

from about six sized crays to about 1.4. Indeed, at the start, fishermen were catching in excess of six crays per night in each pot; that is, in the very early days.

For a number of years the general fishing grounds were being developed, and each year some new areas were exploited by adventurous fishermen finding these new grounds. This had the effect of keeping up the per weight catch. However, as a few years ago, the stage has been reached where virtually all of the crayfishing grounds are currently being exploited, and it cannot be expected that any new section of the field will be discovered. The drop in weight catch has to some extent—indeed, to a marked extent—been offset by a very sharp increase in prices. The wholesale price of crayfish today is about \$2.80 American money, and fishermen are receiving for the cray meat weight of crayfish in the vicinity of 16s. per pound delivered to the processing plant.

There are ample illustrations around the world—I have said a good deal about this on previous occasions—and indeed even in parts of Australia, where formerly lucrative fisheries have disappeared, always through over-fishing. It has almost always been through over-fishing. We have currently the situation here in Western Australia of a large number of fishermen chasing insufficient crayfish, despite the fact that some few years ago a limit was put to the number of cray boats which could engage in crayfishing.

It is difficult to devise any method of reducing the number of fishermen in a way that such a reduction would be equitable to all concerned. However, there is reason to suppose that there are enough crayfish to support the current number of fishermen, if current export prices are maintained and the taking of undersized crayfish is reduced to an absolute minimum.

It has already been explained how a crayfish with a carapace length of two inches increases its weight and therefore its value threefold if it is allowed to reach a mature size. Maturity is a three-inch carapace length, and the tail weight is something in excess of 5 ozs. A 5-oz. tail—that is, approximately one-third of a pound is worth about 5s. A 2-inch carapace tail would be worth about 1s. 9d. It therefore follows that all possible steps must be taken to ensure that undersized crayfish are left so that they may mature; so that when they themselves may breed; and so that when they are taken they represent a worth-while amount of money.

There is some reason to believe that some percentage of the drop in last year's catch weight represented a diminution of the number of undersized crayfish taken during that season. There is, however,

also ample evidence to indicate that certain fishermen are still taking quite large numbers of undersized crayfish.

There is one last thing the Minister for Fisheries wishes me to stress. It is difficult for anybody who has caught fish to accept that a saleable commodity from the ocean should not be taken and sold. It is hard for them to understand that this is a wrong thing to do. For many years the taking of small crayfish was not regarded as a very serious matter. Crayfish were plentiful; there were always more that could be caught each year. Therefore there was no particular moral issue involved in taking home a few crays or filling the utility with undersized crays and taking them down for distribution among friends.

What the department is aiming to do in this measure is to maintain the crayfish catch in perpetuity. This Bill in basis is a conservation measure for the better protection and management of this most important industry. It aims at making it too expensive to catch undersized crayfish. There is no desire to brand a man a criminal, as the Minister for Fisheries has said; but any man engaged in this industry who will take undersized crays is, in fact, depriving himself and family of his and their future livelihood.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Kelly.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 6th October, 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	1229
Audit Act Amendment Bill—Report	1222
Bread Act Amendment Bill—Assembly's Message	1229
Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1240
Com.	1240
Report	1241
Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	1225
Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	1229
Jetties Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1222
Laporte Industrial Factory Agreement Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1229
Com. ; Report	1231

CONTENTS—continued

BILLS—continued

	Page
Local Government Act Amendment Bill— 3r.	1222
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—3r.	1222
Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill— 2r.	1222
Milk Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1226
Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1222
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1222
Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill— 2r.	1227
Com.	1227
Report	1229
State Tender Board Bill— 2r.	1229
Com. ; Report	1229
Traffic Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1225
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Com- mission Bill—2r.	1222

QUESTION ON NOTICE—

Mining for Iron Ore— Control and Safety Conditions	1222
Health Certificates	1222

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

QUESTION ON NOTICE

MINING FOR IRON ORE

Control and Safety Conditions

The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Does mining for iron ore come under the control of the Mines Department in Western Australia?
- (2) Do the working and safety conditions attached to mining for iron ore in the various areas in Western Australia, come under the control of—
 - (a) the Government inspector of mines;
 - (b) the workmen's inspector of mines?

Health Certificates

- (3) Is it compulsory for miners sinking test or pilot shafts for iron ore to have health laboratory tickets?
- (4) What are the requirements re health laboratory tickets for workers in the iron ore industry, other than those working underground?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. All iron ore mining operations in Western Australia must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act and are subject to inspection by the district inspector of mines and the workmen's inspector of mines.

(3) Yes.

- (4) Advice has been given by the laboratory that construction men, as distinct from mineworkers, do not require health certificates.

BILLS (5): THIRD READING

1. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and transmitted to the Assembly.

2. Local Government Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee, and passed.

3. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill.

4. Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

5. Jetties Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and passed.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COASTAL SHIPPING COMMISSION BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.41 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The proposal in this Bill to establish a Western Australian coastal shipping commission arises from the report made by Captain John Williams on the State Shipping Service in 1962.

Captain Williams is regarded as one of the leading shipping authorities in Australia and is of high international repute. He is also Chairman of the Australian Coastal Shipping Commission, which operates the Australian National Line. Consequently, he is well experienced in the particular difficulties associated with the operation of ships on the Australian coast, both intrastate and interstate.

His report covered the entire field of State Shipping Service operations. Most of his recommendations have already been, or are in the course of being, implemented. Some of the recommendations have had to await an improvement in some port facilities, and it was Captain Williams' expectation that such recommendations as were acceptable to the

Government would be implemented progressively as time and circumstances permitted.

The full effect of any reorganisation within the State Shipping Service would be dependent upon the introduction of new types of bigger, faster ships, specially designed and suited for our north-west operations and to meet present day operating conditions and demands. In the past, it has not been easy to justify such vessels, having regard for the comparatively poor port facilities and low volumes of freight generally available.

However, the overall question of port facilities and that of northern development has changed greatly over the past few years. It is, therefore, considered by the Government that the time has come to implement the recommendations in respect of the commission.

It would, I think, be desirable at this point of time to mention that quite apart from the views expressed by Captain Williams, it is the considered opinion of the Government, the former general manager, Mr. Owen, and the present general manager, Mr. Kopp, that the complexity of the problems to be dealt with in the next few years are such that the service generally would benefit by a commission entrusted by Statute with the responsibility of operating the service.

The State Shipping Service is currently engaged in the study of the type of vessel which could actually carry loaded barges which could be discharged at various ports in the sequence in which they are stowed, with the empty or reloaded barges being picked up on the return journey.

Greater emphasis will need to be placed on loading going north. An important problem will be that entailing balanced loading coming south, for the great percentage of produce will, because of its nature and the geographic location of the north, go to overseas markets. Therefore, it is desired to endeavour to establish some new way of overcoming some of the economic problems of ship operation in the north.

Whether the barge idea, which officers of the State Shipping Service have been examining, proves feasible remains to be seen, but it is mentioned as indicative of the approach that is being made to some of the problems of the north. Other types of design are, of course, also being investigated by the senior officers of the service.

The State Government has been advised that a ceiling is to be fixed on the deficit that can be incurred by the State Shipping Service and reimbursed through the Grants Commission. While we might not be satisfied with this position, in view of the peculiar industrial conditions which are encountered and the peculiar demands required to be met by the northern service,

we are nevertheless required to adopt the realistic approach and we cannot expect the Commonwealth, through the Grants Commission, to reimburse the deficit without limit indefinitely.

There is no intention of permitting the service to continue with its existing disabilities; and the objectives of the Government, as well as the commission, will be to reorganise the service over the next few years so as to give an efficient and acceptable service, and, at the same time, improve the economics of operation.

The Bill covers the several requirements of the establishment and operation of a commission. It will be a three-man commission to be appointed by the Governor. One of the commissioners will be the chairman and another will be the vice-chairman. The commissioners first appointed will hold office, in the case of the chairman for five years, in the case of the vice-chairman for four years, and in the case of the remaining commissioner for three years. This is for the obvious reason of staggering the initial retirements so that they do not all retire at the one time.

Subsequent appointments will be for a period of five years with a retiring commissioner eligible for reappointment. There is provision for the appointment of acting commissioners. The conditions under which the commissioner vacates his office are the ones that are generally covered in such circumstances, and they are clearly set out in the Bill.

The procedures of the commission are left largely to the commission within the provisions of the Act and its regulations. The commission is to be subject to the Minister, and reference to this is in clause 5 (2) (e).

The functions of the commission, which are covered by clause 13, include the maintenance and operation of the service carried on by the State Shipping Service at the present time, and provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of additional services as well as incidental services.

The commission will have the power and duty to maintain and operate these services in the manner and to the extent it considers fit. That is, it will have the right to expand or contract the services within the powers given by the legislation.

In clause 14, the more specific powers of the commission are listed and these are the powers considered necessary for the proper operation of a shipping service or services by the commission.

These powers include such matters as purchase, leasing, chartering ships, disposing of leasing, acquisition of land, acquisition by purchase or lease of buildings, land, etc., acquisition of plant, stevedoring operations, appointment of agents, training of employees, and the like.

The commission is to be restricted in its powers to purchase or dispose of assets without the consent of the Minister to a figure of £50,000. The remuneration of the commissioners is to be fixed by the Governor. There are the usual powers of delegation. Also, the commission has the power to enter into contracts to alter its liability as a common carrier.

It is necessary to deal with this particular aspect as a special matter in the present legislation, because it is insufficient to rely on the normal Commonwealth powers in respect of seagoing traffic. Most of our operations are intrastate and, therefore, have to be dealt with, to a large extent, under the laws applying to intrastate operations as distinct from those applying to interstate operations.

The provision of the Bill, however, is related to the power of the State Shipping Service to contract itself out of common carrier responsibilities. This is necessary in the case of a service which could be entering into contracts for the shipments of cargoes under special conditions.

One provision of particular importance is that in clause 18 where the Governor may direct the commission, where it is considered necessary, to meet the requirements of a particular area and it is desirable in the public interest to establish, maintain, and operate, or continue to maintain and operate, a shipping service for the purpose of meeting this requirement. Such direction is required to be within the provisions of the legislation.

The Governor could not, in his constitutional position, direct a service which was outside the powers of the Act to be established by the commission. But there is provision included virtually for the Governor of the day to direct, in effect, that a service be established or continue to be established, because it is considered to be in the public interest.

Special provision is made in the legislation for the financial results of such directed services to be shown separately. This is quite reasonable for, should the members of the commission, in their wisdom, consider it desirable not to operate a service but find themselves directed to do so, the results of the directed service should be available.

The commission is charged with the responsibility to pursue a policy directed towards securing revenue sufficient to meet its expenditure and, ultimately, permit the payment to the State of a reasonable return from the capital. This objective is not one likely to be achieved at once, but it is a stated objective within the Bill. Likewise, the commission is charged with operating the service as efficiently as possible and making its shipping services available at the lowest possible charges, having regard for the earlier mentioned requirement in respect of recovering expenditure where practicable.

The rates of charges for the carriage of persons and goods are subject to the approval of the Minister and he must have regard for the provision of clause 19 in respect of the responsibility of the commission to operate efficiently and at the lowest possible rates with the objective of recovering expenditure from income.

The commission will be responsible for the hiring and firing of employees other than those who fall within the equivalent, for the time being, of the Public Service administrative classification class. Measured in terms of salary, these are the people who will receive remuneration within the £3,921 range and above. This is not inconsistent with practices followed by other similar bodies.

The general manager will be in a special category and the appointment will be made by the Governor on the recommendation of the commission. All existing employers of the State Shipping Service will automatically be retained by the commission on the present terms and conditions in force in respect of the State Shipping Service, and officers and employees will retain their existing and accrued rights and any particular rights under the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act, 1938, that they might currently have.

In determining these rights, the service of an officer or employee of the State Shipping Service will be taken into account as if it were service with the commission. The commission will be subject to the normal industrial arbitration awards. The general manager will be the chief executive officer and be responsible for the day to day management of the service.

The financial provisions of the Bill, located in division 4, part II, establish procedures similar to those now in force in respect of the State Shipping Service, with the addition that the commission will have borrowing powers not now available to the State Shipping Service. Funds are made available to the commission by means of the establishment of a bank account at the Treasury, or at a bank approved by the Treasurer. Authority is given for the Treasurer, or for any bank approved by the Treasurer, to advance moneys to the commission to meet the excess of expenditure over revenues, such advances being made against moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose. The repayment of moneys so borrowed is guaranteed by the Treasurer.

Moneys may be borrowed subject to the approval of the Governor on terms and conditions to be approved by the Treasurer, who may guarantee repayment of the loan and the interest thereon, with provision to be made by the commission for the creation of a sinking fund for the redemption of the moneys so borrowed.

These are the normal financial provisions that are made so as to give the Treasury complete authority in respect of the form in which borrowing shall be undertaken.

The Bill also provides for the commission to meet interest and sinking fund contributions on moneys made available to it from the General Loan Fund in a manner similar to the existing system in respect of other Government instrumentalities and authorities, including the State Shipping Service.

Clause 29 enables the commission temporarily to invest moneys standing to its credit, and not immediately needed, in approved securities as directed by the Treasurer. This could apply to moneys borrowed for a specific purpose, payment for which was not immediately required.

Under clause 30, in the event of operations resulting in a profit in any financial year, after providing a sufficient amount for depreciation and obsolescence, covered by clause 31, and subject to the requirement of the Treasurer in respect of such amount of profit, the commission may use it for any purpose within its powers; for example, the creation of a reserve for tonnage replacements, etc. The commissioners will strike the rate of depreciation, but, if the Auditor-General considers it is not adequate, it must be increased to the figure nominated by him.

The Bill requires the commission to keep proper accounts and records and to submit a report each year to the Minister on its operations for the year, accompanied by financial statements in respect of that year after they have been audited and reported upon by the Auditor-General, with specific reference to the matters enumerated in clause 34(3). The Bill provides that these reports and financial statements shall be laid before each House of Parliament within 15 sitting days of that House, after their receipt by the Minister.

Part III of the Bill terminates the existence of the State Shipping Service and provides for the transfer to the commission of all of its existing assets and liabilities and its rights and obligations. Part IV provides for the recovery by the commission of unpaid fares or charges and for the making of by-laws and regulations under the Bill. It is felt that the provisions of the Bill cover adequately the foreseeable requirements to enable the commission to function smoothly.

Included in the objectives of the service, as suggested by Captain Williams, is the establishment of a State Shipping Service terminal at Fremantle. This would be a great advantage to the service. Negotiations have already commenced with the Fremantle Port Authority and will be contingent, to a large extent, on upriver development over the next few years.

As is known, Fremantle is the home port of the State Shipping Service, which has no official terminal of its own, and this constitutes a distinct disadvantage in the

operations of the service. This is because, at the home port there is certain basic equipment, and there are other facilities which should, for preference, be housed and taken care of at a terminal point. Unfortunately, this has not been practicable in the past but it is one of the objectives of the commission, and the present management is pursuing this policy in consultation with the Fremantle Port Authority.

When concluding his speech in the Legislative Assembly, the Minister for the North-West (Mr. Court) paid tribute to the good service given to the north by the State Shipping Service over some very difficult years; and he related something of its history from a small beginning. He made reference to the management, the staff, and the crews of the ships; and I think he made special reference to the recently retired general manager (Mr. Owen) who held the onerous but important position of General Manager of the State Shipping Service for over 20 years. He also mentioned the ships' masters in respect of their record of seamanship on a difficult coast, and in the difficult wartime period, this being something upon which Mr. Court, in the Legislative Assembly, expressed himself in terms of being extremely proud.

In conclusion may I say that undoubtedly times are changing, bringing new developments with them, and the Government thinks the establishment of this commission is timely and in the best interests of both the State Shipping Service and the north. The establishment of this commission must not by any means be regarded as a magic wand to wipe out all of the deficits and difficulties, but it will assist in the laying down of a programme for the reorganisation of the State Shipping Service—a programme that can be systematically implemented over the years.

I most heartily endorse the remarks made by my colleague, the Minister for the North-West (Mr. Court), and I hope and trust the explanation I have given to the House in the introduction of this Bill will be regarded as satisfactory.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), read a first time.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan) [5.1 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a very brief Bill and it seeks to amend the Traffic Act in one particular. The reason for this amendment is that up until 1963 the definition of "road" meant and included any street, road, lane, thoroughfare, footpath, or place open to or used by the public, and all bridges, culverts, and other things appertaining to and used in connection therewith.

In 1963, the definition of "road" was altered to mean any highway, road or street, open to, or used by, the public and included every carriageway, footway, reservation and traffic island thereon. The 1963 amendment apparently was not as comprehensive, as far as the definition of "road" was concerned, as it had been up until that time. The idea of the 1963 amendment was to get uniformity throughout the various States and this particular omission was obviously not thought of at that time.

The fact is that as the Act now stands there is no provision for a driver to report an accident—whether it be to a vehicle or to a person—if the accident occurs in a car park or at a drive-in theatre, or in a situation of that kind. However, should a similar accident occur in a street or a highway, then it is obligatory that the matter should be reported to the nearest police station.

When this Bill was introduced in another place it was intended to try to bring about a situation whereby it would be possible to have the same position applying to the car parks and drive-in theatres as applies to the highways and streets. However, that provision was negated in another place and has no further application to this Bill.

To clarify the present situation I would point out that under the Act as it now stands, if an accident occurs in a driveway or in a car park, there is no obligation to report that particular accident. This Bill seeks to amend section 30A of the Act so that where, in the course of the use of a vehicle in any place such as a public or private car park, an accident occurs whereby bodily injury is caused, then a report of the accident must be made to the nearest police station. That is simply all that is envisaged in this Bill.

Section 30A of the Act at present reads as follows:—

Where, in the course of the use of any vehicle on a road, an accident occurs whereby bodily injury is caused to any person the driver or person in charge of such vehicle shall (unless disabled by personal injury himself) report the accident forthwith to the officer in charge of the nearest police station or traffic inspector of the district of the nearest local authority.

This Bill proposes to amend section 30A to read as follows:—

Where, in the course of the use of any vehicle on a road, or in any place commonly used by the public or to which the public is permitted to have access . . .

and the rest of the clause follows on. It simply means that if bodily harm is caused in one of those places which are not constituted as a road, then the same principle and the same set of circumstances as apply to the reporting of an accident which occurs on a roadway will also apply. I do not think there is any need to labour the issue, as it is very clear and obvious.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government).

MILK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.9 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The introduction of this measure is necessary because of the proposed consolidation of the cattle industry compensation funds into one combined fund under another Bill introduced this session. This Bill provides the requisite amendments to the Milk Act inasmuch as it refers to the Dairy Cattle Compensation Fund.

There was in existence in 1946, under the provisions of the Milk Act, a milk vendors' compensation fund and a dairy-men's compensation fund, which were transferred, under the provisions of the 1946 amendment to the parent Act, to form a nucleus for the establishment of the Dairy Cattle Compensation Fund. All funds, totalling £34,887 14s. 10d., standing to the credit of those two funds were transferred to the new fund.

All sections of the liquid milk industry, including treatment plants, milkmen, and milk shops, contributed to this fund. The Dairy Cattle Compensation Fund has played a major role in the campaign for the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle. In 1960, the eradication campaign was expanded to cover dairy cattle kept for butterfat purposes, the passing of the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Bill being instrumental in this regard.

It is fairly obvious, if members stop to think, that many of the replacements to the dairy industry and the whole-milk industry were drawn from butterfat herds; and this, of course, was a sensible and logical step in this particular programme.

Then in 1963, the scheme was extended to beef cattle under the Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Act with the result that, at the present time, all types of cattle are now covered for TB testing and compensation.

This, again, is a logical extension of the scheme which was held up for some years by a shortage of the necessary veterinary surgeons and technologists to carry out the tests. I repeat, it is logical for the general eradication of this complaint.

With the combining of the dairy cattle and beef cattle funds, it is proposed that the testing and compensation requirements contained in the Milk Act will be repealed as they are covered by the current Cattle Industry Compensation Bill. Therefore, this Bill contains provision for the disposal of the appropriate funds held by the Milk Board. The administration fund of the board has met the cost of TB testing since the scheme commenced in 1947. It also provides for the cost of the scheme for milk improvement, including the establishment of laboratory and other facilities out of those funds.

In order to enable the board to carry on and provide the necessary protection for the whole-milk industry, generally, it has been agreed that the Milk Board will transfer £10,000 to the combined compensation fund, as its proportion, and this has been approved by the Treasury. The remaining balance will be retained by the board to be used in the interests of the liquid milk industry.

In order that the various administrative procedures may be set in train, it is proposed that the provisions in this Bill, when it passes into an Act, will become operative when proclaimed. The date of the proclamation will be ordered so as to coincide with the combined cattle compensation legislation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.14 p.m.]: Due to the fact that I was absent from the House yesterday afternoon—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: We had a very pleasant session.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Perhaps I should stay away more often! That is the only speech I have heard from Mr. Willesee on the Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill. I am sorry I was not here, but, as members know, I have been in the north. However, I have had an opportunity of checking the reception which this Bill received, and it obviously received a very good one from Mr. Wise, Mr. Ferry, and Mr. Jones.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Jones raised one query and, in replying, I think this is the only matter I need deal with. He suggested that that portion of the Bill dealing with the qualifications of the commissioners could, with advantage, be altered slightly. He thought the Bill could be so worded that two instead of one of the five commissioners should have administrative ability and not necessarily banking ability. The part-time commissioner of course, on the R. & I. Bank, is the Under-Treasurer, and obviously he, being a full-time Government employee in that position, is one not likely to have banking experience; in fact it is more than likely that he would not have this experience.

The whole purpose of the Bill, however, with this particular amendment, is to bring the Rural and Industries Bank to an integrated state so that its employees will have the same opportunities as employees, with the same qualifications, of other banks; and the Treasurer's representative on the board, being the Under-Treasurer, is the only one not in the category of the other four commissioners. If I interpret the remarks made by Mr. Jones correctly, I do not think he will pursue his suggestion to any great extent. It appears to the Government that the Bill in its present form should be acceptable because it is considered to be reasonable, and I trust the House will allow the measure to be passed without amendment.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 65N amended—

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: After lauding the objects of this clause, I was most interested and pleased to hear the remarks of Mr. Ferry. As one who is steeped in the activities of associated banks and who has held a very responsible position in the banking field, it would have been understandable had he criticised the extension of the service of the Rural and Industries Bank into the savings bank field.

Therefore it was interesting to hear him supporting strongly the entry of the Rural and Industries Bank into this field; and he exhibited a very broad viewpoint from his angle.

As I endeavoured to point out in the debate on the second reading, this is not merely a function creating an interest in saving in the minds of the younger generation; it is most important that children

and their parents should have an opportunity to support an institution belonging to the State. This applies particularly to the children who, at an early age, would be thus encouraged to save. I support the principle entirely and therefore support the clause.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Until he rose to speak I did not realise the Minister for Mines was going to close the debate, otherwise the remarks I am about to make on this clause would have been made on the second reading.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sorry.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I was keeping the debate open, as a matter of fact.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I waited some time for an honourable member to rise to his feet before I spoke.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I was waiting for the Minister for Local Government to rise to his feet, and that is how I came to miss speaking on the second reading debate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Minister for Local Government obtained the adjournment of the debate last night so that I could have an opportunity of speaking to the Bill.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I want to make a few comments on one aspect of the Bill. Perhaps members do not realise what a tremendous undertaking school banking has become, and if I quote a few figures on the method of its operation they may be of information to them.

At the beginning of 1963 there were no fewer than 520 school banking agencies, and the number of school accounts that were in operation at the 31st December, 1963, was no fewer than 154,731. The balance to the credit of depositors on the same date amounted to £517,694. As members will realise, that represents fairly big business. I would not mind holding that much in credit myself. The system of banking in schools used to be very simple. The work, which was performed by the teachers, would occupy them from 10 or 15 minutes on banking days when the children would lodge their bank books with their deposits. This would not involve more than 10 or 15 minutes every week.

The whole system has now been changed. Today, all banks, including private banks, take part in school banking. The system under which they will work is that at the head of a board will be the Director-General of Education, or his representative. There will be a representative of the Commonwealth Savings Bank, a representative of the Rural and Industries Bank, and two representatives of the private banks, and they will be responsible for the whole operation. All I wish to say is that I trust that everything will work satisfactorily.

The banking will be carried out on appointed days once a week in those schools where it is possible to conduct the banking. Only one representative of all the banks will attend the school on

that day to collect the deposits for all the banks. He will then credit each bank with its respective deposits. I understand it is firmly agreed by all banks that there will be no attempt to persuade children to bank in one bank as against another.

I would make only one observation. I notice that one bank has made a move of persuasion, as it were. Its bank books have been issued in special colours, something along the lines of pink for girls and blue for boys, with an appropriate little design on the outside of the books, which I suggest might be attractive to smaller children in particular. If that is a method of keeping competition away, I doubt whether it will have the desired result.

I think school banking is to be commended, and I am particularly pleased to see the Rural and Industries Bank coming into this field because I appreciate the wonderful service it has given. By encouraging children to bank it has taught them the habit of thrift, and it is surprising how large some of the children's accounts are. I have seen some children of 11 and 12 years, whose parents are not in the affluent class, with bank accounts of £400 or £500, which they accumulated while they were banking at school; and I felt sure that if they continued in the same way during their adult life they would be free of any financial worries.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is a sign of the times.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: The period of which I am speaking was about 30 years ago when we were not living in an affluent society; but the children still had £400 or £500 in the savings bank.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I thank Mr. Wise for his generous comments, and Mr. Dolan for his explanation of the present set-up of the school savings bank system. There is one point worthy of comment in considering our present educational facilities; namely, the present system, to which the Rural and Industries Bank will now contribute, operates on a roster of all banks to service the savings bank facilities. Therefore, from now on, as Mr. Dolan pointed out, the banking will be done by rostered staff from each of the savings banks, and the burden of the work will be removed from the teaching staffs of the schools.

To me this is most important, because teachers already have a tremendous task in fulfilling their educational responsibilities in the scholastic field, and they should not be burdened with the work involved in school banking. As the Bill seeks to correct the existing situation by placing banking in schools on a proper footing, so that it will be handled by bank officers and not by teachers, I commend it to the Committee.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

BREAD ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Assembly's Message*

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

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill.

2. Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill.

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

STATE TENDER BOARD BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd September, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan) [5.30 p.m.]: This Bill comes before the House somewhat as a surprise, because the State Tender Board has operated since its initial formation in the year 1904 with varying success, until some form of consolidation was effected. In July, 1944, a series of regulations were gazetted under the Audit Act, whereby the operations of the Tender Board were controlled; and from 1944 until the present time that position has obtained.

In looking through the operations of the Audit Act we find that the Treasury was advised that the creation and the operations of the Tender Board under the regulations made under the Audit Act were defective, because there was no power under that Act to establish such a board by way of regulation. It is rather amazing to think that such a situation could have obtained for so long a period. However, when something is discovered to be wrong the sooner it is remedied the better it is for all concerned.

The Bill will, upon its passage and proclamation, create a new tender board under a separate Act of Parliament. The Bill is very brief in outlining much of the operations of the board, but I think the regulations which now exist will be re-enacted where appropriate. It would appear that the entire existing organisation will be absorbed after the Bill is proclaimed.

I assume that matters such as times of meetings and fees payable to members will be dealt with by regulation. Within the Bill no specified times of meetings are

mentioned, but one would imagine that the State Tender Board at the present time would be at its busiest, as compared with its functions in the past. The board has been left in its present position for a very long period—governed by regulations as a sideline to the Audit Act—because there was not, in the past, a great deal for it to do. It was run, more or less, by the part-time activities of the members who were appointed to it.

I feel the time is fast arriving when there will be a need for a full-time executive officer to be appointed, so that the Tender Board can be developed to the fullest extent in meeting the demands of the State, and in giving full-time consideration to the problems that obtain in connection with its work. After all, the purchases of the Government of Western Australia reach large proportions, and require serious consideration. I think the board should be developed with the assistance of a full-time specialised executive officer who has a complete knowledge of the facts, so as to produce for the Government, and for the taxpayers in general, the very best results that can be obtained through the functions of this board; and these can be achieved by bringing about keen competition in the purchase of goods, by ensuring a high quality, and by fulfilling any contracts that are given.

I unhesitatingly support the Bill. I regard it as the beginning of a board which will grow in importance as time goes on, and which will return—when it reaches the point where it becomes self-sufficient by having a full-time executive administrator—to the Government of the day very great benefits by bringing about keen competition, good quality articles, and better service. This, in effect, will mean a better return to the people of Western Australia. Therefore I support the Bill.

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.

LAPORTE INDUSTRIAL FACTORY AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 23rd September, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan) [5.41 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to amend the 1961 agreement between the Government and the Laporte company. The original agreement dealt with the provision of housing for the

families of the employees of that company, and under it a given number of homes were to be built by the Government as and when called upon by the company. Of course, the number requested by the company would have to be within reason. Under the agreement the State Housing Commission was to build the houses, and I understand the company was to allocate them to the tenants and be responsible for the rentals.

As time elapsed the permanent employees of the company made representations that they desired to own the houses in which they lived. I understand the company approves of this principle, and desires that its employees should own the houses in which they live.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: So does the Government.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The Minister says: so does the Government. May I say: so does the Opposition. We think that home ownership should be encouraged. I might add to the remark of the Minister that not only would this be a good thing, but the Government should encourage home ownership among the employees of the Laporte company. With the acquisition of these homes by the employees, sums of money will be released to the State Housing Commission, and this money will be reinvested to build more homes for the people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: In that respect there is reason for agreeing to the proposals in the Bill. Without deviating very much from the contents of the Bill, those of us who have been elected as members to this House know full well that the problem of providing houses to-day is most acute, and this applies not only to newly married couples, but also to aged people.

It is interesting to note that the number of homes which have been provided at the request of the company is in the vicinity of 69, and another five are being built. This leaves a balance of 26 more homes which the company can call upon the Government to build to house the additional employees required with future extensions of the company.

With this provision written into the Act it will only be a matter of time before these homes will become available for ownership. I presume that once the contract figure has been achieved, any future homes built in the vicinity of the Laporte area will be the subject of direct negotiation between the State Housing Commission and the tenant, and that the demand for housing throughout the whole of Western Australia will be taken into consideration.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Government is not liable to accept a recurring responsibility.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The Minister has put succinctly into his interjection what I was trying to say. In other words, with the termination of the obligation to build 100 homes, the negotiation between the Government and the company will cease and the Government will then deal with any future applications, taking into consideration the problems throughout the State. I think that is reasonable.

Obviously there is no question that we should do anything other than support the amendment to the agreement, and hope that the people who will ultimately own these homes—and I understand that the State Housing Commission will make the selection—will enjoy them and that the association they have had with the company for so long will continue.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [5.48 p.m.]: I, too, support this legislation. My mind goes back to a similar agreement made in 1950 with the BP Refinery. When the township of Medina was constructed it was the Government's obligation to erect approximately 1,000 homes. However, that figure was never reached, the total number of homes constructed at that time being in the vicinity of 650. The company was responsible for the rents of the houses, which it let to its employees at a reduced rental.

However, chaos broke out in Medina when the company handed back to the Government many of these homes because it found difficulty in getting its employees to live in them. If this provision had been thought of at that stage and people had been permitted to buy the homes from the company, I think it would have led to a more stable community in Medina. That is why I compliment this legislation. It allows for a more stable community in Bunbury.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: This Bill does not commit the person occupying the house to purchase it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did not say it would. I said that if this had been allowed—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said that if the previous Bill had committed the occupier to purchase the house—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If I said that I said it wrongfully, and I apologise.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is what I thought you said.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In Medina at that time, and particularly when the homes were handed back by the company to the Government, the tenants had an increase in rent from 10s. to 15s. a week, which they did not like. If the homes could have been purchased at that stage I think many people would have taken advantage of the right to do so and would have settled down in that town. Instead, most

people wanted to move out of the township; and it is only of late that inquiries in any quantity have been received and people want to settle permanently in that town and buy their own homes.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think this will give to the company many difficulties it does not anticipate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: At Medina or Bunbury?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Bunbury.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I know what you mean.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This provision will add to the well-being of Bunbury as a township because people will take up permanent residence in the town. I support the measure, but I trust that if any other large concern requires houses to be built—particularly in Medina, an area I represent—this provision will be made at the beginning so that people can settle and buy their own homes.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) (5.52 p.m.): I thank Mr. Willesee and Mr. Ron Thompson for their support of this Bill. I was interested in the interjection of Mr. Wise in relation to what may be the result of selling these homes to the employees of Laporte. It is a fundamental that when a Government enters into a proposition to build a set number of houses for an industry there is no recurring responsibility on the part of the Government to build another lot in the event of the first group of tenants purchasing those houses and then leaving the industry; because the Government could find itself in a difficult position if there was, in fact, a recurring responsibility.

In the case of the Esperance fertiliser agreement, we entered into a responsibility to build a certain number of houses in order to help get the industry off the ground. That was not a recurring liability or responsibility. Once that number was built we did not have any further responsibility to put up another 30 or 40, or whatever the case may be. So also must the position be in Bunbury in respect of Laporte.

It may well be—and I think this was the purpose of Mr. Wise's interjection—that tenant A may buy his house today and then, due to some set of circumstances, be transferred to some other part of the country or the world. He may go of his own volition and therefore sell his interest in that house. The Government could not accept the responsibility of building another house for the employee who would take his place.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is the line of thought I had.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thought so. Medina was quite a bit different. I was Minister for Housing at the time, in 1959, and I found we had a lot of houses vacant in Medina.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I am way back in 1953.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They were vacant then?

The Hon. R. Thompson: When the company change-over occurred.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am saying that at the time when I was Minister a great number of houses were vacant, to the extent that it was considered better to place pensioner couples in the houses in a caretaking capacity on a reduced rental rather than have the houses vacant.

I think Mr. Lavery will remember that in 1959 when he raised this matter in the House, I said to him, "Give us an opportunity and not only will we fill these houses, but we will be required to build some more." We are now required to build more; and I venture to suggest that as the years progress the housing requirements of that particular part of the State will be very great indeed, because there will be a huge industrial area developed there.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is a matter of evolution.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; plus the progress which we are enjoying at present and which I hope we will continue to enjoy for many years to come. I am not too sure, but I think the houses being built at Medina today can be purchased by the occupants.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Yes; there are seven applications for the purchase of homes at present.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The number of applications does not fulfil the requirements. I think they can be purchased.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think you are right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think the others which were built under the arrangement in 1953 can also be purchased, although I am not too sure of that. However, I think that is getting a little away from the Bill, because we are at Bunbury and not at Medina.

I am glad support is being given to this small measure to enable these houses to be purchased by those who occupy them in Bunbury. I commend the Bill to the House.

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.

MARKETING OF ONIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading: Reasoned Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd September, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

To which The Hon. R. Thompson had moved the following reasoned amendment:—

That all words after the word "That" be deleted and the following words substituted:—

until a democratic plebiscite vote is held by all producers of onions, and both the Onion Marketing Board and the Market Gardeners' Association have been allowed to present their cases to the growers for and against the proposed amendments to the Act, this House declines to give this Bill a second reading.

THE HON. C. E. GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [5.59 p.m.]: I wish to take the opportunity of saying only a few words on this amendment. If anyone had told me my first speech in this House would have been on onions—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It's a crying shame!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: —I would have laughed.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: By the direct courtesy of Mr. Ron Thompson I feel I can now speak a little authoritatively on the subject. When moving the amendment, Mr. Thompson gave many and varied views for believing that the referendum that was carried out by the Onion Marketing Board was undemocratic. As a new member in this House I was somewhat alarmed at the constant reference to this supposedly undemocratic vote, and it was for this reason that I accepted the invitation extended by the honourable member to accompany him on a visit to the Spearwood district in order to speak to some of the growers; and he assured us that he would convince us that his allegations were correct. Together with Mr. Jones, I accompanied Mr. Thompson and interviewed half a dozen onion growers. I am pleased to say that I certainly was not convinced that his argument was correct.

I would like at this stage to refer to two sections of a newspaper report of this visit. The report is headed "Politicians Meet Onion Men," and the following is the first portion to which I wish to refer—

Mr. Griffiths said last night that of the six growers interviewed, half said they understood what the bill was about and the other half said they did not.

The second portion is—

Mr. Griffiths said members had sought unbiased opinions from a cross-section of growers. The findings would probably be put to the House when the debate on the bill was resumed.

The whole of Mr. Ron Thompson's speech when he introduced his reasoned amendment dealt with the fact that the growers did not understand what they were voting on in this referendum.

I now come to the stage where we interviewed the six onion growers; and I wish to refer to the second portion of the newspaper report which states that I said we had sought an unbiased opinion from a cross-section of the onion growers.

Mr. Thompson introduced us to these men—or at least to four of them—and I took it that they were meant to represent a cross-section of the onion growers. I myself chose two of the six onion growers at random; and I would say it was reasonable to expect that these six people did represent a cross-section of the points of view of the onion growers.

I will deal with the six people one by one; and I do not think Mr. Thompson could say that the first gentleman we spoke to agreed at all with his allegations. If he did, I certainly misunderstood him; because, although he generously entertained us, he was completely against the suggestions that Mr. Thompson was making that the vote was an undemocratic one and that the onion growers did not understand what they were voting on.

The second gentleman was another who was introduced to us by Mr. Thompson; and I believe we must at least extend to the honourable member the courtesy of saying that he did not stack the show, because number two was also most emphatic that he understood what the referendum was about and that he believed the other onion growers did, too.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They were both members of the Onion Board.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Did you get the same hospitality at the second place as at the first?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: We did not get as generously entertained at the next place. The third man we interviewed knew more about the Marketing of Onions Act than anybody else I have spoken to, although I must admit I have not spoken to too many.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: He knew his onions!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That is right. He brought up a very important point as far as I was concerned, inasmuch as I was a little amazed that out of 400 growers this gentleman pointed out to us why, in his opinion, a great many of them had not voted; and that was because the Act precluded them from voting by virtue

of the fact that they were not naturalised Australians. I can vividly recall at least Mr. Thompson saying, "I did not know this was in the Act." The gentleman to whom we were speaking raced inside and came out with a copy of the Act, and this particular section was underlined. The section states that unless an onion grower is a naturalised Australian he is not eligible to take part in any vote.

This gentleman's opinion was that some of those who did not vote—I do not know what percentage—were people who were precluded because of the section in the Act which I have just mentioned. This suggested to me that the number of unreturned votes was not as bad as was first indicated.

I will forget about the fourth and fifth gentlemen for the moment and will proceed to the sixth one, because this man was also introduced by Mr. Thompson. He, of course, was most emphatic that he did not understand what the vote was about; and this gets back to the first reference in the newspaper where Clive Griffiths said that half of them understood it and half did not. The first three were most emphatic that they did, and this man, number six, was one who said he did not.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think it is fair to say that the first three were members, or ex-members, of the Onion Marketing Board.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: It does not matter; they were onion growers, and you took us to them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Quite true.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The sixth man was most emphatic that he did not understand what this was all about. But the most extraordinary part of this is that he went further; because, although he explained that he did not understand what it was all about he produced a *how-to-vote* card, or paper, or pamphlet, which he proceeded to distribute to some of the other onion growers! He did that, although he had said he did not understand what it was all about.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That could happen at your election.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: It probably did.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It could happen at anybody's election.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: So number six, of course, was one of those that I was reported to have said did not understand what the vote was about. I am now qualifying that remark by saying that in my humble opinion he must have had a rough idea of what it was all about because he went to the trouble of producing some literature to tell people how they should vote.

Numbers four and five were people—and here I must be completely fair—who did say to us that they did not understand what the Bill was about. That was the first thing they said; and fair enough. But then they carried on and qualified their remarks—or disqualified them, as we see fit—by saying they felt the 10 items in the proposed amendments should have been answered separately. This made me think; and I thought that although the chaps said they could not understand the referendum, because only one answer was asked for, they could understand it sufficiently to say that the 10 questions required 10 separate answers. They did not quite convince me that they did not know what it was all about.

They went further and said they realised that this was a proposed amendment that would alter the Marketing of Onions Act, which dealt with an industry in which they were vitally concerned. They admitted that, in fact, they knew this was what the document was about.

I asked them this, "Do you not realise that in an industry that is vital to your livelihood it is your obligation, if you do not understand the questions, to make it your business to find out what they are all about?" They said, "Well, reasonable enough," or words to that effect. They went even further and said that they themselves, and their friends, looked at the proposed amendments on the piece of paper sent out by the board, and they believed that those growers who were in favour of the board voted "Yes" because they felt the board was a good thing; and those who opposed the board voted "No", because they did not want the board, and because the very fact that the board was suggesting something meant to them that it must be wrong.

So the six people who were interviewed as representing a cross-section of the onion growers gave an unbiased opinion. I can only speak as I interpreted the interview—and Mr. Ron Thompson will probably interpret it differently, although I cannot see how he possibly can—and I will be the most surprised man in this House if Mr. Thompson does not withdraw his amendment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You want to know him as we do.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I would also like to mention one of the many remarks that Mr. Thompson made in his speech when he moved his reasoned amendment. He said—and this is vital to the question I feel—

Many of these growers did not vote, simply because they could not understand it; and, before this ballot was returnable on the 20th August, seven growers came to me and I obtained from them copies of these papers. They asked me whether they had

voted rightly or wrongly. I said, "I cannot answer that for you. Were you in favour of these amendments?"

This is the vital part—

They said, "We were in favour of parts of them and completely opposed to others." I said, "How did you vote?" They said, "We think now we voted the wrong way."

The most significant feature of this is that, firstly, we interviewed six people as a cross-section of the onion growers. According to Mr. Thompson, seven growers interviewed him, and all seven of them said they understood the ballot. Mr. Thompson said, firstly, that they did not understand it, but here he said that they were in favour of half the questions and were bitterly opposed to the other half.

If these people were in agreement with half the questions and were opposed to the other half, then they must have understood them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think you are misinterpreting what I said.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: No I am not; this is what you said.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Read, in its true context, from, "Many of these growers."

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am only reading what I have here.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Prior to tea I was discussing a part of Mr. Ron Thompson's speech when he moved the reasoned amendment, and I had suggested that the seven growers who had come to him prior to the closing date of the referendum had said, in fact, that they were in favour of some of the amendments in the Bill but were completely opposed to others. The fact that these people said that they were in agreement with half of the amendments but were opposed to the other half ruled out completely what Mr. Thompson said about their not understanding what the referendum was about.

We interviewed six growers as an unbiased cross-section of the district and they, together with the seven whom Mr. Thompson interviewed, make a total of 13 and, in my opinion, they all understood what the referendum was about. Therefore I believe that the suggestion made by Mr. Ron Thompson, that this was not a democratic referendum, was not correct. As a result of the investigations I made, and in view of the suggestions made in Mr. Ron Thompson's speech about the seven growers who approached him, I certainly could not vote for the reasoned amendment moved by the honourable member.

In this connection I would remind the House that I am speaking only about the reasoned amendment and I am not refuting the fact that the onion growers

expressed dissatisfaction about the Marketing of Onions Act generally. They suggested it would be a good idea—and on the face of it I agree with them—to give the Act a complete overhaul. Suggestions were made that cost of production of onions was in the vicinity of £28 to £35 per ton, or that was the figure which the growers suggested would be a fair and equitable one for them to receive for their product. The average price now given to the growers, so they told us, was of the order of £20 a ton.

In view of the looseness—for the want of a better word—of the Act, and the apparent black-marketing of onions, because the board has not got complete control of the situation, I think it would be desirable to overhaul the Marketing of Onions Act. Apparently something like one-third of the onions grown are sold on the black-market, and this was a figure on which all the growers agreed. Therefore, although I cannot go along with the amendment moved by Mr. Ron Thompson, I sincerely believe that as apparently the black-marketing of onions is caused by a lack of control on the part of the board, due to insufficient power being given to it by the Act, at some future date there should be a tightening up of the sections involved.

I shall not prolong my contribution to the debate except to repeat that as a result of the views expressed by the six growers whom we interviewed as an unbiased cross-section of onion growers—four of whom were introduced to us by Mr. Ron Thompson and two we chose at random—and the seven who approached Mr. Ron Thompson, I am sure the growers understood the referendum, and I oppose the amendment.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (West) [7.37 p.m.]: I desire to say a few words on this amendment and, like Mr. Clive Griffiths, I am indebted to Mr. Ron Thompson for the little knowledge I now have of the onion industry generally. Before the subject was introduced into the Chamber, and Mr. Ron Thompson placed his amendment on the notice paper and then moved it, my knowledge of the Onion Marketing Board, and the industry as a whole, was very limited. However, apart from taking the interest which we all must take in various subjects as Bills are introduced in the Chamber, I have taken a keener interest in this subject because a market-gardening district is now included in my territory, and in that section onions are grown. Therefore, the offer which Mr. Ron Thompson made to me was accepted with pleasure.

As Mr. Clive Griffiths has said, he, Mr. Ron Thompson, and I went down to Spearwood for four or five hours one afternoon last week, and I think Mr. Griffiths has given a fairly good resume

of the proceedings. The opinions he has expressed, and the findings he has arrived at are supported by me, and I must conform with his thoughts in the matter to a certain degree. I felt his case was a good one, and meeting and talking to the people involved in the industry has certainly improved my knowledge of it.

I am sure Mr. Ron Thompson's amendment has stimulated the interest of all members here and naturally we desire to know more about what is to be done by the amendments in the Bill. I have come to the conclusion, from my investigations, that all is not well with the Onion Marketing Board or the industry as a whole. The figures quoted by Mr. Clive Griffiths as regards the number of onions which seem to find their way on to the market through the operations of a black market are rather astounding. As Mr. Griffiths said, apparently one-third of the onions are being sold through black market channels.

We were told also that one particular merchant has a weekly or monthly order—I shall not state what the period is—at a certain period of the year for four to five tons of onions. As soon as the supply ceases—and it is usually about now—he places an order with the Onion Marketing Board for something like 10 times that quantity. So it is obvious he is not buying all his onions through the board. That fact seems to be well known; and, if it is, why is not something done about it?

Apparently the Onion Marketing Board does not have sufficient power to police the black-marketing of onions; and, like Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Ron Thompson, I believe the Government should have a good look at the whole of the Onion Marketing Act so that it can be thoroughly overhauled and given the necessary teeth to enable the board to police the Act and effectively operate the marketing side of the industry.

Wherever we went during our investigations we were told that the Potato Marketing Board was a much better set-up. Whether that set-up could be applied to the onion industry I do not know; but these are aspects that should be investigated. I feel sure that the industry could carry on, and the board's status would not be reduced, if the Bill were passed in its present form, and then the Act as a whole could be thoroughly overhauled. I think we should pass all 10 amendments unless good reason can be shown why any of them should not be agreed to. If that is done we can then ask the Minister, and the Government, to have a really good look at the industry; and if the amendments in the Bill do not, within a reasonable time, provide it with the stability which we think it should have, an inquiry into the whole ramifications of the board and the industry, generally, should be held.

If the Minister would give us that undertaking I am sure all of us, including Mr. Ron Thompson, would be satisfied, because none of us wants to dispense with the board. It is a necessary part of the industry, but if the industry is to survive the board must be given more power.

I am sure that most of the people we interviewed knew quite well what they had voted for, but they were of the opinion that everything was so mixed up, and so many questions were asked on the one paper, that it was very misleading.

I feel a democratic vote should have been taken in a democratic way. All these things should have called for separate answers. Had that been done the referendum would have had a better reception and been more clearly understood than it was. There was doubt in the minds of some of the growers—perhaps in the minds of many of them; and I was inclined to agree—that the paper was prepared in a very wrong manner.

I do not know whether this was because the board wanted it that way, or whether it was influenced by the secretary who, I believe, is a very able man, and who would have considerable influence on some of the members of the board, particularly those who are not thoroughly conversant with the English language. We did meet one who was not very conversant with the meaning of the plebiscite.

I have mixed feelings as to how much these people did understand, and how much they did not understand, of all that was entailed by so many questions to be answered on one paper. I will not hold up the passage of the Bill, but I would ask the Minister to take cognisance of what we have said. I hope he will give a definite undertaking that if this does not cure the ills of the industry, an inquiry will be held into the matter.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [7.47 p.m.]: I feel I cannot support the reasoned amendment, but I do agree that the debate has thrown some light on what appear to be various shortcomings of the Onion Marketing Board. I say this without reflecting on any of the office bearers, but merely as a reference to the general operations and the principles of the board. For that reason I am thankful this measure is before us.

I would particularly like to observe that I am aware that under the Act there is a closed season and an open season for the marketing of onions. At the present time, beyond a certain date in the calendar, onions may be grown and marketed in the free period before the closed season operates.

Following the collapse of the tobacco industry in the Manjimup area ways and means were discussed to fill the vacuum

which was created. Because of this collapse in the tobacco industry the agricultural and horticultural sections gave consideration to the marketing of onions in that area. It has been established by thorough research, with the aid of the Department of Agriculture and of the local growers in the Manjimup area, that brown onions of a very high standard indeed can be grown in that area, and that these have perhaps greater keeping qualities than onions grown in other areas of the State.

The problem, apparently, is that under the regulations the onions in the Manjimup area are grown during the closed season when all onions have to be marketed through the board. Naturally enough the growers are, under the regulations required to market them through the board. But the main feature is that because of the keeping quality of these onions grown in the Manjimup area, a large percentage could, in fact, be marketed by the board during what might be termed the open season for onions. It is during this season that we have the importation of onions from South Australia. Onions are imported into Western Australia during this open period at prices far in excess of those paid to Western Australian growers under the board's control during the closed season.

I feel that, perhaps, a separate pool could be constituted within the framework of the Onion Marketing Board to enable the Manjimup growers in the southern areas, where onions with greater keeping qualities can be grown, to market those onions during the period when prices are high. Prices are high without a doubt, because we pay a greatly enhanced figure for the South Australian product on what we pay for the Western Australian product. I feel we could give this benefit to our Western Australian growers.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I hope the honourable member will confine his remarks to the amendment.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: Thank you, Sir. My remarks stem from the disclosures evident in certain features of the Onion Marketing Board. I would conclude by saying that I cannot support the reasoned amendment.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) (7.52 p.m.): Before I commence my speech on this Bill I would like to congratulate Mr. Clive Griffiths on his maiden speech. Perhaps the honourable member did not think he would make his first speech on a Bill dealing with onions. I congratulate him for having done so, however, because we must remember that in some countries of the world onions are the staff of life; so the honourable member has started off on a very good footing.

I wish to support the reasoned amendment proposed by Mr. Ron Thompson. I have listened to the remarks of Mr. Griffiths and of Mr. Jones very carefully. The case put forward by Mr. Ferry reminded me very much of the case I put up on behalf of the onion growers at Spearwood many years ago when I sat in exactly the same seat that Mr. Ferry now occupies. I made this speech when the growers in Carnarvon set out to grow onions in similar circumstances. The people in Spearwood and those in Osborne Park became very upset when the board's case came to Parliament and I was able to support it. I told the Spearwood growers, however, that they had nothing to be afraid of, particularly in view of the growing population. If Manjimup can grow onions to replace other industries which it might have lost, I will be the first to support such a venture.

I would point out that I am also in favour of orderly marketing. Mr. Watson will recall that many years ago he and I clashed over the Barley Marketing Board, which is now a permanent board. I agree there are quite a number of growers who would try to get under the Act, but I also feel that the board itself is lacking in that regard. The activities of the board seem to leave the way open for some black-marketing to take place. I do not agree that the black-marketing problem is of the proportions mentioned in the House. We believe there is black-marketing going on; I am told there is, but I would be quite wrong to say I know there is. But what is the board doing about it?

Does the board believe that in the expectation of a "Yes" vote in the plebiscite it will be able to secure control over onions which may be going on to the black-market? Does it believe it will be able to do this by a circular containing ten questions? If I am wrong in this matter I will apologise, but it is my opinion that the document which was given to these people was not prepared by the Crown Law Department. I am sure it was not, because its verbiage cannot be understood by members of Parliament; how much less would it be understood by people who do not understand English!

The feeling among the onions growers themselves is that the circular issued by the board was not in the best interests of the board, of the growers themselves, or of the marketing of onions in this State, because it left the sour taste that is apparent to us at the moment. The debate that has taken place on this Bill would not have been necessary had the board done as other boards do and prepared a reasonable document, after taking it to the Crown Law Department, before it conducted a ballot of the people. It could have been done in the same manner as the Bill that is now before us.

It has been said that there are ten amendments in this document. I say they are ten commandments, because they command the people how they should vote, instead of providing for a single vote, as was suggested by previous speakers, for each section of this particular plebiscite.

I agree with Mr. Griffiths that the board made a very grave mistake in this matter. Had it tackled the matter properly it would have got every item through bar one, and that would have been in connection with subsections (3) and (4). Section 4 of this document seeks to delete subsections (3) and (4) of section 3 of the Act. It states what the actual subsections refer to and mentions that the matter comes under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. On the opposite side it says, "Legal advice—not necessary. The law is still for definition". We might understand what that means, and some solicitors might understand it, but it would be difficult to convince 400 growers in the industry as to what it meant. The document says it is unwise to retain this paragraph, and vesting onions under section 92 considerably weakens the vesting. This is where the wording of the plebiscite was very ill-advised. The Bill itself has about 35 lines to replace the five already taken out.

The document does not say that the board is going to provide something in place of the paragraph referred to and I say to those members who have suggested there is no room for debate on this matter, that that alone puts the board in a bad odour in regard to its attempt to get the growers to do something which the board would have liked them to do.

I would like to state that those growers who are in opposition to the board over certain matters—there are a number of growers in all kinds of industries who are in opposition to controls—would not have shown such opposition had they not been faced with a document of this nature.

I think Mr. Clive Griffiths admitted that section 4 did disturb the people very much; and in support of this I propose to read a letter, written by a person residing at 99 Hamilton Road, Spearwood, on the 13th September, 1964, and addressed to The Hon. C. D. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), Parliament House, Perth. Before I read this letter I wish to state it was written by a young lad who had passed his Leaving English; but as his father cannot write English, this lad wrote on behalf of his father and others. The letter is as follows:—

Dear Sir,

It is with great concern that we view a certain section of the proposed amendments to the "Marketing of Onions Act (1938)" as sought by the Onion Marketing Board, the matter which is now before you, and such

amendments reputedly approved by a majority of growers in a recent referendum.

The section concerned is subsection (4) Four which aims at the removal of access to a three months' free marketing period now enjoyed by out of season onion growers, and we, as the biggest of this select, but nevertheless important group, as entirely distinct from the more common growers of the export onion trade group, wish to place before you the following pertinent facts regarding the removal of this privilege:—

1. Should not voting regarding this section have been solely confined to early out of season onions growers? The growing of these onions is a highly skilled operation, only open to those who can achieve this degree of skill, and therefore necessarily lucrative to its participants. Confined as it is, production is limited, vending easy and orderly, therefore marketing is never a problem requiring Board participation by way of export organisation, pooling, grading, etc., as with the later productions at normal times.

2. Hence the Board's contention in its circular that "OBJECT HAS FAILED," to justify its action is blatantly wrong, exceedingly biased, and seems to us purely a sly attempt to tap the profits derived from early production and divert such funds to supplement profits from its own generally unsatisfactory dealings in later produced onions for whose disposal it is responsible.

3. Early onion growers in the majority were not even eligible to vote by virtue of the fact that they did not qualify as "growers" within the Board's confines of its definition of "Registered Grower." Indeed, the close proximity of the referendum results, indicates that had these early growers been eligible to vote, they would have reversed the result, they all being most certainly opposed to the proposed deletion of subsection (4).

4. Even at this late date we contend, is it fair to so drastically penalise us by disrupting our marketing methods of years gone by, and slashing our profits margins, presumably in order to give some small but doubtful measure of relief to the ordinary grower; who, through his own folly of over-production is causing the Board concern?

Please do not under-estimate the importance of this early-out of season industry for it is big, satisfying all local demands in September, October, and leaving a surplus for export, satisfactorily handled, by our merchants.

5. The method adopted in conducting the referendum is unsatisfactory. All those who favoured the adoption of other proposals as submitted in the circular automatically were forced to vote for the proposal in Section Four (4) which we believe was a question distinctly different from all the rest of the questions, and which did not concern in any way whatsoever the majority of those who received the ballot paper.

6. Generally the voting was conducted in an atmosphere of confusion and ignorance due to insufficient explanations in the circular and the very technical nature of its printing as well as the method of voting. Above all, the comments offered were exceedingly biased in favour of the proposals while no attempt was made to explain in which ways the Board would implement its newly won powers (especially Sect. (4)), and how they would affect the growers concerned.

From this we could infer that the result possibly may not represent the true feelings of the majority of growers.

In conclusion, we wish to impress upon you that the referendum result where it concerns Sub. Section (4) is in direct opposition to the feelings of the growers involved, men who were not so much as given an opportunity to express this opposition. We respectfully ask that you use your powers to cause a survey to be conducted of early onion growers to gauge their true feelings, and finally to use your powers of discretion to realise the utter futility of this action taken, its detrimental effects on the men concerned and cause this iniquity to be removed.

Yours faithfully,

A. BASSAN,
for J. BASSAN & SON,
Spearwood.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: Who was that letter written to?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It was written to the Minister for Agriculture on the 13th September, 1964.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Three weeks after the ballot was taken, or the result of the ballot was known—let us put it that way.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: As I said before, I do not think there would have been very much objection to the rest of the amendments. I will now quote a letter from the Minister for Agriculture in reply to the letter which I have just read, dated the 13th September. The Minister's letter was written on the 26th October—six weeks later. The letter from Mr. C. D. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture) reads as follows:—

Messrs. J. Bassan and Son,
99 Hamilton Road,
Spearwood, W.A.

Dear Sirs,

Your letter of the 13th September which raised a number of points regarding amendments to the Marketing of Onions Act (1938) has been considered and I now advise as follows.

My enquiries have indicated that practically all growers in Spearwood who produce early onions also produce other onion crops and therefore would have been eligible to vote at the referendum.

Subsection (4) of Section 4 was an amendment to the Act aimed at stimulating Carnarvon onion production. However, statistics indicate that this amendment did not encourage production at Carnarvon or at other centres where very early or out of season onions are grown.

The importance of early onion production to this State is fully appreciated and it is pointed out that the W.A. Onion Marketing Board will have adequate powers irrespective of the deletion of Subsection (4) of Section 4 to exempt certain growers from the provisions of the Act where this is considered desirable.

The onion industry has now been catered for satisfactorily by the Board since 1938 and I have no doubt they will consider any application made by you in regard to this matter and will be quite competent to decide any issues involved.

As I said before, the original letter was written on behalf of one of the biggest growers. At the present time he has 30 tons of onions, and is certainly not a small grower. When Mr. Nalder replied he did not discuss any of the points raised except in regard to subsection (4). So subsection (4) must be of vital importance to the board, particularly when the Minister did not see fit to reply to complaints people have made in regard to it.

Mr. Logan said a circular had been issued amongst the growers asking for a "No" vote. I have a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. L. A. Logan on the 26th September, 1965, from Mr. A. E. Brindal, which I will quote. I have a further letter from Mrs. Milos, who was also responsible for sending a circular, and I

will quote her letter, too. The Minister knows all about this, but other members do not. The first letter I will read was written by Mr. A. E. Brindal, accountant, 18 Joondanna Drive, Joondanna Heights, on the 27th September, 1965. It was addressed to The Hon. L. A. Logan at Parliament House, Perth, and reads as follows:—

Dear Sir,

Onion Marketing Act Amendment.

In your reply on September 23rd to Mr. Thompson's motion in the House you correctly stated there were many canvassers against the issues involved in the Onion Board's request for additional powers.

This proposition, standing on its own, is a misrepresentation of the facts to be contradicted by what actually happened.

The Market Gardeners' Association was not directly notified that a referendum concerning the Onion Board's request for additional powers was to be held.

It was only because perplexed and puzzled gardeners brought the board's circular to us for interpretation of the inherent ambiguity written in it that the association learned at a late stage in the proceedings what was going on.

With only a few days to act, about 30 circulars were issued to growers whom we thought may not have voted, and as well in those concluding four days we called on growers personally to discuss the amendments with them and explain the fact that if they voted "yes" they would lose their most personally rewarding onion selling season, i.e. the period between the 1st September and 31st October each year when the board cannot operate and growers receive premium prices for their onions.

As many of the producers had voted by the time we were able to contact them we were only able to influence about forty or fifty who had not voted to oppose the measures.

Some of the growers who had, because of misunderstanding the enigmatic form of the board's circular, voted in the affirmative were strong canvassers against the issue when we made them fully aware of all the implications of the referendum.

You can be sure that had the Market Gardeners' Association had as much time as the board to contest the issue the Upper House would not have this contentious matter to resolve.

In support of this statement I refer to a meeting of ninety Spearwood onion producers, subsequent to the result of the referendum, who unanimously carried a resolution seeking

to have the result of the vote annulled and vehemently opposed the board's request for additional powers.

Osborne Park growers are no less antipathetic towards the board's sub-missions.

In the past, producers have been most apathetic to the board's manner as its dictatorial attitude and powers leave no room for arbitration but by taking advantage of the lack of growers' linguistic ability to further solely its own interests in promulgating the circular it enclosed with the ballot paper I believe it has enlightened everyone to the autocratic administration of the board.

You, as a member of the Upper House, a political body of review, are personally charged with the moral protection of democratic practices and I appeal to you not to treat this merely as a measure to be passed by weight of Government majority but I hope you will personally study the situation and then vote on it according to your enlightened appreciation of the position.

If, I, being closely engaged in the industry, can be of any help to your enquiries I will be only too pleased to assist you.

Yours faithfully,

A. E. Brindal.

I think Mr. Brindal might be the secretary of the Onion Marketing Board, but I am not sure. The above letter was addressed to Mr. Logan; but Mr. Brindal would not realise that Mr. Logan, being a Minister, could not perhaps have realised the weight of voting envisaged by Mr. Brindal. I will also quote a letter addressed to Mr. Ron Thompson from Mrs. Milos. It is as follows:—

The Onion Board conducted a ballot to alter an Act in the existing curriculum, but unfortunately as it was not advocated and most of the growers did not fully understand the position.

And when later explained to them they have found that it is not what they want, and have voted wrongly.

I have been told by market gardeners who attended Parliament last Thursday, that Mr. Logan referred to a leaflet that was distributed to market gardeners against the amendments to the Act. I issued the leaflet concerned one of which I enclose for your perusal.

In all I distributed approximately 20 leaflets but discontinued distribution. I found that the gardeners had already voted against the board yet claimed they had voted "Yes" as they did not understand the contents of the circular enclosed with the ballot papers.

I'd like all interested members of Parliament to get to know the true position we growers are in.

That letter was dated the 27th September, and it included a copy of the pamphlet which is as follows:—

CIRCULAR TO ONION GROWERS:

As you are all aware the Onion Board has issued a circular with new regulations and changes in the existing Act. This will give the Board more control over the sale of onions. The majority of us feel that there is enough control already, and we would prefer that the act remain as it is now.

We work hard for our living and deserve our full rights, therefore we urge all growers to VOTE:—

NO.

That circular was printed in English and Slav. The pamphlets were sent out by Mrs. Rosie Milos and Mr. Brindal. If Mr. Brindal is not the secretary of the Onion Marketing Board he has some close affiliation with the vegetable growers.

I want to point out that the above circular proves, in my opinion, that the confusion that existed over the document sent out by the Onion Marketing Board became more confused as it got amongst the people concerned. I have mentioned the fact, and I will repeat it, that section 4 of the circular stated that two sections were to be deleted. If we look at the Bill we find that there are three amendments to be substituted. This was not stated in the board's circular. So, one can see that the circular was not truly presented to the growers when they were asked to vote; and I stand on that point and I would stand on that point in any court of law.

In conclusion I want to make one or two comments on the meeting of 90 people which was held at Spearwood. Those people are adamant that this legislation should not be passed. I support orderly marketing. If Mr. Ron Thompson's amendment is not agreed to, I feel sure from the information I have that a petition will be received and the board will be abolished. If that happens it will be a tragedy—and it could happen. The growers can use pressure. It would be a tragedy because we have reached a stage where onions are available near enough to 12 months of the year. A special type of onion has been perfected to be grown in the period of three months—August, September, October. I do not think it will be continued. Another point I want to make clear is that the three men who were spoken to by Mr. Clive Griffiths were board members, or ex-board members. The other people were not on the board at all.

I have spoken to a number of people during the last seven or eight days and they are concerned that they did not have an ordinary ballot paper placed before them, which would have been constitutional. This would have been done in any organisation or in any Parliament where the questions were separately stated. That, in itself, condemns the action of the board

for trying to bluff something through. The Crown Law would not have written verbiage of that type. It could not have done so.

The board has not always protected itself as it might have. In 1953, Bill No. 39 was not only passed by Parliament but was assented to; but the board—because it suited it—never had the Act proclaimed. I support the amendment moved by Mr. Ron Thompson.

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

Ayes—8

Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. H. C. Strickland	Hon. R. Thompson

(Teller)

Noes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. V. J. Perry	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. J. M. Thompson
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. G. E. D. Brand

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Noes

Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. F. R. E. Lavery	Hon. J. G. Hislop

Majority against—8.

Amendment thus negated.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [8.27 p.m.]: Unfortunately, my amendment has been negated.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Order! The honourable member has spoken on the Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: With all due respect, I did not touch on the Bill. I moved an amendment to delete words. I did not mention one clause of the Bill or discuss the Bill in any way.

The **DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): The honourable member has spoken during the second reading debate.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. A. R. Jones.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate, from the 22nd September, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 6 amended—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not sure, but I think one honourable member who is absent from the Chamber for only a moment might want to say something on this clause. I notice that he has now re-entered the Chamber.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I apologise, Mr. Deputy Chairman, but unfortunately I was unexpectedly called out of the Chamber. I am in full support of this clause, but I was mainly concerned about what the Bill does not contain rather than the amendments which are set out. However, I am afraid Standing Orders will not permit me to discuss what is not in the Bill.

Nevertheless, I express disappointment that the Builders' Registration Act still does not embrace the whole of the State. Many who are engaged in the building industry deeply regret that this is not so, and therefore it is to be hoped that in due course, during this session, the Minister will be able to introduce another Bill to cover all builders within the State, not only for the benefit of the builders themselves, but also to protect their clients.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 6th October, 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1249
Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—3r.	1248
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1248
Education Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1248
Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1248
Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1248
Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill—	
Report	1251
Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1251
Jetties Act Amendment Bill—Returned	1251
Licensing Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1258
Local Government Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	1251

BILLS—continued	Page
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Receipt ; 1r.	1251
Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1280
Com.	1282
Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	1251
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill—Returned	1251
Vermis Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	1248
LOAN ESTIMATES, 1965-1966—Com.	1282
MOTION—	
Conditional Purchase Land and Sale of Leases : Inquiry by Select Committee....	1251
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Aged People at Midland—	
Census	1247
Homes : Establishment	1247
Building Costs of Major Works : Increases and Contributing Factors	1247
Cotton at Gascoyne Research Station : Staple Lengths and Quality	1245
Education—	
Public Examinations Board—	
Establishment : Authority	1248
Members : Appointment	1248
Powers and Functions	1248
Teacher Training Bursaries at Private Schools : Refunds and Claims for Yearly Allowances	1248
Harbour, Albany : Tug—	
Subsidy for Board	1242
Usage by Vessels	1242
Housing—	
Government Employees' Housing Authority—Homes : Acquisition in Kalgoorlie	1244
Housing in Albany—P.M.G. Employees : Provision	1242
Olympic Swimming Pool in Fremantle—	
Finance for Construction by City Council	1243
Government Assistance	1243
Public Relations Counsellors : Qualifications	1244
Railways—	
Goods Shed at Kalgoorlie : Resiting for Standard Gauge, and Resumptions Involved	1244
Midland Railway Company Property—	
Midland : Use	1247
West Midland : Availability for Leasing	1247
Railway from Perth to Geraldton : Re-routing	1246
Railway Station at Midland—	
Car Park : Capacity	1247
Kiosks : Tenders	1247
Opening	1247
Railways Department : Payment to E. L. and B. D. Hovell	1243
Shipping—Commonwealth Line : Establishment	1246
Taxi Plates : Issue in Special Circumstances	1245