Parliament. I can recall a conference in the late '30's which lasted all night in the Speaker's room.

There is no need to lose the Bill; and I am certain the other contents of this measure would mean it would not be lost at a conference. An effort should be made to draft two, three, or more amendments to meet the desires of everybody, so that no-one is imposed upon; so that municipalities do not get more than their just due.

Perhaps progress could be reported and the views of members taken privately. It is not possible to present to you, Sir, or to the clerks at the table reasoned amendments to meet the points in question, because we are contemplating the Bill with this clause out of it. If we are to assist the Minister in the retention of the clause, we need more time to think about the points that are not covered, so far as I can see, in the proposed amendment.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I was also about to suggest that progress be reported to give us time to draft the necessary amendments to meet the views of all members. That would be preferable to having the Bill considered at a conference of managers. It has been difficult to concentrate upon this matter and prepare amendments. If we report progress we will have more time than would a conference of managers to consider amendments that might be necessary.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I, too, suggest we report progress. Perhaps the Minister could send for the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Solicitor-General to deal with points raised by Mr. Mattiske. Perhaps members could express their views outside the Chamber, and the necessary amendments could be drafted accordingly. By doing that we will achieve our objective in far shorter time.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I endeavoured to find out whether any business was likely to come before the Chamber, and having ascertained there is none at the moment I am prepared to report progress and ask that the Parliamentary Draftsman be made available. We will probably have an hour or an hour and a half in which to discuss these matters with him.

I was not trying to force the Committee into the position of having a conference as I already have to attend one at 7 p.m. and naturally I would have to be on this one, too, if one were held. However, I am quite happy to report progress. As far as I am concerned I would like this Bill to meet the position I desire to have covered; and if members will assist me, through the Parliamentary Draftsman, I will be happy to co-operate.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again at a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning).

(Continued on next page)

COMPANIES BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Legislative Council.

Sitting suspended from 3.42 to 5.30 p.m.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported from an earlier stage of the sitting after the Minister for Town Planning had moved that the following amendment made by the Council be not insisted on:—

No. 1.

Clause 6, page 4—Delete this clause.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: During the suspension members had a chance to discuss certain proposed amendments to clause 6 with Mr. Walsh (Crown Solicitor), and all the points raised I believe have been satisfactorily attended to. Questions raised by Mr. Wise and Mr. Mattiske have been dealt with and a further amendment will overcome the objections to the clause as it was originally printed. As it will be necessary to move certain amendments as alternatives to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1, which was to delete clause 6, I ask leave to withdraw the motion before the Chair.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The amendments I now intend to move are alternatives to the deletion of clause 6. I move an amendment—

Page 4, line 26—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following:—

(b) has been constructed and surfaced jointly at the cost of the municipality and the original subdivider, or is required to be so jointly constructed and surfaced.

This and the next amendment were proposed by Mr. Mattiske and are acceptable.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I think the Minister is to be commended for taking the action he did to save time and to try to put into workable form the clause as it was originally printed and rejected by this Chamber. This amendment, and the one to follow, were two that I had on the notice paper previously and the effect of them is to eliminate from the Bill any road construction carried out as the responsibility of the local authority. I think that is a good provision and I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 22—Delete paragraph (a) of subsection (4) of proposed new section 28A.

I should like to thank members for their interest and co-operation in allowing us to get some agreement on this Bill. I think it shows a good spirit of co-operation when we can get together on the last day of the session and iron out our difficulties in this way.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move an amendment—

Page 7, line 37—Insert after subsection (11) of proposed new section 28A a new subsection to stand as subsection (12) as follows:—

(12) This section shall not apply to any road that has been constructed or surfaced or both at the cost of a municipality.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I have one query in regard to this amendment. The word "municipality" is used. Does that cover shire councils? Mr. Mattiske used the words "local authority" and I was wondering whether the word "municipality" covered all local authorities.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Under the Local Government Act all local authorities are, in effect, municipalities.

Amendment put and passed.

Report

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

Sitting suspended from 5.41 to 9.14 p.m.

RESERVES BILL

Conference Managers' Report

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [9.14 p.m.]: I have to announce that the managers met in conference, and I present the report as follows:—

The managers have met and have agreed to accept the amendment made by the Legislative Council.

I move—

That the report be adopted.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

Sitting suspended from 9.15 to 11.13 p.m.

RESERVES BILL

Assembly's Further Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the conference managers' report.

LOAN BILL, £21,762,000*Receipt and First Reading*

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

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [11.14 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The reason for introducing this Bill to Parliament may be found in the obligation on the part of the State to obtain parliamentary authorisation to borrow. As is known, the States have no intrinsic borrowing rights. These are a function of the Commonwealth under the terms of the Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. This Bill, accordingly, is introduced in respect of Western Australia's allocation, by the Loan Council, of loan funds to be raised by the Commonwealth.

Clause 2 refers to loan raising authority to the extent of £21,762,000. This figure takes into account existing unexhausted authorisations, and, furthermore, provides for moneys likely to be expended before the passing of the next Loan Act.

The new authority provided in respect of each item in the schedule does not necessarily coincide with the estimated expenditure on that particular item during the current financial year, because it is customary to seek approval for sufficient money to enable certain continuing projects to be carried on for approximately six months after the close of the financial year. That ensures continuity in the progress of works up to the passing of the next Loan Act.

Clause 3 makes provision for payments authorised by this Act into the General Loan Fund, and the application by the Treasurer of the funds to the various works detailed in the Loan Estimates.

Clause 4 enables the appropriation of funds from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to meet the debt charges on loan funds. It is expected that interest and sinking fund payments required to be met from the Consolidated Revenue Fund during this current financial year will amount to £13,564,000.

Clause 5 authorises the Governor, by warrant, to empower the Treasurer to make advances from the Public Account so that the loan works itemised in the schedule to the Bill may be continued or proceeded with pending the raising of the necessary funds.

The only other comment I would like to make is that the Legislative Assembly arranged to deal with this Bill so that we in this Chamber could be debating it, if necessary, with the understanding between the Treasurer and the Leader of the

Opposition, in the form of a request, that I take this Bill to the third reading stage but do not complete it until such time as the Appropriation Bill reaches us.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North—Leader of the Opposition) [11.17 p.m.]: As it is only three weeks since the previous Loan Bill was before us, it seems that the Government is able to get rid of millions rather quickly. I remember that when the Supply Bill (No. 2) was being discussed the Minister mentioned that he thought it would be the last one to be submitted. I said by way of interjection that there would be another one. But the Minister was probably thinking at the time of the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No; I was thinking of another Supply Bill as distinct from the Loan Bill.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I see. This is a Bill which gives an opportunity for members to submit any matters for discussion which they might not have had the opportunity of submitting before. Therefore I would advise members who desire to speak on some particular subject which may be worrying them that now is the time to do so.

I support the Bill. I know that the country cannot carry on without the additional funds and I am perfectly sure that no Government is able to carry on without having Bills of this nature passed.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [11.19 p.m.]: With your indulgence, Mr. President, perhaps I may on this Bill make a few remarks which I had intended to make when the debate on the Appropriation Bill was in progress. However, in the circumstances it might save the time of the House if I make them now.

The Hon. J. Murray: Surely you are not going to be that long!

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would like to refer to the recent announcement of the discovery in the Pilbara mining district of up to 2,500,000,000 tons of iron ore deposits. The announcement appeared in last Monday's paper and I understand that although it was made by Senator Spooner, it was announced rather prematurely. As to just why Senator Spooner should have made such a premature announcement is not clear to me.

It seems to me that for many years the greatest obstacle to ore discoveries has been the Mines Department. I recall those words of Edmund Burke that a great country and little minds go ill together. Matters reached such a stage that the predecessor of our present Minister for Mines so far forgot himself as to say, in effect, that prospectors were parasites; and even with a change of Government it took quite a while to get away from the inherited socialistic outlook. I earnestly

suggest that every endeavour be made to create and maintain the interests of the giant and very wealthy overseas companies, in conjunction with local interests, in seeking for and exploiting our various mineral deposits.

I suggest that to do this the whole State should be thrown open to prospectors as in the days of old. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that the technical man does not find mineral deposits; it is the practical man on whom we have to rely to find mineral deposits in this State—the practical man, whether he be a fossicker on foot, or a modern prospector with a jeep or aeroplane.

I submit also that every prospector is entitled to the fruits of his discovery. In my opinion, if he discovers a mineral of any description he is entitled to peg out and be granted a lease. In respect of iron ore, for very many years, up to quite recently, the Mines Department practically adopted the role of brain suckers.

Twelve months ago, on the 16th August 1960, Mr. Cunningham reminded us of the case of a prospector named Jock Walls who discovered an iron ore deposit out beyond Koolyanobbing, and pointed out that for his discovery he received no credit and no reward. He was not entitled to a lease because there was a blanket over all iron ore deposits.

I suggest that an attitude like that would dampen any prospector's ardour and enthusiasm to the great detriment of the State. During this year there has been a very definite change of attitude in the Mines Department and I congratulate the Minister for Mines on the fact that this is so. Nevertheless, I fear that the hands of officialdom still hang too heavily on the prospector.

Only 12 months ago, a proposition—a very attractive proposition in my opinion—was submitted to the Mines Department, but nothing came of it. I would remind the house that the discoverer and developers of the Golden Mile did not require a Minister for Mines or an advisory committee of public servants to tell those who found it what to do and how to do it. They developed the Golden Mile by private enterprise, to their own advantage and the advantage of the State. I would say: Let it be so with iron ore, manganese ore, or any other kind of ore. I would say: Let the giant wealthy companies come in and spend their millions, and let the Minister ride them with a pretty loose rein.

Returning now to the recently announced discovery in the north of iron ore deposits, which Senator Spooner says will transform Australia's iron ore position and should enable us to export iron ore without any risk of depleting the iron ore reserves vital to the nation's own requirements, I think that the suggested

tonnage of 2,500,000,000 is really staggering and colossal. But even if it were 500,000,000 tons it would still be a magnificent deposit, particularly when we remember all the talk about Mt. Goldsworthy with its 7,000,000 tons of minable ore, and Talling Peak with its comparatively small deposits.

This newly announced discovery was made in 1952 by Mr. Lang Hancock, a well-known mining man in the north-west. You may remember, Mr. President, that on Monday, when in company with some other gentlemen we happened to be discussing this question outside the House, a distinguished citizen of this State suggested that some public recognition ought to be made of such a discovery.

I think it is fitting that Mr. Hancock should be given due public recognition of his discovery. This is not Mr. Hancock's first contribution to the development of the north, for members may recall that it was he who was responsible for interesting the Colonial Sugar Refinery Company in the asbestos deposits at Wittenoom Gorge, so that the company commenced work there. Quite an industry has been developed there as a result of Mr. Hancock's efforts some 10 or 15 years ago.

There are various ways in which recognition can be given to Mr. Hancock for his latest discovery, but I suggest that the most practical one is this: I understand that on the faith of the Government's north-west charter, and on the day that the present Government was elected to office, Mr. Hancock and his partners in the Moore Prospecting Company pegged out and applied for a mineral claim on the Mt. Goldsworthy iron deposits. It is now going on for three years since he made that application which has so far been denied him.

I submit that the granting of that application is the very least the Government should do by way of recognising the efforts of a man whose resourcefulness has so greatly benefited the State and who enjoys the confidence of the many mining companies which he has over the years managed to interest in the mineral resources of Western Australia; a man who in his aeroplane flies over the vast spaces of the north with the same facility and routine that I travel from my home to this place in my motor-car.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [11.31 p.m.]: In supporting the Bill I would like to make a few observations. I want particularly to bring before the House a subject which has been in the papers lately and which concerns me greatly. I have had many letters and inquiries on the matter of fluoridation, which is a means of including fluoride in the water supply. I would like to read a letter I received dated Friday, the 10th

November. I might say that I support the sentiments expressed in it. The letter reads—

As much has been written lately in the press recently concerning the compulsory fluoridation of our water supply, I am taking the liberty of writing you to give you some of my views on the subject.

My own three children have particularly good teeth thanks to (a) Pre and Post Natal advice on diet, (baby clinics do a wonderful service), (b) few sweets and good plain food, (c) fluoride tablets and (d) brushing teeth with fluoride once a week.

I do fully realise the value of fluoride as a preventative against tooth decay, but whilst expert opinion is still divided on the long range toxic effects on certain people in the community, I feel that great caution should be exercised before we decide to add it to our water supply. I enclose newspaper cuttings to illustrate my point.

If dental decay was an infectious disease, compulsion would of course be necessary, meanwhile, most of us think we have the absolute right to make decisions about our own bodies. Furthermore over the past decade there have been many cases of experts being in favour of treatments which they have been obliged to discontinue later, because of unforeseen repercussions.

We do not want more "Big Brotherism" than we can possibly avoid. In the interests of the community we are compelled to do many things, and rightly so, but "Big Brother" doesn't always know best. I, with many other people, feel that one by one our freedoms are being whittled away.

Because you are a mother, and for that reason will look further into the future than most men, I ask you to give this question deep, serious consideration.

Thank you for the splendid work you are doing for the women and children in our community.

As I say, I find myself in sympathy with the sentiments expressed there. When I was in America and England my inquiries showed that among women's organisations and the public, generally, in those two countries, opinions on this problem were very divided. I have some literature on this subject which I do not propose to read. I would be prepared to make it available to anyone who would care to read about the matter. I have two opinions by experts, one is a report from Brisbane as follows:—

Expert Urges Fluoride Use

Brisbane, Sun: A world authority on dentistry tonight urged the fluoridation of water supplies throughout Australia.

He is Professor F. C. Wilkinson, dean and director of studies at the University of London's post-graduate Institute of Dental Surgery.

Professor Wilkinson said Australians would be "darn fools" if they did not use fluoride to combat dental decay. He urged that Australian local authorities should act to fluoridate water supplies without seeking the permission of electors.

I need hardly say that I cannot agree with the sentiments expressed there. There are other nations which are not so sure about this matter. Some dental faculties are for it, while others are against it. To my mind the most important aspect is that in the third schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act there is a provision dealing with poisoning by fluorine. It refers to any process in which fluorine is used. I feel that would be telling a tale. Before we have fluoride imposed on us I think we should be very cautious. It would be stupid to enforce something on the entire population when the use of fluoride is mainly for the benefit of the teeth of children.

If a mother has a child's welfare at heart—and most mothers have—then it is open to her to do what the writer of the letter that I read a moment or two ago did to see that her child is treated with fluoride. But why should we impose this on all the people. How do we know what effects it will have on aged people? How do we know what disabilities it would create? I feel too much passion is created in suggesting things like this; I also wonder what tie-up there might be with big business. I know the country is rich in bauxite and aluminium which contain fluoride. We should be very sure of what we are doing before we impose anything like this on the general public.

I am also told that even though fluoride might be put into our water supply there is no guarantee that the proper doses will reach the individual person. After all, the placing of it in the water supply could be left to somebody who knows very little about the matter and this of course could have a very harmful effect. I do feel that we should all be ready to protect the children and everybody else in the community from any such impositions. Its use would not affect the many thousands of people who wear dental plates; they would not require fluoride for their teeth. We should find out how it affects the worker under the third schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act. It seems to me that all is not as it should be in regard to what we are told about the fluoridation of water.

I now wish to comment on the action of the Government in bringing down important legislation in the dying hours of the parliamentary session. I refer to the Mental Health Bill. The Government has been in office for three years and it only now brings down such a Bill, without intending to go on with it. I have done

much work on this subject and I am keenly interested in it. To my mind there has been far too much kite-flying by the Government in these important matters. I saw a heading in *The West Australian* to the effect that the Bill provided new hope for the mentally ill. This is a cruel thing to put in the paper when the Government has no intention of going on with the matter.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: You are not blaming the Government for what appeared in the newspaper?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: No, but the paper very well expressed what the Government wanted it to. When the Hawke Government was in office three years ago plans were prepared for the erection of new buildings at Guildford to deal with mental cases. I heard that the plans were not suitable, but that was never proved. The fact is that something would have been done for the children for whom I have been fighting ever since I entered Parliament. These children are still in the same deplorable condition at Claremont. When I asked the Minister a question he said that new toilets had been erected, and so on. I find, however, that there exists only the ordinary amenities which should be there. The toilet that was there was a disgrace.

Had the Government been honest about this matter it would have brought down the Bill earlier in the session. Reams have been written about the big business that is coming to this State, yet we have men walking the streets unable to get work. The Government has done nothing for the social services of this State.

The Government's action in connection with the Mental Health Bill has just about floored me. The Bill will be a good one and will help alleviate some of the worst features at Claremont. It will go some way towards helping people achieve the new look which is so evident in other countries. I do not think we quite realise just how backward we are. One does not quite realise this until one has seen conditions overseas. After having travelled to America and England I returned to Perth feeling that I had entered a country where the dark ages were still in existence.

I think this Bill might have been brought forward early in the session. Had that been the case, something might have been done about the question of mental health. However, nothing has been done at all and children are still at Claremont. Nothing has been done in regard to the provision of reasonable workshops; and the greatest need of all is a residence for the female nurses. That is the greatest need of all at Claremont. If we had that, the story might be different, but nothing has been done.

When I went down there recently the kitchen was quite satisfactory and modern. I am satisfied that the Director of

Mental Health knows what he is talking about, and if he is given a chance we might make better and quicker progress than we are now. I want to know whether the Government is going to do something should it be in office next year; or do we forget all about it and wait for another three years before something is done? When the Minister replies, I would like him to tell me what is being done.

I have in my possession a copy of the Bill that was supposed to be introduced this session. However, I understand it is not intended to bring it forward. I also have the report which appeared in the Press, and this makes as good reading as an advertisement, but there is nothing else to it.

I tell the Minister that I am ashamed to be in a Parliament which countenances people being treated in this manner. It is happy homes that make happy people; and a nation is nothing without happy homes. The distress caused by mental ill-health today is real indeed. People are still suffering as a result of the war and as a result of the upsurge of the trouble which is in the world today. However, by the way we treat these people in this State we are about 100 years behind the times.

I also asked the Minister if he would keep his promise about an amendment to the Married Women's Protection Act and he said "No". I want to tell the Minister this: He broke a promise to me which I have in writing. He promised that if my amendment was not proceeded with last session when the Bill was before the House, the Government would bring the measure up again this year so that I could have an opportunity of moving my amendment. However, nothing has been done in this regard and no Bill has been introduced into the House. That is an indictment of the Government.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is in *Hand-sard*.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Yes; I have it in the form of question and answer. I accepted what he said in good faith and withdrew my amendment in the knowledge that the measure would be before the House this year. I got all my papers ready in connection with the Bill so that I would be able to put forward my amendment and speak to it, but nothing happened.

Before the session ends tonight, I would like the Minister to inform me of the position with regard to regulations in connection with teachers' bonds—a matter which I have raised in this House—because he did tell me that they were being prepared. As a result of a promise to me he said that they were being prepared, but they have not been presented to this House, and I do not suppose they will be now. I will be happy if I can see these regulations.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How long ago did I tell you they were being prepared?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: A few days ago.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Well!

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I understood they would be brought to this Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You often misunderstand.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I think it smacks of dishonesty, and at the end of this session I am a very disgruntled woman. I have been led on a string, trusting that the Government would keep its promises to me. However, it has broken every one. All it talks about is millions of pounds in connection with iron ore, gold, and all the rest of it; but the points I have raised are gold as far as I am concerned. If a new Government is elected next year I hope something will be done; and I will not be begging its pardon if nothing is done.

Before concluding I wish to refer to my favourite topic—that is the franchise of the Legislative Council. When we were dealing with this subject the other day, someone spoke about the ignorance of the people who did not want to get on the Legislative Council rolls. Tonight, I have an enrolment card here and I am going to read out what is on it so that the information will be recorded to show the Liberal-Country Party Government, which has a majority of two in this Chamber, how difficult it is for the mass of people in Western Australia to understand this card.

On one side of the card we find the following information that has to be supplied by someone who wants to become enrolled:—

SURNAME
 (Block letters.)
 Christian Names (in full)
 Place of Living
 (Full Address.)
 Occupation Sex
 Date and Year of Birth
 (Particulars relating to birth will not appear on roll.)
 Place of Birth
 To the Electoral Registrar for the
 Province.

On the other side of the card there is a brief explanation of the qualifications required for enrolment. They are as follows—

1. FREEHOLDER who has a Legal or Equitable estate in possession situate in the Electoral Province of the clear value of £50. Quote house number if numbered, otherwise lot or location numbers and where situated. (N.B.—The term "owner" should on no account be used.)

The first thing that comes to a person's mind if he has a home is that he is the owner; but one is not allowed to use the

term "owner" on this card—the word "freeholder" has to be used or the card is not accepted. I do not see how anyone can call that simple. No wonder people do not know what it means. The card goes on—

2. HOUSEHOLDER within the Province occupying any dwelling-house of £17 CLEAR ANNUAL VALUE. (N.B.—A lodger or person renting rooms from legal occupier cannot claim "Householder" qualification.)
3. LEASEHOLDER who has a leasehold estate in possession situate within the Province of the CLEAR ANNUAL VALUE of £17.
4. CROWN LEASEHOLDER who holds a lease or license to depasture, occupy, cultivate, or mine upon Crown Lands within the Province at an ANNUAL RENTAL OF AT LEAST £10. Quote Lot or Location Numbers and where situated.

To get the lot and location number is like solving a Chinese puzzle. Anyone who has tried will know that. Continuing with the card—

5. "E.L.A.L." A person whose name is on the Electoral List of any Municipality or Road Board in respect of property within the Province of the annual rateable value of not less than £17. Quote House, Lot, or Location Number and where situated. If the property is rated on the Unimproved Capital Value there is no right of enrolment as no Annual Rateable Value exists.

I know that is not even clear to some members of Parliament, because they fill in so many cards that are not valid. I regard that as stilted legal phraseology and it is an insult to expect the ordinary person to be able to understand that sort of language.

When I was canvassing in Midland Junction I discovered that some people were not on the roll as ratepayers, as they were entitled to be by being on the municipal roll, and when I went to the council chambers to check to see whether it was all right for them to be on the roll, I was told the people had to be on the council roll 12 months beforehand.

I said I had some electors whose wives paid the rates, which made them the ratepayers. I was told that a man could do that if he insisted, but it was necessary to be enrolled 12 months beforehand. About 24 or 30 cards were disallowed on that account. To continue with the card—

IMPORTANT.—Personal Signature of Claimant.—The signature of the claimant must be his personal signature. If unable to sign his name in

his own handwriting, he may make his mark as his signature. Such signature or mark must be made in the presence of the person who signs as witness.

**DIRECTIONS TO THE PERSON
WITNESSING THE SIGNATURE
ON THIS CLAIM.**

THE ELECTORAL ACT, 1907-1957
provides:—

Sec. 193.—The person witnessing any claim, or application to change the qualification of an elector under this Act shall, if he is not personally acquainted with the facts, satisfy himself by enquiry from the claimant or applicant, that the statements contained in the claim or application are true.

Sec. 207 (1).—The signature to claims or other forms may be witnessed by an elector, or person qualified to be enrolled as an elector of the Commonwealth Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia.

Any person who witnesses the signature of a claimant without being personally acquainted with the facts, or satisfying himself by enquiry from the claimant or otherwise that the statements contained in the claim are true, is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds.

Thousands of people fill in these cards and when one goes to a person and asks, "Are these facts true?" that person says, "Yes." One simply has to take the person's word for it and sign the card. That is hypocrisy, because there is no means of one being able to prove that the information is true. This is something that is done by every member of Parliament. It is time we woke up and became a bit more honest with this card than we are now.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said it.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: It is full of camouflage in its worst form. I tell the Minister now that if he went to 50 people 48 would not understand the phraseology on the card. I have had top civil servants argue over the filling in of this card, and I have met public men who did not know what the wording meant. Take the letters "E.L.A.L.", which appear on the card. I think the enrolment card is ridiculous and it is time something was done about it.

It could be simplified very much. The Liberal and Country League has full and entire power over the legislation in this State by virtue of its majority in the Legislative Council. It holds Western Australia in its hands. We have to take around a card such as this, and it gives no-one

a chance. The L.C.L. dot the "i's" and cross the "t's" to make it as difficult as possible for people to get on the roll and to understand the qualifications for voting. People do not know the position, and all kinds of confusion enters into enrolment. One knows this is so. We should be honest with ourselves and admit that. This enrolment card is objectionable.

The hour is late and I am sure that no-one here wants to hear me talk further. I hope that next year I will have an opportunity to speak earlier in the session. I still indict the Government for what it has done; and it has left me to speak against this matter in the dying hours of the session. The Government has broken its promise to me, and I am ending up this session a very frustrated member of Parliament.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [12.2 a.m.]: I think that at the end of this session we should congratulate the Government on what it has achieved. I do not think that any Government has ever achieved in this State what this Government has achieved in three years. I believe good fortune may have been on its side, but the Government knew exactly what to do with fortune when it smiled. I think we will see in the future such tremendous progress in this State that we will look back to this time in this era and realise that it was the start of placing Western Australia on an equity with other States of Australia.

It may not always be felt that it was entirely due to this Government. History sometimes presents the facts in a different manner. But I think we must all realise the intensity of purpose and the loyalty to Western Australia which members of the Government have shown; and the success they have achieved, I am certain, is only just the beginning.

There have, in the past few years—in fact ever since I came into this Chamber—been certain things which have been distressing to me, and possibly have become increasingly distressing; and they may be due entirely to the changed atmosphere which must accompany progress and the changing times not only of this community but probably of the entire world, and certainly of the Western World.

There seems to be a change in the method of Government of the country. Whether it is for good or bad is a matter for members to inquire for themselves. I feel it would not do the slightest bit of harm at this stage for a Government, either of its own volition or by the appointment of a body of persons qualified so to do, to look at whether the method of government today fits the requirements of the times and of the people.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: This Bill doesn't.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would like to make this point: I believe that in the process of time government has gone further away from the actual member of Parliament. Apparently it is becoming essentially necessary that the decisions of a Cabinet shall be the legislation as presented to the people and possibly accepted by Parliament. There is also some alarming tendency to loosen the procedure in Parliament, and I think this may be felt by those who have seen protections disappear.

I have been concerned during the last session or two at the way the passing of some Bills has tended to lessen the inviolability of the Constitution Act. I need not at this time mention to the House instances which have been before us in this present session. Therefore I think it might be wise to take stock of these changing times to see whether our methods are in keeping with the requirements.

I would suggest that a very sound look be taken at the Constitution Act to see whether legislation might be introduced to make it more difficult to lessen the rigidity of that Act and the conduct of Parliament. I also think that we might consider the formation in this Parliament of committees of members which can report to the Government and the people on what occurs in either House. I refer to such things as the regulations which are laid on the Table of the House. I think that such a committee would have a very salutary effect in the interval in which Parliament does not sit, during which time we have in the past years seen regulations promulgated which, when the House did meet, were disallowed.

A committee investigating regulations before they were issued as law could prevent a good deal of the disallowance that does occur from time to time. Admittedly there may be only one or two. I think that the most I have seen in any session is three. I look at this vast array of regulations laid on the Table of the House, and I realise what little attention is paid to those regulations by members of Parliament. It is only when a glaring instance comes along that a movement for disallowance is made.

Such a committee is not a new one. I have asked for one before. The South Australian Parliament has had such a committee for years, and it is highly regarded as a useful adjunct to parliamentary services. I believe we could well copy the Legal Statutes Committee of the Victorian House; and it would not do any harm, if members felt it wise, to refer a Bill which was presented to the House to such a committee for its wording, for its impact, for legal investigation in order to see that it did not infringe the Constitution, or if it was of great merit, to see that it would be placed before the House in correct legal terminology. But in no way

would the committee interfere with the purport of the legislation proposed by the Government.

This would mean that members would pay closer attention to Parliament. It would provide a greater interest to members and it would ensure that what is publicly believed should be done, would be done; and each and every member should take some share in the framing of legislation for the people.

I would also suggest that considerable attention might be paid to the question of whether the impact of the work upon individual members of Cabinet is not of such a degree that it should be reviewed. This session we have witnessed the tragic loss of one of our valued members of Cabinet, due possibly to a considerable degree by a continuance of tremendous effort; and possibly during a time when he was not well. Therefore the question of whether there should be a fixed number of Ministers, or whether additional Ministers or assistant Ministers should be appointed to lessen the work, might well be worth considering.

Also, we could ask such a committee to inquire whether two sittings in each year would be possible. I believe the difficulty of having a session in the hot weather has been due to the absence of air conditioning in this Chamber. However, when the new building is completed that difficulty will disappear. I think we may well consider the question of having one session in which the Address-in-Reply can be dealt with, and a further session in which there is no Address-in-Reply but legislation is brought immediately to the House.

I am certain that in many ways we could lessen the useless waste of time that has occurred here in the last 24 to 48 hours. I do not believe that we should continue merely because it is customary. The position could well be looked at in the light of changing times which call for changing modes of activity and changing modes of administration in the preparation of legislation for the people.

I do not say this with any feeling of being disgruntled. It is merely a view I express from having watched this Parliament for over 20 years. We have reached the time when we have moved far from what this Parliament was 20 years ago. I would suggest that a look at the happenings and changes which have occurred, whether or not they be for good or otherwise, would be well worth while and well merited. I support the measure.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [12.14 a.m.]: I do not intend to delay the House very long.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: Do not make any excuses.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There is one point on which I would like the Minister to take note in order to see whether something can be done. I refer to something which occurs in our police courts at the present time. A youth may have done something wrong and have a conviction recorded against him—or it might be a young girl. The youth grows up and reaches the age of 18 years or 19 years, and he is charged with a traffic offence.

As we all know, at present our traffic courts are very well attended when anyone is charged in them with an offence. We find that these people who did something wrong in their youth, on being charged before a traffic court, after they have grown up to be good citizens, have to face the embarrassment of a magistrate asking whether any previous convictions had been recorded against them; and those convictions, which may have been recorded many years ago, are read out in open court. I do not think that is in the best interests of those people who have done the right thing after making only one mistake in their early years, because they are subjected to a great deal of embarrassment.

I therefore hope that something can be done to prevent the continuance of this practice and thus avoid the necessity of these people being embarrassed when they have to answer a charge before the traffic court. Most of them have found their rightful place in society, and occupy good positions, and I do not think they should be subjected to the embarrassment they have to face at present in these courts.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [12.17 a.m.]: The Bill before us is the usual measure that is presented to the House at this time every year. It proposes to raise certain loan funds to enable the Government to carry on the affairs of the State until such time as Parliament meets again. I notice in the schedule an amount of £1,000,000 is to be provided for the North Fremantle traffic bridge; the construction of the Cockburn cement railway line, including the necessary land resumption; the Kwinana railway deviation to the alumina refinery; and the Kwinana-Mundijong railway line, including the necessary land resumptions for that project.

When we hear of proposed land resumptions we naturally turn our minds to the area where the land is to be resumed with a view to ascertaining the type of land that is affected. When speaking to another Bill on the construction of another proposed railway line, I asked the Minister whether the land that was to be resumed for the purpose of creating a reserve for the railway was within the green belt. The Minister replied that, if possible, he would try to obtain the information for me. I am merely raising the point again tonight to remind him about it, because I cannot accept the answer he gave to my question.

Over a period of years we have been told that when a suggestion has been made of subdivisions of land, an area not less than five acres can be set aside without interfering with the land that is to be made available for any particular class of industry; this land to be reserved for use by our future population. I have always believed that where an area of about five acres is occupied by a person, he should be permitted to make a subdivision to enable two people to produce profitably from the land, instead of having the area of five acres which is too large to work economically and from which one cannot make a living; and yet it is not large enough to develop to the greatest advantage.

Therefore, I am wondering whether we are resuming too much land for these railways which are being constructed for secondary industry. I do not decry the establishment of secondary industry in this State, because I believe that secondary industry, together with primary industry, brings about a well-balanced economy, which we have not had in the past when we depended solely on primary industry; although it played an important part in the development of this State, and in the economy of Australia as a whole.

We must expect secondary industries to come to this State, but at the same time we should retain land for the further development of our primary industries because their production will be required to a much greater extent in the future when the population reaches a higher figure than it is now. So I ask the Minister to try to obtain the information I am seeking as to whether any land in the green belt of the Spearwood district is to be resumed for railway purposes.

Speaking of the amount of £1,000,000 shown in the schedule for the railway project and other railway improvements within the Fremantle area, I noticed, quite recently, there has been some talk of the removal of the Fremantle locomotive depot to some other site. From what one can hear, it is proposed that that land—which I presume is Crown land—is to be taken over by the Fremantle Harbour Trust to provide parking facilities for harbour trust purposes.

If we are to have all this industrial expansion, particularly in the Fremantle and Kwinana areas—and there is this rumour of the possible removal of the Fremantle locomotive depot to another site—I am wondering whether we can visualise the important port of Fremantle—known as the Western Gateway—being badly affected by such a move. I understand that about 25 railway services are organised from that depot, and if it is removed to some other place how can we expect the port to function without it?

We must bear in mind, also, that a large number of men are employed at that locomotive depot in running and

organising the railway services that are conducted from it, and, if it is to be removed it will mean that a large number of people who are now employed there and who reside in the Fremantle districts will be transferred somewhere else at great inconvenience to themselves and with resultant loss of population in the Fremantle area.

This question and other relevant matters are very important to me, and I would like the Minister, in his reply, to tell us something of the proposal; because, if it is correct, it will mean that much objection will be raised by the people who are dependent for their livelihood on the business they receive from those who are employed at the locomotive depot.

There is another point I would like to mention. That is the burning off of Crown land. I notice the Minister for Local Government looking at me, because I have raised this question on more than one occasion.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I cannot find anyone to accept the responsibility.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: As the Minister has said, no one will accept the responsibility for the burning off of Crown land. As the position is at present, Crown land is a fire hazard; and this is a matter which should receive earnest attention, because under the Fire Brigades Act an owner of private property is compelled to burn off, and if a fire starts on his land he is responsible for any damage that is caused.

It does not seem that the Crown is making any endeavour to take steps to burn off the land which it owns. I have asked several questions in this House on this matter and I have received some replies that do not appear to be correct, especially when I am told that the responsibility lies with the local authority concerned which, of course, is not true. There are large areas of Crown land in and around Fremantle, and they all constitute fire hazards.

I ask the Minister for Local Government to seek further information in regard to this matter to see whether it is possible for the Crown to accept responsibility and to ensure that these parcels of land are burnt off and not left as fire hazards.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I have not forgotten the matter.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I know; and I know that the Minister when Parliament is in session, and other Ministers have to be present at their offices during the day and attend Parliament House in the afternoon to sit long into the night to deal with legislation. They have very onerous tasks to perform, and one realises that by the time they have spent many hours here, and attended to their ministerial

duties, they cannot deal with all the matters which require their attention. However, now that Parliament is about to go into recess, I ask the Minister to make some further inquiries to see what the position is.

During the session—and prior to it—we have seen in the Press many statements by both Commonwealth and State Ministers on the matter of unemployment. Whilst we are pleased to know that there is a possibility of further industries coming to Western Australia which will help to absorb a large section of the community, we have to bear in mind that when we are subjected to credit squeezes, many people are thrown out of employment. We then read Press statements by Ministers that the unemployment figures are improving from time to time.

It seems to me that people who are unemployed are merely regarded as being ciphers in a mass of statistics. One moment we read how many unemployed there are, and shortly afterwards we see a statement that the unemployment figures have decreased. Let us keep in mind that those people who have lost their livelihood have also lost the equities in their homes, which they built up during a lifetime.

Some of these people come to me for help and I can only tell them that I will endeavour to get them a job somewhere, but that the question of their losing their equities in their homes as a result of becoming unemployed is one that will have to be dealt with by someone who has greater authority than I have.

I think it is quite wrong to have people deliberately thrown out of employment as a result of some credit squeeze or credit restriction that is imposed. One reason why unemployment is brought about when we have these credit restrictions is because less money is made available by the banks and other financial organisations; and the building trade is one of the first that suffers. A vicious circle is then created and before long many of the employees in the building trades find themselves without work and without an income. Others in the community then suffer because the spending power of those employees has been diminished.

The vicious circle then revolves. People purchasing their homes find they are unable to meet their commitments, and they lose the equities in their homes, which they may have battled for years to own.

In recent times, in relation to the credit squeeze and credit restrictions, we have seen in the newspapers reports that many thousands of the unemployed have been found work. That does not alter the fact that people who have lost their jobs, no longer have any equity in their homes. It is not much use telling the unemployed

people who have lost their homes that industries are to be established in this State. They want something right now, not in the future. Many statements have been made that industry will do something for this State in 10 years' time, but the fact is that at present there are many unemployed people who have lost the equities in their homes.

I feel that the Government in this State as well as in the Federal sphere should refrain from saying that periodically credit restrictions should be imposed. Such restrictions might be all right for people who can continue to live and retain their homes, but to others the imposition of credit restrictions means the loss of income, assets, and equities in homes.

This country spends a great deal of money on bringing migrants here. When they arrive many of them discover there is no work available. When they return home they tell the people in their own countries of their experiences in Australia, and those reports give Australia a bad name.

If money can be found for immigration, surely money should also be found to create extra employment for the people, so that those who are already in Australia can be found employment. I have brought up this matter during the closing stages of the present session of Parliament so that the Minister during the recess can give consideration to it. I support the Bill.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [12.33 a.m.]: I hope the Minister will accept my comments as being constructive and not destructive. I refer to item 21 relating to the provision of school buildings and to the amount of £2,400,000. This State is quite entitled to ask for financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the provision of these buildings, and for the training of teachers, in order to cope with the demands of the large increase in population since the early 1950's.

According to the figures given by the Director of Education a sum of £5,000,000 is required to provide the additional educational facilities and overcome the lag. This amount is infinitesimal when compared with the amount of revenue which the Federal Government derives from the taxpayers, and which it then lends to the State on interest. A request should be made to the Commonwealth for assistance amounting to £5,000,000 to overcome the lack of accommodation.

Great stress has been laid on the industries being established in this State, particularly in the Fremantle-Kwinana area. I discussed with the Minister for Education, the possibility of building a technical college in that area. There is already a high school at Medina which serves the surrounding district.

With the great influx of industry into this area, those in charge of the industries consider that in that district there is a lack

of technical training available to the employees. We should remember that not all children can succeed in passing through high schools and in going to the University for further studies. Balanced education must be brought about by the provision of technical training.

In discussing this matter with the Minister for Education he informed me that it would take at least two years before consideration could be given to the proposal I outlined, because of the lack of finance. There is a need for such projects to be planned ahead. I am sure the Minister is keen to provide a technical college there. There is the old saying that the squeaky wheel gets the most grease, so I am voicing my comments to draw attention to this need, and I shall continue to do so.

This State has contributed a large amount to the Heart Foundation Appeal. The superintendent of a very big hospital in this State told me several days ago that Western Australia had not received any benefit from that fund. He cannot find out what is to be the outcome of the fund. As the hospitals are becoming more efficient with the discovery of new techniques, this Government should make a request for an amount to be made available to Western Australia from that fund. I do not know the exact steps that have to be complied with, but the superintendent told me that unless this matter was mentioned in Parliament it could remain stagnant for a few years.

Money is also required for the improvement of King's Park. We all know that the park has deteriorated in the last few years from various causes, mainly through the infestation of veldt grass. A new director has been appointed and I am sure he will improve the park. I do not want to detract from the value of what the previous director, Mr. Watson, did for the park with the meagre funds at his disposal. The King's Park Board had no means of raising revenue, and it is amazing to see how the improvements were carried out.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It receives a rental from the tearooms.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is about all. The new tearooms are a great tourist attraction. If there is no other way to raise money to improve the park in time for the Empire games, the Government should make available to the King's Park Board sufficient funds for this purpose. We know there is a move to improve Thomas Street.

I am sure the new director would then be given a great incentive to improve the park. Also the director of mental health had great hopes of improving his departmental requirements, but he became frustrated with the slow progress that was being made on account of finance.

Reference was made by Dr. Hislop to the desirability to increase the number of Ministers in the Government. The day

after the late Mr. Perkins passed away I told the Premier and other Ministers that in view of the increased population, particularly in the metropolitan area, and of the increased activity throughout the State, the time had been reached when at least two more Ministers should be added to the Government.

I referred to the fact that Ministers have a strenuous task, particularly when they have to travel incessantly in the course of their duties. By increasing the number, some of the strain now placed on the Ministers could be removed. I hope that when the number is increased, the number of Ministers in this House will also be increased.

I pay a tribute to the two Ministers who are in charge of the business of this House. A considerable strain is placed upon them. One Minister has always to be present, and it means that great co-operation has to exist between them to keep the House going. I feel that there is a tremendous amount of business growing in the State at the moment. With regard to finance alone, I believe the amount has trebled since 1950, and all this must be handled by the same number of men. Now with all the finance coming to the State and all the great improvements which the Government is telling us are occurring—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Are you thinking of the Chevron-Hilton hotel?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am not thinking of that because that is the greatest blot on the Government's administration.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Or the wood pulp company?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is not a blot on us at all. Be fair in your criticism.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I do not mean by that to criticise—I do not know whether the Minister is referring to me when he makes his reference to criticism.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You said that it is the greatest blot on the Government's administration.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister did not allow me to finish my sentence. I was about to say that it was the greatest blot because the Government got caught on the three card trick which has occurred all round Australia with this company. It has a property in Queensland but has only built about a third of the storeys; and in Sydney and Victoria the company did the same thing. It thought it would do likewise in Western Australia and bluff this Government into providing finance for a hotel which it could not afford to build.

I have a very influential friend who has just arrived from Queensland. He has brought quite a lot of money with him and is spending about £80,000 on building. He said he knows the principals concerned in the other States because at one time he

was going to invest money in the firm. However, he woke up to what they were trying to do before it was too late.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: How much did it cost this Government?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would not like to say, but the company made a fool of the Government.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It did not cost us a penny.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I have to have that proved to me. I am afraid the Minister will draw me into something.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Be drawn in, even at this late hour.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: There is another Bill to come up and it is not here, so I have time available.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Go for your life.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: What happened—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As long as we have half an hour for breakfast, I do not mind.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I think the remarks of the Minister are most unkind. I prefaced my opening remarks by saying that I was offering constructive advice. Now he has indicated that merely because I want to say something he believes I am setting about him. In 1958 the Minister was most insulting in his castigation of the then Government for bringing two vital Bills before the House in the dying hours of the session. I am saying the Government has done the same thing here. The Workers' Compensation legislation which affects the lives of individual people has had a miserable amendment made to it.

I give the Government credit for setting out to sell the State to big business; and it has been successful; but it has not had the slightest thought for the ordinary citizen of this State. It has done nothing else but gather up the big industries—and I am pleased that it has because it will provide employment—and in the process has used most insulting electioneering propaganda to throw the Hawke Government out—the best Government which has ever been in office in this State for the social welfare of the people.

As I say, I give the Government credit for the fact that it set out to sell the State; and it has done a pretty good job, or will have when the industries start operating. There has not been one shovel of dirt turned over in my district despite the fact that millions of pounds are to be spent. The Minister has asked for this and he is going to get it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You were going to tell us what the Chevron-Hilton project cost us.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: What about Hawker Siddeley?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You were going to talk about the Chevron-Hilton project.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: First of all, what about the piece of land itself?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is still ours.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This land was provided for the benefit of the people by the early statesmen of this country—not those who were fortunate like myself to gain entry into Parliament to do their best, but by statesmen.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What are you going to use it for?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That land should never have been sold for the purpose stated. Right opposite in Victoria Avenue, Hay Street, and St. George's Terrace there is a block of buildings which could have been sold for a quarter of the price which was to have been paid for the piece of land allocated. When the Government has been paid I think the Minister will have a right to castigate me.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I am not castigating you. You said it has cost us money; but it has not.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It has cost the Government plenty.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No it has not.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It has cost plenty in prestige.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No it has not.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister should ask some of the small businessmen who will not be voting for this Government next time. Not just one of them but many. I went to the opening of the South of Perth Yacht Club as a representative of my leader, and there were 10 Labor people present. The rest belonged to, or were followers of, the Liberal Party. Within a few minutes they gathered around me.

What does the Minister think they said to me? They said, "What do you think the proposition is going to be with the Federal Parliament?" I said, "I have not given it much consideration because we are having a busy time in Parliament." They said, "We think you should. We are small businessmen and whereas our staffs were between 17 and 20 employees, we have had to reduce them to four or five because the banks will not advance us any more money." Because of the credit squeeze, some of these businessmen have had to close down their businesses. I do not know exactly how many have closed down.

Admittedly the big people have been affected, too, because I think a lot of them went a little to the extreme in expanding their businesses too quickly; and perhaps the Federal Government did have a point there. However, the Federal Government, like this Government, does not give a continental dash for the small businessman.

The number of small businessmen who will not be voting for this Government will surprise it. No matter how many millions of pounds the Government is bringing into the State, it has done nothing to help the small businessman, no matter what his political allegiance may be. I have never spoken like this before.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We have only reduced unemployment from 2.7 per cent. to 1.8 per cent.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Next time a Minister or anyone else in this Parliament talks about percentages of unemployed to me—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They are facts.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: —I will ask him what keeps his heart going. In other words: where does he get the money for food and clothing? From percentages?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We got them back to work; you didn't.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This Government has not the slightest thought for the individual person; and the Minister talks about percentages. I could give percentages of unemployment existing in the Fremantle electorate. There are Italian people down there who have been eight months in this State and who still have not found employment.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There are Australians in my constituency.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: There are 300 women down there in exactly the same position.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There are Australians too.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am not against migration; it is very necessary. There are those in the party to which I belong who believe that migration should be cut to the backbone, but I do not think so, because I feel that provided employment can be found for all, migration should be encouraged. But the Minister should not talk of percentages. I could give percentages of what my salary is and what I spend it on; but that is no good to people who are without employment, because such percentages do not obtain food for their children. I would ask the Minister for Housing, who drew me into this—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You did not take much drawing.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: —how many appeals he has had for reduction of rent over the last two or three years. How many people were buying their own homes but are now getting out of them because they cannot carry on?

The Minister said with regard to the Chevron-Hilton project that it did not cost the Government anything. It may not at the moment but it will cost it plenty before it is finished. The people who did benefit from the negotiations and

who were quick to accept the offer were the members of the Christian Brothers' College. It is a very wonderful school and it will now have the opportunity to expand.

I did not intend to enter this kind of debate and I am surprised that I was drawn into it. I would now like to speak about the office of the Public Trustee. It was known for 15 or 20 years before last June that the Public Trustee would retire then. We are now coming towards the end of November, and we know that the appointment will be a political one because the man appointed will be chosen from those who are in the top administrative section.

There are a number of people who have been concerned for quite a considerable time as to who is going to get this job. However, no decision has as yet been made by this Government or the responsible Minister. I consider that the position of Public Trustee is a very vital one in this State; not that the person in charge now (Mr. Marshall) is not capable of carrying on, but he is not the Public Trustee; he is only acting.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They will probably import one.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is a probability, too. On the point of the Public Trust Office, it has just shifted into an office of its own and it is very nice and all that kind of thing, but I remind members that it is a very powerful organisation. I say powerful, because it has a large number of estates ranging from £500 to £200,000.

I am led to believe that in the other trust organisations, including the Perpetual Trustee Company, when a man knocks off work at night, he knocks off; he is finished. However, in the Public Trust Office, because of the enormous amount of work to be done, a number of the men take the work home to try to see how they can work out some of these estates. They are so engrossed in the subject that even at night when they are having their dinner and their wives are talking to them, all they can say is, "Yes, Mum"; or whatever term is used. They are thinking all the time of their work. They wake up thinking about it, and they dream about it, and all that sort of thing, because they are overworked, understaffed and, I believe, underpaid. I am referring of course, to the five or six top men. This is a matter which this Government and all Governments should consider.

I have one more grizzle and then I will say something nice. If the Minister were to pay a little attention to the handing out of information to local shire councils about what is happening in their districts, I do not think the managers' conference which was held on Wednesday night would have been necessary. The members of the

shire councils of Rockingham, Kwinana, and Cockburn are very disappointed, because they are not told things.

I want to pay a tribute to the Minister for Local Government. When the Kwinana Shire Council made an approach to him with respect to the planning of all that area, he told it that the plans were being prepared and that as soon as he knew anything he would advise the council accordingly. I presume that included the Rockingham local authority. I am not sure about the Rockingham local authority, but with regard to the Kwinana local authority he did say he would attend to the matter for it.

A few days ago he did send Mr. Lloyd, the Town Planning Commissioner, down there and the members of the council were very grateful for that. They learned more from him in the short time he was there than they had been able to learn from this Government for several months. There was one article in the paper down there which I do not intend to read but the headline is "Nothing on Local Development Says Councillor," and then it goes on to castigate the Government on what is happening. Part of it reads—

In seven months we have heard nothing of what's being done, and I submit that it's a bad form of Government not to let the council know what's going on in its own district, said Councillor D. H. Ratcliffe in an outspoken attack on the responsible authorities at the October council meeting on Wednesday night.

That was some two or three weeks ago.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He was not quite right in that, of course.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister for Local Government and Town Planning is not mentioned in this castigation. I tried to explain that. But as regards the Minister for Industrial Development, and other Ministers, we all know that negotiations have to reach a certain point before they can become public knowledge, but down there we have in Mr. McGuigan one of the best local government officers one could possibly get. He is a person whom the Government could trust above anybody else; and surely the Government could bring him into its confidence and let him know what is happening so that he could handle matters at the council meetings.

I believe a little more tolerance could be used and there could be more ethics in dealing with these situations; and, if there were, the Government would not be criticised as much as it has been in this area.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What do you think of the new cardboard maker's building in O'Connor? Don't you think that's a fine building?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It is a very fine building, and I want to pay a tribute for the action taken there. The time

from when the land was cleared until the buildings were erected was a very short period—only a matter of weeks. It was a wonderful effort.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: They turned over a few shovelfuls of earth there, didn't they?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Yes, but Mr. Watson has missed my point. They are not in the Kwinana area.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: They are in your district.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Granted. A lot of paint manufacturers are in my district, too. The Government lent these people money to start this cardboard-making factory.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: A lot of small people as well as big people.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: They are not small people; they are one of the biggest cardboard manufacturers in the world. It is an Austrian company. The small men have not had anywhere near the same consideration as the big people have had.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They exploited the unemployed.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is so. There were so many people going east in the trains last year that one could not get a seat. I hope the trains coming here are now filled with people returning to this State. Had not the Minister for Mines drawn me into the debate I would not have spoken as I have done, but I am glad I did because I have been very docile this year and I have not had a go at anyone.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You are getting mature.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I thank members for their tolerance, and as this is the last time I shall be on my feet in this year of grace I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and all members who were so kind to me when I was ill last year. I have now come back fighting. I want to thank particularly all members of the House staff who have been so kind to me during the year. I wish everybody the compliments of the season.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [1.5 a.m.]: My remarks will be very brief, and I am prompted to speak only because of item 52 in the Loan Bill, and also because of a recent newspaper article in which I read certain remarks attributed to a Mr. Holmes regarding the tourist trade in this State. That particular gentleman referred to Albany as ugly and stuffy, and he commented unfavourably on the tourist accommodation there.

If we go back to 1959, when the Tourist Act was passed, we find rather a strange section in the Act which deals with the appointment of members to the authority. I was not in the House at the time but from the Act it appears that there are five members on the authority who are civil

servants, another is the Mayor of Albany, and there are two other gentlemen representing persons having a special interest in the development and publicising of the tourist attractions of the State. There is also one, in addition to the Mayor of Albany, representing country municipalities.

I am not condemning those members who have been appointed to the authority, but one would have thought that of the first five persons to be appointed not every one needed to be a member of the Civil Service and employed in a Government department, because I feel sure that not every one of them would have a particular knowledge of tourism. I admit it would be hard for Ministers to nominate persons who knew very much about tourism, because there has not been much scope for it in this State up to date.

However, one rather strange part of the whole set-up is the fact that tourism is more or less joined with the matter of accommodation. Not only must a State have certain attractions for tourists, but there must also be ample and excellent accommodation available in the tourist areas. If one took cognisance of the remarks of Mr. Holmes in regard to accommodation at Albany, one could possibly apply it to a number of other places in the State where tourist attractions exist.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Where did he stay at Albany?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not know from memory, but apparently he must have had a look around the district. I am not basing my remarks fully on that gentleman's comments in the newspaper. For many years now we have heard of the poor type of accommodation that is available in certain parts of the State.

One wonders what is the answer to the problem. Would it be possible for the Licensing Court to be used in conjunction with this authority to try to brighten up or improve the standard of accommodation in one way or another? It appears to me that in regard to new hotels the accent is always on the provision of a certain amount of accommodation—so many rooms must be built for guests irrespective of the demands for accommodation in the area concerned. To a degree this is a rather short-sighted policy, particularly if the court intends to adopt the stereotyped idea of saying, "If we give you a provisional license for a hotel you have to provide so many bedrooms."

Could we put this matter into reverse and reduce the number of bedrooms available to guests, particularly in country areas, and at the same time improve the standard? Having had some experience in the business I know the cost of upkeep of a large number of bedrooms in a hotel; the cost is very high, and, unless the potential for guests exists, the result can be a strain on the resources of the particular establishment.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is a strain on the wife of the proprietor, too.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I believe there should be some consultation between the tourist authority and the Licensing Court in this regard.

There is another aspect of this matter. It is only two years since the Tourist Act became law and the authority was appointed; actually the names were gazetted on the 11th November, 1959. Outside of paper reports, Parliament has heard very little, if anything, of what has happened in regard to this authority. I think it is a pity that when the Act was before Parliament a provision was not placed in the measure to ensure that each year the authority presented to the Minister a report which had to be tabled in both Houses so that members would be given an opportunity to study the report and consider what progress had been made in tourism in the State.

The tabling of the report would also give us an opportunity to decide whether members of the authority had justified their term of appointment. It would also provide an opportunity of gauging tourism in this State from year to year and finding out whether it would be worth while to spend a little more money than was being spent on this particular angle.

I trust that the Government will give some consideration to this aspect during the next 12 months and, perhaps, add to the Act a requirement that the authority shall submit a report to the Minister so that we can have a general look at the whole of its business and in some way improve tourism in the State. We do not want to start off by having criticism levelled at us by visitors from overseas, or even from the Eastern States. We want a set-up under which we can give satisfaction to the travelling public, and the only way to do it is to keep a close surveillance on this particular matter.

Perhaps we could look around for other nominees to place on the authority who could devote more time to the work than perhaps some of the present members. I feel sure that the departmental officers who are nominated to this authority have very little time to devote to tourist authority activities, and certainly not the time to which those activities are entitled.

I notice that the term of office for three of the appointees finishes at the end of this year, and I think it would be wise if the Government thought about appointing someone else who could devote more time to this work. I believe that that would improve tourism in the State. With those few remarks I support the measure.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [1.15 a.m.]: There are two courses open to me in replying to this debate. One is to deal in detail with the various points raised by members and

criticise some of those points and put members on the right track in respect of them. The other is for me to remain reasonably silent and let the Bill go through.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: I think you should adopt the second course.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank Mr. Jeffery for that interjection. The second course is the one I propose to adopt. It would be a relatively easy matter for me to stand up here for the next half hour or so picking out the remarks made by Mr. Lavery, Mr. Watson, and Dr. Hislop, all of whom expressed opinions; but any comments I made would, I am certain, not satisfy them.

I am sure the remarks made by Mr. Lavery are genuine as we have always found them to be. No Government is beyond criticism. If members wish to draw comparisons they are there to be drawn. For instance, I got a copy of the 1958 Loan Bill which was introduced by the Hawke Government and I made a quick comparison between the figures in that Bill and the figures in this one.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I was not criticising that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But I could; I could tear it to shreds. Comparisons are odious. Let us consider the amount of money the Hawke Government spent on public works.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: You got a lot more from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is a good point; and we are going to need a lot more as time goes on. We are not going to remain in this static state in which we are accused of being. I am pleased to hear Mr. Lavery say that Ministers are overworked, because Mrs. Hutchison says we are doing nothing. That is also debatable. There may not be shovel-fuls of earth being moved at Kwinana but there are certainly bulldozers full of earth being moved.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Will be moved.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They are being moved now. Only the other night I was watching TV and I saw the bulldozers going ahead with the excavations for the aluminium works.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: Have you seen the go-kart track?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, we have heard about that; but we must not interfere with the go-kart track.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is not the go-kart track but the principle involved.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In the weeks, months, and years which follow we will see a transformation of the area from Fremantle to Kwinana. Those of us who will be fortunate enough to live for

another 25 years might think back to the night of the 15th November, 1961, when accusations that the Government had done nothing were made, and then we might say, "Well, one thing the Government did was to lay a good foundation for what is going on."

As we all know, it is not just a matter of saying we are going to get people jobs in a particular industry; we must first negotiate with the company responsible for bringing the industry, whatever it may be, to the State. That takes a lot of time. Having done that, we must negotiate an agreement, which also takes time. Then again it takes time for the company to start to build its industry. That is what the Government of the State has been planning to do for the last three years. It has done that and has built a pretty solid foundation for the future of industry in Western Australia.

I have said before that we have been a primary-producing State for a long time. We got the benefit of our early growth in population and prosperity from minerals developed in Western Australia; and now—in the next decade—we will see a repetition of history with the regrowth of industry as a result of the development of our minerals.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: What about unemployment?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I had hoped that the honourable member would not return to the Chamber and interject. This talk of unemployment is a complete bogey, because while it might annoy Mr. Lavery if I mention percentages—and I hope it will not—I do think that Western Australia is better off—despite all this talk of unemployment—than any other State in the Commonwealth. As I said before Mrs. Hutchison came back, if I went through all the statements she made and told her what I thought, of them, it would do no good at all. It would certainly not convince her as to my opinion.

This is the final night of Parliament; and the Bill is the penultimate one to be introduced. What has taken place in the last three years, creditable or otherwise according to people's opinions, has taken place as a result of the energy, enthusiasm, and willingness of the entire Cabinet to do a good job for Western Australia.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: And they made a thorough mess of it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Thank goodness we do not have to depend on one opinion. I am satisfied, as I am sure is Mr. Logan, and indeed the whole Cabinet, that when the time comes next year to put ourselves before the people of Western Australia to see what they think of the situation, the result will be reflected in the election—whatever that result may be. If it occurs as we think it should occur, we will be returned to office; if not, then we will have a Labor Government in

Western Australia again; and maybe that would make Mrs. Hutchison happy for a few minutes.

As Mr. Davies interjected, we had more money this year than we had last year; but I would say in conclusion that we will need more and more money in the years to come to keep up with the growth that will take place in Western Australia, despite the shadow of gloom some people would cast over the whole State scene.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Sums raised, how to be applied—

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This Government could help the unemployment position if it assisted the pick and shovel men upon whom a great amount of unemployment falls. These men do very good work on deep drainage and sewerage; and there are plans for such work in my electorate. A very small interest payment could raise a pretty high loan for that type of work. In answer to the Minister I would say that Mr. Brand refused to meet a deputation from the unemployed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It was a political stunt.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It cannot be denied; we have the figures to prove it.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Preamble put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Sitting suspended from 1.29 to 2.40 a.m.

LOAN BILL, £21,762,000

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.45 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has been passed in another place, and is submitted to this House for its concurrence to make good the Supply up to the total required by the Estimates, and for the purposes of the appropriation, Advance to Treasurer.

Funds to the extent of £47,000,000 have already been supplied to the Government through the passing of two Supply Bills. Of this amount, £35,000,000 was made available from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £10,000,000 from the General Loan Fund, and £2,000,000 from the Public Account for the appropriation, Advance to the Treasurer.

There is set out in schedule A of this Bill the particulars of the further supply requiring appropriation under the headings of expenditure as detailed in the Estimates. The details of the 1960-61 excesses of expenditure over the Estimates are listed, and the Bill appropriates those amounts.

There is a scheme of expenditure from the Reforestation Fund scheduled in the Bill. The annual submission of such scheme to Parliament for its approval in accordance with section 41 of the Forests Act, 1918-1954 is complied with, and the scheme has already been laid on the Table of the House.

Clause 3 of the Bill provides that all sums mentioned therein have, through the passing of this measure, been appropriated for the purposes and services expressed in schedules B, C, D, E, and F. The Consolidated Revenue Fund expenditure Estimates total £75,077,000 for 1961-62. This is made up of £16,302,292 appropriated permanently by special Acts, leaving £58,774,708 not yet appropriated. That latter amount is provided under subclause (1) of clause 3, and that subclause also provides for the appropriation of £21,420,000 from the General Loan Fund to meet estimated expenditure; and there is also provision for £5,000,000 for the purpose of temporary advances to be made by the Treasurer. Particulars of all these amounts are detailed in schedules B, C, and D.

Full details appear in schedules "E," and "F" of the 1960-61 excesses, for which provision is made in subclause (2) of clause 3.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Schedules A to D put and passed.

Schedule E—

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: On page 9 is an amount of £250 in connection with the free milk scheme. Is the Minister in a position to advise me of the duties of

the officer of the Education Department referred to as an inspector or supervisor of the free milk scheme? Also is it his duty to keep a check on the milk delivered by suppliers to the schools?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will write and let you know.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules F and G put and passed.

Preamble put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Council's Alternative Amendments:
Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's alternative amendments to its amendment to which the Assembly had disagreed.

CLOSE OF SESSION

Complimentary Remarks

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): The message we have just received from the Legislative Assembly actually concludes the business of the Third Session of the 23rd Parliament of the State of Western Australia, and at this point of time it is customary, and proper I feel, to extend our thanks to those many people associated with the activities of Parliament, for the things they do to assist us in the conduct of the affairs of the House.

First of all I would like to pay to you, Mr. President, my personal tribute. This is now your second term in the Chair and you have carried out your duties as President of the Chamber with credit to yourself and to the Legislative Council Chamber. I am sure my remarks will be agreed to by all members.

I regard this as having been a pleasant session inasmuch as we are fortunate in this Parliament that we keep away from personalities. We have our political arguments but fortunately we finish up being good friends. During those arguments we always bear in mind that whatever political feeling we may have, we indulge in such arguments and discussions in the interests of the State of Western Australia of which we are all so proud. I thank you, Sir, for the manner in which you have conducted the affairs of the House and the very kindly attitude you have shown to me in particular.

To my colleague, Mr. Logan, who is the Minister for Local Government, Town Planning, and Child Welfare, I offer my very sincere congratulations. Nothing has been too much trouble for Mr. Logan to do to assist me in the tasks I have had to undertake in the past few years. I do thank him very much.

To the Leader of the Opposition I convey my sincere thanks for his part in the functions of the Legislative Council. There are times when I think that Mr. Strickland, if he feels it necessary, hits hard; and that is what we would expect of him. But we are fortunate because always there has been a good feeling between us after the debates have concluded on the many matters before the House.

Of course those remarks apply to everyone in this Chamber. I would like to mention the Chairman of Committees, (Mr. Hall) and his deputies (Mr. Davies, Mr. Mackinnon and Mr. Jones.) Our thanks go out to Mr. Hall and his deputies for the functions they carry out year by year. Mr. Hall has shown us how to conduct the Committee stages of the Bills, and we are everlastingly grateful for the guidance given and the very judicious manner in which the affairs of the House have been conducted while he has been in the Chair.

I am very pleased, Mr. President—if I may be permitted to mention this now—to see Mr. Davies back in the House. He had a period when he was not in the best of health and it is nice to see him looking well again.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: Thank you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: To those members who will be facing the electors in 1962 I say, personally, "Good luck in your campaigns". Naturally in the game of politics I daresay there will come a time during the election campaign when I will see those members and if I make speeches in their electorates they will be in the interests of the Government, of course.

To the members of all political parties—the Liberal Party, the Country Party, and the Labor Party—I say, "Thank you," for the co-operation shown; and I wish to thank particularly members of the Liberal and Country League, and the Country Party for the support they have given to the Government.

In the last couple of weeks there has been an atmosphere in this Chamber which I have appreciated. We have been able to resort to the function which we should fulfil—that of a House of review. It was interesting and instructive to see the mixed divisions which took place on certain matters, and I think there should be more of it. I wish to say, "Thank you" to Mr. Murray, the Government Whip. As a result of the co-operation

which has existed between him and Mr. Willesee I am sure the private arrangements of members have been facilitated considerably.

To Mr. Roberts, the Clerk of Parliaments, and his staff, without going through them individually, I say, "Thank you"; and at this stage I wish to make particular mention of the absence of Mr. Browne, the Usher of the Black Rod. Unfortunately he suffered an accident one night on the way home from the House but he is progressing satisfactorily and we hope he will return in the very near future in much better health.

Members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: To Mr. Chinery and the *Hansard* staff we extend sincere thanks. We work *Hansard* very hard, even to the point of their being required to record messages of thanks to themselves. We thank them sincerely because we know the part they play in Parliament.

I do not want to forget the House secretary-stenographers who serve members: I refer to Miss Watkins and Miss McCaul. I also extend thanks to the House Controller and his staff who look after the needs of the inner man and feed us so well when we are here.

The Government Printer is a man who does not get much of a mention but I often wonder how day after day he is able to produce the requirements of Parliament and see that we get our notice papers and Bills on time. To him and his staff I extend our thanks. I also extend thanks to the gentlemen of the Press. We do not always think we get the publicity to which we are entitled; nevertheless I suppose we get our fair share.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: They gave you a new Liberal member today.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am pleased to hear that. In the little back room behind the Chamber the secretary to Council Ministers (Mr. Whitely) and my typiste, (Miss Down) work very hard in the interests of the Government of the day to produce for me and Mr. Logan the notes and information that are required. I thank them sincerely for the untiring work they do.

It has been interesting to note that this year, like every other year, the same people come to sit in the galleries. Unfortunately they come to listen only to the debates in which they are directly interested. I think it is a sorry state that as soon as the debate in which they are interested is completed they leave the House. I would like to see more members of the public coming to Parliament House to see what we do. It would further their education and give them a better understanding of the system of which every British speaking country is so proud.

Next year we face an election, and let me say, "May the best man win." However, I would like it recorded in *Hansard* that in my humble opinion the State, in the last three years, has seen a period of excellent progress. I think that the years to come will ensure for Western Australia a very great future and that whatever Government is in power next year or the year after it will use its best endeavours, and will pursue policies which will be in the interests of Western Australia, and which will be of advantage to the State.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North—Leader of the Opposition): Mr. President, I am sure Her Majesty's Opposition appreciates your position as President in presiding over the affairs of the Council during this session, and, on behalf of the Opposition, I wish to express our appreciation for the impartiality you have shown to all members.

I join with the Minister in expressing appreciation for the help given by the staff of Parliament House, the officers connected with *Hansard*, and all other departments. I also join with him in expressing thanks to the Press, but I differ from him on one point: I feel that the members of the Press should tell the public a little more of what the public should know in connection with Parliament rather than what members would wish to read about themselves.

The session has been an exceptionally interesting one from many angles. Some very important legislation has been introduced and passed during the session. Also, some debatable legislation has been introduced, but it has been treated in the manner in which Parliament saw fit. I do not think the State or the Government will be worse off for any legislation which the Government wished to have passed, but which was not passed; but there was very little that was not passed.

This is the final session of this Parliament and not every member will need to face the electors. However, I hope that those who do will have the good fortune to return here and take part in the debates during the next session. I conclude by taking this opportunity of saying to you, Mr. President, to all members, and to everybody associated with Parliament House, that I hope they have a most enjoyable Christmas, good health, and a prosperous New Year.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government): As it is the last session of this Parliament I would like to join with my colleague, Mr. Griffith, in paying a tribute to all those he mentioned. To you, Mr. President, I would like to say, "Thank you" for the co-operation you have extended to me and the assistance and guidance you have given to me at all times, not only in the Chamber but outside it also.

To be a member of the Cabinet of the State of Western Australia has been a wonderful experience and privilege. I am proud to have been given the opportunity, and for that privilege I must thank my Country Party colleagues because they elected me to this position. Whatever the future might hold, nothing can take away the three years I have had; and, although it has been hard work, it has given me a lot of satisfaction. I have had to carry three portfolios—not very glamorous ones on some occasions—and they have involved a lot of work.

One might think that as a Minister it would be better to come to Parliament and present a Bill knowing that there were sufficient numbers to get the Bill through. But on reflection I think it might be better the way it has been in this Chamber, because there is no satisfaction if one merely has a Bill passed without any worry attached to it. I have appreciated this fact probably more than anybody else because of what happened to the town planning legislation last night when two clauses were deleted.

The Minister representing me in another place said, "What are you going to do, Les?" I said, "We will accept the amendments and forget about it." But on reflection I said, "No. We will have one more try. We will accept No. 2 and you disagree with No. 1 and we will have another go."

I am thankful I did that because it paid dividends. It made me fight for something, and I think when one fights for something and succeeds one appreciates it all the more.

To those who are facing the electors next year I offer my sincere sympathy, although I suppose most of us have to face such a contest at some time or other. Not all members will have to face the electors, of course. It is my fervent wish that they return to this House to continue the service they have given to the State.

To all members who have co-operated with me in the discharge of my duties; to you, Sir; and to all the staff and members of this House I wish the compliments of the season.

THE HON. W. R. HALL (North-East): I wish to associate myself with the remarks passed by the previous speaker, and to thank you, Sir, for the co-operation and courtesy you have extended to me in my position as Chairman of Committees. It has been a pleasure to serve under you and to be associated with you during your term as President. I wish you, Sir, your wife, and family the best of health, a very happy Christmas and a bright and prosperous New Year.

As it might not be possible for members to congregate together again before the festive season, I extend my greetings to

each one of them. I would like to compliment Mr. Griffith and Mr. Logan for the way they have introduced and handled their Bills. They have done as good a job as any that I have seen during my 23 years in this Chamber. I thank them for all the courtesies they have extended to me.

I would also like to compliment Mr. Strickland, Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Wise, his deputy, for the manner in which they carried out their duties in opposition. As members know, during this session the Government of the day and the Opposition have got on remarkably well. I cannot let this opportunity pass without commending those members who has occasion to introduce and handle Bills in this Chamber. Both Mr. Willesee and Mr. Jeffery have done a good job in that regard.

I thank the Leader of the House for the remarks he passed about the Deputy Chairmen of Committees (Mr. MacKinnon, Mr. Davies and Mr. Jones), and also for his remarks relative to myself. His kind remarks have been very much appreciated. I think it will be fitting at this stage for me to thank my Deputy Chairmen for their assistance during the session. They have handled approximately 30 Bills between them and they have given me considerable help and relief in my duties.

My thanks again go out to the Clerk of the Legislative Council and of Parliaments (Mr. Roberts), to Mr. Ashley, and to Mr. Hoft for the manner in which they have assisted me in my duties as Chairman. Over a period of years they have proved most capable and efficient officers; and the procedure they have devised has certainly simplified my job as Chairman of Committees. My work, as a result of the help I have received from the clerks of this Chamber, is far easier than it was in years gone by.

I must also take this opportunity to refer to Mr. Browne who met with a rather serious accident. I regret he cannot be here among us to know that his services and conscientious application to his duties have been very much appreciated. There are few men who are more conscientious than Mr. Browne. I regret very much he is not here tonight.

My thanks also go to Mr. Carrick and Mr. Joyner for the manner in which they have looked after us at all times. They are great servants, and I know I echo the sentiments of every member when I say we appreciate very much all they do for us.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without thanking *Hansard* for the manner in which they give us the best of their services at all times. We know perfectly well that theirs is a job which requires considerable concentration and which at times is not altogether an enviable one. I dare say we all know just how some of our speeches would read if we were presented

with them verbatim rather than in the polished form in which they come to us. I take this opportunity to thank the Chief *Hansard* Reporter, the Deputy Chief, and all the *Hansard* staff for their invaluable assistance.

To Mr. Burton and his wife I extend my grateful thanks, as I am sure do all members of Parliament, for the manner in which they carry out their duties and look after our more pressing needs. Most members have hearty appetites and they seldom leave the tables without feeling satisfied.

This has been a comparatively short session but a very pleasurable one. Although we are sitting late tonight we are finishing a month ahead of time by comparison with some other sessions. I take this opportunity again to wish you, Sir, and all members and staff, a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South): On behalf of my Country Party colleagues I wish to be closely associated with the complimentary remarks passed as they concern you, Sir, and the manner in which you have presided over this session of Parliament. I also take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the officers of the House (Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Hoft, Mr. Carrick and Mr. Joyner) for their services.

As one who goes out to face the electors in the hope of returning, I express my thanks for the good wishes that have been expressed by previous speakers, and I wish you, Sir, and every member of the House good health, a happy Christmas, and a prosperous New Year.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver—Central): I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Mines, the Minister for Local Government, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hall, Mr. Thomson, and all members for their complimentary expressions concerning my term of office as President. Not only those who have spoken this evening, but all members of this House, have, by their good taste and good judgment and their general good conduct in debate, made my lot extremely easy.

I have been particularly fortunate in occupying the position of President during the session. Perhaps history will record it as being a great era of development in Western Australia, which all members of Parliament have been looking forward to for many years.

I take this opportunity to thank members for their conduct within the Chamber, as well as for their tolerance when disturbances were created by the building additions to Parliament House. I did not hear any complaints from members. I know that at times the noise must have been really disturbing. I thank members for the tolerance they have shown.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without thanking the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Hall), and the Deputy Chairmen of Committees (Mr. Davies, Mr. MacKinnon and Mr. Jones) for their co-operation. Their assistance has helped to make the work very pleasant during this session.

I express my appreciation to the Clerk of the Council (Mr. Roberts), for the valuable assistance he gave me on very many occasions in attending to the affairs of this House. I wish to include in this expression of thanks Mr. Ashley and Mr. Hoft. It is with deep regret that I record the absence of the Usher of the Black Rod (Mr. Browne). I know I am speaking on behalf of all members in wishing him a speedy recovery and expressing the hope that in the not-too-distant future we will see him again amongst us. I would also like to thank Mr. Carrick and Mr. Joyner for the services which they have so readily rendered not only to me but to all members.

To the secretary-stenographers (Miss Watkin, Miss McCall, and Mrs. Colling), I extend the thanks of all members. To the Chief Hansard Reporter (Mr. Chinery) and the Deputy Chief Hansard Reporter (Mr. Hale), and the *Hansard* staff, I express thanks for their loyal co-operation.

To Mr. and Mrs. Burton I extend special gratitude. Their lot has been far from easy in view of the work which is going on around Parliament House. The staff working under Mr. Burton have had a trying time. We appreciate the tolerance which they have shown. No expression of appreciation would be complete if I did not include the switchboard operators (Mrs. Abbott and Mrs. Long).

I add my thanks to the Public Works Department building team which has been engaged on the additions to Parliament House. On many occasions we had to ask them to discontinue their work because of the disturbance created. No one likes to be asked to leave one job to go on to another. On behalf of the House Committee I express appreciation for their co-operation.

I wish all members, officers and staff, and their wives and families, the compliments of the season and good health in the ensuing year.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): May I also extend to members, the staff of Parliament, and everyone associated with this House, and to their families, the compliments of the season. I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to a date to be fixed by the President.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.37 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 15th November, 1961

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Boddington-Narrogin Railway Closure : Sale of Salvaged Materials	2807
Butter Substitutes—	
Definition	2808
Imports	2806
Chemical Analysis	2806
Cape Tulip : Treatment and Eradication	2807
Carlisle Ratepayers : Redress Against Industry for Injurious Affection	2810
Chamberlain Industries : Negotiations for Sale	2809
Cinematograph Operators : Licensing	2808
Comprehensive Water Scheme—	
Completion of Incomplete Sections	2807
Extension of Mains	2807
Fire Fighting : Stand-pipes in Rural Areas	2806
Hospital South of the River : Site and Construction	2809
Housing in Wilson Area : Houses to be Built	2810
Interstate Railway Bookings : Control	2808
Land Settlement : Civilian Scheme	2807
Low Water Pressure : Position in Wilkins Street, Bellevue	2808
Parking : Restrictions in Albany High- way, Victoria Park	2808
School at Wilson: Site and Commencement of Building	2809
School Seats : Replacement with Tubular Seating	2808
Sewage Treatment Works : Commence- ment South of Fremantle	2809
State Insurance Office : Profit or Loss on Motor Vehicle Insurance Policies	2810
Swine Fever : Incidence, and Avail- ability of Serum	2809
Tourist Promotion : Sunshine Cruises along North Coast	2810
Water Supplies in Rural Areas : Develop- ment of Rock Catchments	2807
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Albany Harbour : Third Berth	2811
Commonwealth Railways : Effect of Com- petition from Air-line	2811
Elections—	
Roe Constituency	2811
State Poll	2811
Reserves Bill Debate : Minister's Com- ments on remarks by Leader of the Opposition	2811
MOTION—	
Traffic Act : Disallowance of Amendment to Regulation No. 353 (1)	2856
BILLS—	
Appropriation Bill—	
Message : Appropriation	2885
Intro. ; 1r. ; 2r.	2885
Com. ; report ; 3r.	2889
Returned	2894
Companies Bill : Council's amendment	2822