The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has been a political football for the last seven or eight years.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I am disgusted to think that this House of review, which would not have anything to do with a motion of a similar nature moved last year by a member of one political party, should accept the same sort of motion when moved by the member of another political party. One has only to read the papers over the last few weeks, and since the meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Tokyo, to realise what has happened. The Federal Treasurer (Mr. Holt) has given his views on the question, and one article which appeared in the Press is headed "Federal Weakness On Gold."

I represent the goldfields districts in this House and I have also worked in the goldmining industry, so is it any wonder that I am disgusted with the sort of treatment that it is receiving by being made a political football? I can put my feelings in no other way. However, as I have already stated, I hope the motion will receive the support it deserves and that when the committee is formed—providing honourable members agree to its formation—it will do something towards giving a facelift to the goldmining industry. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 27th October, 1964

CONTENTS

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Tabling

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I have received from the Auditor-General a copy of his report on the Treasurer's statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1964. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WATER SUPPLY FOR DURANILLIN

Progress of Investigations

1. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:
   (1) Has any further progress been made with the detailed investigations for a water supply for the Duranillin townsite?
   (2) Is it the intention of the department to provide a water scheme for Duranillin during the 1964-65 financial year?
   (3) Does he remember that the West Arthur Shire Council is prepared to use its borrowing powers to raise the necessary funds similar to the Darkan water scheme, if the Public Works Department is prepared to install such a scheme?

   Mr. WILD replied:
   (1) It has not been possible to proceed with the investigation due to works of a higher priority, particularly associated with winter flooding, which have taxed the resources of the investigation staff. However, the investigation will take place as early as possible.
   (2) No.
   (3) Yes.

MANDURAH BAR OPENING

Conclusions from Working Model

2. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Works:
   (1) Is the model of the Mandurah Bar still in operation at the department's research centre at Floreat Park?
   (2) Have the engineers of the department come to any definite conclusions from the working of the model?
   (3) If so, what are they?
   (4) Can the residents of Mandurah now expect that plans will be drawn for the permanent opening of the bar?

   Mr. WILD replied:
   (1) Yes.
   (2) A technical report on model testing has been prepared and is now being evaluated.
   (3) Answered by (2).
   (4) Plans will be drawn up and costs estimated, but tests indicate that periodic dredging every three to four years will be inescapable.

WATER SUPPLY FOR YUNDERUP

Commencement and Completion of Reticulation

3. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:
   (1) Is it the intention of the Public Works Department to make a start on a reticulated water scheme for Yunderup this financial year?
   (2) Will the scheme be completed by December, 1965?

   Mr. WILD replied:
   (1) Yes.
   (2) Completion during the 1965-66 summer is planned.

CANCER TESTS FOR WOMEN

Free Treatment for Indigent Patients

4. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Health:
   (1) Does exemption of fee apply to feminine patients having limited financial means who seek gynaecological smear tests for cancer?
   (2) If so, will he have this fact publicised with a view to obtaining optimum attendance at clinics?
   (3) Will he have further assurances given to the effect that where treatment is necessary feminine patients need not be deterred from attendance on grounds of possible cost?

   Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:
   (1) and (3) The cancer screening clinic at the King Edward Memorial Hospital is a health service and no patient would be denied treatment because of inability to pay a fee. In any event, a member of a medical benefit fund can be recouped to a degree which removes any financial embarrassment.
   (2) The existence and locations of cancer screening facilities have been well publicised but the agencies involved will be requested to include the information suggested by the honourable member in future publicity.

COLLIE-BUCKINGHAM RAILWAY TRACK

Diversion and New Grades

5. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Railways:
   (1) Will he advise the cost of the diversion of the railway track between Collie and Buckingham?

(2) What was the purpose of these diversions and new grades?

(3) Have the diversions and new grades proved successful?

(4) If so, to what extent?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Anticipated final cost £42,000.

(2) Easement of grade to increase loading and reduce bank engine working.

(3) Yes.

(4) Locomotive loads have been increased as follows:—

PM Class: 405 tons to 555 tons.
P Class: 360 tons to 495 tons.
W Class: 360 tons to 490 tons.
FS Class: 370 tons to 500 tons.

GASCOYNE-LYONS CATCHMENT AREA VEGETATION

Aerial Survey: Tabling of Report

6. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Will he table the report on the partial aerial vegetation survey carried out by his department some years ago in respect of plant cover and erosion on the Gascoyne and Lyons River catchments and also the report on the more recent comprehensive aerial inspection of the same area?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The results of the aerial survey of the Gascoyne catchment formed part of a submission prepared by a committee appointed in 1961 to report on flood damage and river erosion.

There has not been any subsequent aerial survey of the area specifically for erosion purposes.

I am prepared to table a copy of the committee's report.

The report was tabled.

MURDER OF JILLIAN BREWER

Inquiries Subsequent to Eric Edgar Cooke's Confession

7. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) Subsequent to Cooke's confessing that he had murdered Jillian Brewer and prior to the hearing of the Beamish case by the Court of Criminal Appeal, did an officer of the Crown Law Department travel to the Eastern States for the purpose of interviewing Mr. Dinnie concerning a matter/or matters contained in Cooke's confession?

(2) What particular matters were the subject of inquiry?

(3) Was any evidence of substance obtained?

(4) If "Yes," why was it not produced to the Court of Criminal Appeal?

(5) Was the mother of the late Jillian Brewer also interviewed in connection with Cooke's confession?

(6) If "Yes," on what particular aspects of the confession?

(7) What evidence was obtained?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

This question was directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice, but I think it really affects the Police Department. Therefore the replies to the honourable member's questions are as follows:—

(1) No; but subsequent to Cooke's confession, Inspector (then, Detective-Sergeant) Burrows went to Sydney on police business and on his return, *en route*, interviewed Mr. Dinnie in Melbourne.

(2) The purpose of Detective-Sergeant Burrows's interview with Mr. Dinnie was to discuss the matter generally with him. There was no particular question which was the subject of the discussion.

(3) No.

(4) Answered by (3).

(5) Jillian Brewer's mother, Mrs. Northey, was also interviewed by Detective-Sergeant Burrows for general discussion of Cooke's confession.

(6) Answered by (5).

(7) No evidence of value.

COKE EXPORTS

Shipments from South Australia

8. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Is he aware that it has been reported that the first shipment of coke from South Australia to Ceylon was recently loaded in the freighter *State of Orissa* at Port Adelaide?

(2) Is it a fact that the shipment was the first export shipment of bagged coke by an Australian company, as claimed?

(3) Is it a fact that the South Australian Gas Co. was the only Australian utility which could supply the coke?

(4) Is he aware that shipment of 7,000 tons to Noumea last month brought the total export shipments of coke by the South Australian Gas Co. to more than 70,000 tons, representing more than £350,000 in export revenue?

(5) Is he aware that a good market exists in South America and Japan for coke?

(6) Why is it that the South Australian Gas Co. is in such a good position to supply coke?

Western Australian Prospects

(7) What prospects are there in Western Australia for an export trade in coke?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Not known.

(3) Not known.

(4) Yes.

(5) Statistical information on South American countries is not available in Western Australia and it is therefore not possible to estimate the market for coke which exists in these countries.

Japanese imports statistics for 1963 indicate that no coke was imported by Japan during that year. Considerable quantities of coking coal were imported and small quantities of coke were exported by Japan to neighbouring countries. This would indicate that the Japanese are currently showing a preference for importing coal in order to manufacture their own coke.

(6) Details of the South Australian Gas Co.'s operations are not readily available. However, it would appear that the supply of coke in South Australia exceeds the local demand, thus creating a surplus available for export.

(7) There are no prospects in Western Australia for an export trade in coke at the present time, for the following reasons:—

(a) The total quantity of coke produced in Western Australia (6,000 tons approximately per annum) is insufficient to meet local demand.

(b) It is impossible to increase the production of coke without also increasing the production of coal gas as the production of coke is dependdent upon the demand for coal gas, which is not increasing at the present time.

VERMIN SCHEME

Participants and Cost to Ratepayers

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Can he advise the number of shire councils participating in the State-wide vermin scheme, and what are their names?

(2) How many shires are not in the group vermin scheme, and what are their names?

(3) What is the cost to the ratepayers as contributors to the State vermin scheme and what shires participate in the scheme?

Objections

(4) Has there been dissatisfaction expressed at the handling of the scheme and, if so, what shires raised objections?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) and (2) All shires in agricultural areas to a total of 78, excepting Denmark, Manjimup, and Ravensthorpe.

(3) In the last financial year the shires were charged £31,230.

(4) No objections have been raised. Problems of operation, which are usually of a minor nature, are discussed with local committees.

NORTH-WEST ADMINISTRATOR

Costs Charged to Position

10. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

What has been the total cost to date to maintain the North-West Administrator, including his assistants, staff, travelling, accommodation, communications, etc., and any other cost charged to this position?

Mr. COURT replied:

	£		
The 1st December, 1962, to the 30th June, 1963	5,644	4	4
1963-1964	12,804	0	7
The 1st July, 1964, to the 30th September, 1964	4,408	9	0
	£22,856	13	11

NORTH-WEST CONSULTATIVE COUNCILS

Meetings: Admission of Press, Public, and Parliamentarians

11. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

(1) How long have the north-west consultative councils been operating and what number of meetings has each council held?

(2) Are the Press and public still excluded from attending the meetings?

(3) Are the State Members of Parliament for the district still excluded from the meetings?

Meetings: Circulation of Information

(4) Are any members of the councils allowed to make public statements concerning business conducted at the meetings?

(5) If the answers to any or all of (2) to (4) inclusive is "No," what are the reasons?

(6) As the councils operate on public moneys and the executive officers are paid government servants, should not the public of Western Australia and in particular the north-west people be entitled to know how their money is spent and what they are receiving in return?

Tabling of Reports, etc.

(7) What happens to any reports, records of business conducted, etc., after meetings are held; and if they are available to him will he table same?

Personnel and Method of Selection

(8) What are the names, occupations and addresses of the people who comprise the consultative councils?

(9) How are the members selected and by whom?

Cost

(10) What are the costs to date of maintaining the consultative councils?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) The consultative councils have been operating for a period of 18 months.

Meetings held:—

Kimberley Division	6
Central North Division	5
North-West Division	6

(2) to (5) In view of the fact that the work of the councils is consultative and not administrative, it was originally thought that it was desirable for council meetings to be held in committee.

At that time it was decided to re-examine the matter periodically in the light of experience.

The question is one for decision by the councils, and their current decision is for no change from the original practice.

Where the respective councils have arranged for experts to address meetings on matters of general interest to the council and others outside the council, it is the usual practice to invite local members of Parliament and the public.

(6) I think it is fair to say that the residents of the north-west and Kimberley are now better informed than before on what is happening and what is planned for northern development.

The background and experience of the consultative councillors assures this. The public can see that the money is well applied as a genuine and practical step to improve the understanding of what is being done, planned, and the day-to-day administration of the area.

(7) This information is provided to all consultative councillors, shire councils in each division, and to the Minister for the North-West. Copies of the record of proceedings for these meetings could be made available for the perusal of the honourable member if he so desires.

(8) NAMES, ADDRESSES AND OCCUPATIONS OF MEMBERS OF CONSULTATIVE COUNCILS

NORTH-WEST DIVISION CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL:

	Address	Occupation
Town of Carnarvon—		
Mr. F. G. Baxter	9 Brown Street, Carnarvon	Business Proprietor
Mr. J. Parker	Olivia Terrace, Carnarvon	" "
Gascoyne-Minilya Shire Council—		
Mr. E. Berry	P.O. Box 182, Carnarvon	Plantation Owner
Mr. T. V. Cahill	Carnarvon	Business Proprietor
Upper Gascoyne Shire Council—		
Mr. N. S. Smith	Towrana Station, via Carnarvon	Pastoralist
Mr. M. Donovan	Ullawarra Station, via Carnarvon	"
Pastoralists' and Graziers' Association—		
Mr. R. Forrester	Yarlarweelor Station, via Meekatharra	"
Mr. L. McTaggart	"Bidgemia," Gascoyne Junction	"

CENTRAL NORTH DIVISION CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL:

Ashburton Shire Council—		
Mr. A. Barrett-Lennard	Nanutarra Station, via Onslow	Pastoralist
Mr. W. M. Paterson	Yarraloola Station, via Onslow	"
Meekatharra Shire Council—		
Mr. H. H. Lee Steere	Koonmarra, Meekatharra	"
Mr. M. White	Yarrabubba Station, Meekatharra	"
Marble Bar Shire Council—		
Mr. F. H. Welsh	Yarrie Station, Marble Bar	"
Mr. S. H. Stubbs	Comet Gold Mine, Marble Bar	Mine Owner
Nullagine Shire Council—		
Mr. J. C. B. Leete	Bamboo Springs, via Nullagine	Pastoralist
Mr. A. Spring	Roy Hill	"
Port Hedland Shire Council—		
Mr. E. A. Richardson	Port Hedland	Business Proprietor
Mr. R. F. Lukis	Resigned on leaving Port Hedland—not yet replaced.	Munda Station,
Roebourne Shire Council—		
Mr. S. C. Ball	Victoria Hotel, Roebourne	Publican
Mr. J. A. Fernihough	Roebourne	Business Manager
Tableland Shire Council—		
Mr. D. F. Eacott	P.O. Box 62, Wittenoom	"
Mr. E. W. Parsons	Coolawanyah, Roebourne	Pastoralist

	Address	Occupation
Pastoralists' and Graziers' Association—		
Mr. D. Stove	Pyramid Station, Roebourne	"
Mr. P. Hardie	Boodarie Station, Port Hedland	"
KIMBERLEY DIVISION CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL:		
Broome Shire Council—		
Mr. A. S. Male, O.B.E.	Broome	Business Proprietor
Mr. J. Conlan	Continental Hotel, Broome	Publican
Halls Creek Shire Council—		
Mr. E. J. Lilly	Bow River Station, Turkey Creek	Pastoralist
Mr. I. Thom	Moola Bulla Station, Halls Creek	"
West Kimberley Shire Council—		
Mr. A. W. Nichols	P.O. Box 9, Derby	Publican
Mr. K. Gorey	Camballin	Business Manager
Wyndham-East Kimberley Shire Council—		
Mr. J. Arbuckle	Kununurra	Farmer
Mr. H. R. Young	P.O. Box 20, Wyndham	Contractor
Pastoralists' and Graziers' Association—		
Mr. T. S. Emanuel	Go Go Station, Fitzroy Crossing	Pastoralist
Mr. B. Underwood	Bedford Downs, Halls Creek	"

(9) The members are nominated by the shire councils in each division and by the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association, for appointment by the Minister for the North-West.

(10) Expenditure to Maintain Consultative Councils—

	£	s.	d.
1962-1963	756	4	8
1963-1964	2,687	0	6
The 1st July to the 30th September, 1964	272	7	7
Total	£3,715	12	9

MR. JUSTICE NEVILE

Nature of Present Work

12. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

(1) What actual work has Mr. Justice Nevile been engaged upon since he was removed by the Government from the field of industrial arbitration?

Cases Adjudicated as Supreme Court Judge

(2) What specific cases of importance has he adjudicated on in his capacity as a Supreme Court judge during this year?

(3) What actual work is Mr. Justice Nevile engaged upon at the present time?

Recommendation for Additional Conciliation Commissioner

(4) Did Mr. Justice Nevile prior to the abolition of the State Arbitration Court recommend or suggest the appointment of an additional conciliation commissioner?

(5) If so, what happened to his recommendation?

(6) Upon what date was the recommendation made?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) From the 4th February, 1964, to the 3rd June, 1964, Mr. Justice Nevile was engaged as Chairman of the Public Service Appeal Board in hearing appeals against the 1963 Reclassification, mainly by groups of professional graduate officers.

From the 17th March, 1964, to the 21st March, 1964, he presided at the Eastern Goldfields Circuit Court and the Eastern Goldfields Court of Session, Kalgoorlie.

From the 5th June, 1964, to the 24th June, 1964, he was engaged in hearing cases in the Supreme Court Civil list.

On the 1st July, 1964, he proceeded on leave.

(2) It is not possible to specify which cases are of more importance than others, but it could be assumed that all cases which are dealt with by a Supreme Court judge are of importance.

(3) Mr. Justice Nevile proceeded on six months' long service leave on the 1st July, 1964, at his own request.

(4) Yes. Mr. Justice Nevile requested the Government to give urgent consideration to the appointment of another conciliation commissioner "because of the increasing work in the arbitration court in the past few years."

(5) No action was necessary in view of the Government's intention to introduce amending legislation, which was enacted, and established the Industrial Commission.

(6) The 5th September, 1963.

EGG MARKETING BOARD

Staff, Duties, and Remuneration

13. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In connection with the W.A. Egg Marketing Board, will he indicate the following particulars for 1961-62 and 1963-64:—

(a) Total staff employed;

(b) dozens handled per staff member;

(c) average annual remuneration per staff member;

Wages Cost and Handling Charges

(d) wages and salaries cost per dozen—received ex producers;

(e) Board charges per dozen relative to—

(i) handling and selling charge;

(ii) board administration;
(iii) plant, building and equipment reserve;
(iv) advertising trust?

Mr. NALDER replied:

	1961-1962	1963-1964
(a)	166	170
(b)	65,397	72,660
(c)	£783 11s. 2d.	£871 15s. 2d.
(d)	4.96d.	4.98d.

(e) (i) 4½d.
(ii) ¼d.
(iii) ¼d.
(iv) ¼d.

MILK

Pickup Pilot Scheme

14. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the Milk Board been approached with a request for a bulk milk pickup pilot scheme?

(2) If so, by whom?

(3) Is it the board's intention to institute such a scheme?

(4) In which district would the scheme be commenced?

(5) What premium would be paid to producers?

(6) In the event of a commencement being made in bulk milk pickup in Western Australia, would the board guarantee that small producers and those not wishing to join the scheme would be in no way penalised?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) A group of 10 dairymen in Armadale, Mundijong, Mardella, and Keysbrook area have applied for permission to install refrigerated farm milk tank units for bulk pickup of milk from farms.

The milk treatment plant supplied by them has advised the board it informed the dairymen in answer to their request that providing the board approved of the introduction of a pilot scheme the treatment plant would cooperate with the dairymen in the introduction of a run to pick up milk in bulk.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) The board has publicised its policy that no decision or recommendation regarding bulk milk pickup in this State will be made by the board without prior consultation with producers, the Farmers' Union, treatment plants, and the Government.

The board has had discussions on the subject of bulk milk pickup with the Farmers' Union whole milk section and with the Metropolitan milk treatment plants association, but no decision has been made.

(4) Answered by (3).

(5) The treatment plant states it will be prepared to only guarantee a premium of one penny per gallon on whole milk.

(6) Yes.

STATION AT DARKAN

Installation of 3-ton Crane

15. Mr. COURT (Minister for Railways): On the 21st October I answered questions for the honourable member for Collie regarding a crane for Darkan, and I undertook to obtain more specific information concerning the estimated date of installation. I now find from the railways that they plan to have this crane installed at the end of January, 1965. The crane is being provided as part of a programme of installing heavier cranes at certain localities and is contingent on the release of a 3-ton crane from one of the localities where a heavier crane is to be installed. I also understand that following the release of the 3-ton crane to be installed at Darkan it is proposed to increase the length of the jib before such installation so as to make it more serviceable in the Darkan location.

PYRITES AT KOOLYANOBBING

Deposit and Position of B.H.P.

16. Mr. BOVELL (Minister for Lands): Last Thursday the honourable member for Mt. Marshall asked a question relative to pyrites at Koolyanobbing and referred to deposits in possession of B.H.P. The Minister for Transport replied that he would refer the question to the Minister concerned. I am now informed by the Minister for Mines that the answer is "Yes".

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Special Leave for Service with Armed Forces

1. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

(1) Is it the policy of the Government to grant special leave to government employees to enable them to carry out service on a short-term basis with the Army, Navy, or Air Force?

(2) If not, what is the reason for refusing special leave?

(3) Have any government employees been refused special leave during the present calendar year?

(4) If so, how many?

(5) Are any employees being refused special leave at the present time?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) Yes, but subject to departmental convenience.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Yes.

(4) Twelve officers—three in the Public Service, and nine in other government employment.

(5) Not that I am aware of, but if a specific case can be quoted, I will have an investigation made.

I have a note here that the 12 officers in question are made up as follows:—A railway employee who is a traffic officer desired to attend a course in Sydney lasting three weeks; the difficulty was to replace him. Three employees of the Government Printing Office; it is a rule to allow no leave whatever during the parliamentary session; employees can attend during any other period. Two employees of the State Electricity Commission. Two teachers in the Education Department. One prison warden. Two officers of the State Government Insurance Office. One officer of the Local Government Department. In the Police Force, military leave is not approved. Camps must be attended during an officer's annual leave.

WATER SKIING

Banning on Swan River

2. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Works:

Was he correctly reported in the *Weekend News* to the effect that water skiing may be banned on the Swan River? If so, will he inform the House—

(1) Whether he was expressing the opinion of the Government or his own personal view?

(2) When it is anticipated that a total ban on water skiing on the Swan River will be put into effect?

Mr. WILD replied:

I was speaking to a deputation that waited on me from the Local Government Association relating to toilets at the 12 ski sites now allocated around the river and expressed my view that, looking into the future in that regard the day would come, as it did with Sydney harbour, when water skiers would be banned from the river. However, at this point of time, there is no such suggestion; and, as I said, I was looking into the future.

IRON ORE (MOUNT NEWMAN) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Today I will be introducing two important agreements relating to the mining, transport, shipment, and processing of Pilbara iron ore. The first relates to the Bill directly under consideration to ratify what we know as the Mount Newman agreement. The other will be the subject of a separate Bill to ratify a revised Mount Goldsworthy agreement. The general background of the exploration and proving of huge tonnages of iron ore in the Pilbara district is fairly well known to honourable members.

Over a period of about four years we have moved from a situation where we had a comparatively small known tonnage of high-grade iron ore to a position where we can confidently say that Australia no longer has any problems of iron ore security in view of the tonnages that have been discovered and proved.

This proving has been done in a very expert and expeditious way because a number of companies of Australian and international repute have been engaged on this work and have been given the rights to explore with the prospect of the right to develop and establish major long-term operations.

The whole background of iron ore sales is very much interwoven with the plans of the Japanese steel industry, although it should be made clear that as a result of interest generated in other countries it is confidently expected that when the industry is established in the Pilbara on a major basis, exports to other countries, particularly to Europe, will become economically feasible.

In negotiating these agreements the Government has endeavoured to adopt a realistic attitude and acknowledge that if we want major companies of repute to invest very large capital sums in the area, to develop mines, towns, railways, and ports, there has to be long-term security on fair and reasonable terms.

The important thing is to get the areas opened up quickly and on a big enough scale. The main avenue through which this can be done is the export of what

is known as "direct shipping ore." However, the agreements provide for processing in varying degrees on a logical programme, the phases of which I will endeavour to summarise.

It is difficult to forecast the long-term technological changes that will occur in the steel industry. There is a lot of very costly research being undertaken throughout the world in the search for cheaper methods of processing ore closer to the actual mining operation so as to produce a semi-reduced product or an even more advanced process which will amount to direct reduction and the bypassing of the blast furnace.

The Government is keeping in close touch with this research. The main spearhead appears to be West Germany and the United States of America. One of the important features of a lot of this research is that it is based on oil fuel, which has special significance in our State.

Whether or not we find commercial oil fields in Western Australia, the simple fact is that the ports that will be developed to allow 60,000-ton and later 100,000-ton bulk ore carriers to operate on our Pilbara coast will permit the ready access of large-scale oil tankers, thus reducing the transport costs of fuel to the minimum level.

If, of course, we find oil or natural gas in our own State on a commercial basis and preferably close to the iron ore deposits at a location such as Barrow Island, the economics of production will be even further improved. It is a product such as high-grade pellets, or a semi-reduced or direct reduction product which will have the greatest attraction to additional markets, such as Europe.

The combination of such high-grade products and large ships will make us competitive with some of the other suppliers and potential suppliers of raw material for the European steel industry. I should add that the interest in these markets amongst the steel industries of Europe is very real, because they are always looking for alternative sources of supply, particularly from a country which is stable both economically and politically.

Honourable members are well aware of the activities of the Japanese steel industry in Australia, particularly in Western Australia, in examining our deposits and including all phases such as geology, metallurgy, and civil engineering. The negotiations are at an advanced stage, and all the companies concerned have supplied and are still supplying their required technical, financial, and economic data.

To deal more specifically with the Mount Newman agreement, I should explain that the agreement is with a company known as the Mount Newman Iron Ore Company Limited. This company is a subsidiary of American Metal Climax Incorporated and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited. The first is a large American company which has a 55 per cent. interest. The second-named company is one of the largest Australian companies and has a 45 per cent. interest.

Mr. Tonkin: Where do the Japanese come in?

Mr. COURT: I anticipated that question from the honourable member; and I am telling him that 55 per cent. is owned by Amax and 45 per cent. by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited. They are the official owners of this particular company. This is the type of Australian participation we like to see.

Mr. Tonkin: Are not the Japanese in this in a big way somewhere?

Mr. COURT: The people we are working with are American Metal Climax and the Colonial Sugar Refinery; and the Japanese, of course, will be interested in a big way because they are expected to be the big buyers.

Mr. Tonkin: As the producers, I mean.

Mr. COURT: I can only tell the honourable member this is the official information about the proprietors.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you telling all you know?

Mr. COURT: All I know, despite the fact that no matter what I say, the honourable member will not believe it anyhow.

Mr. Tonkin: I might tell you something I know.

Mr. Brand: Tell us what you know.

The SPEAKER: (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. Tonkin: The Speaker will not let me at the moment.

Mr. COURT: We are anxious to hear of this mystery. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition always tries to bend these things and give a sinister air to them.

Mr. Tonkin: It is no mystery. An amount of £9,000 does not come out of the air.

Mr. Brand: That would go a long way in this case!

Mr. Tonkin: It goes a long way to paying rents on the leases.

Mr. COURT: It would not go far when it is going to take £30,000,000 to get the first ton of ore into the ship.

Mr. Tonkin: The Premier knows it, too.

Mr. COURT: It is unfortunate that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to introduce contention into everything, even when it is good for the State.

Honourable members on a study of the agreement will appreciate that it is very much along the lines of the agreement negotiated with Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. and which was ratified by Parliament last session. The main variation is to provide reasonable protection for the company if

it is not successful in negotiating a major iron ore contract during the current negotiations taking place between a number of Pilbara-based companies and the Japanese.

It was always intended that companies which had continuously, efficiently, and conscientiously explored their deposits, and in a competitive and active way had negotiated for contracts, would be given reasonable protection; and I think that would apply regardless of the Government they were dealing with.

However, the companies felt this should be more clearly expressed—expressed in very clear terms—in the actual agreement, and this has been done. I suggest to honourable members that they study clause 5 subclause (4) of the agreement for the exact terms. I think they appear on pages 12 and 13 of the agreement. This is one of the material points on which this agreement might differ from the Hamersley iron ore agreement.

The significance is that the company can request an extension of time beyond the 31st December, 1964, within which to make iron ore contracts; and provided it demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Minister that the company has complied with its obligations, has genuinely and actively but unsuccessfully endeavoured to make the iron ore contracts on a competitive basis, and reasonably requires an additional period for the purpose of making iron ore contracts, then the Minister will grant such extension.

In the first instance this will be for six months. In the second instance it will be up to three years. Beyond that it could be for a period of up to a further two years unless the Minister shows to the company satisfactory evidence that some third party is able and willing if made the lessee of the mineral lease to obtain and fully fulfil the company's obligations under contracts for the sale of iron ore or processed iron ore from the leased areas on terms from the State not more favourable on the whole to the new party than those applicable to the original company.

I think the significance of that will be appreciated by honourable members, because it would be grossly improper of any Government to endeavour to obtain a substitute party on terms more favourable than those available to the party which has done all the work and which is not prepared or able to undertake the project.

Beyond this type of extension, the Government can terminate the agreement on giving 12 months' notice if the company has not complied with the conditions of the lease. This, of course, is independent of any extension which the company might have been entitled to through the delays clause or any other special provisions of the agreement. This agreement contains the normal *force majeure* provisions.

In view of the fact that this provision was not incorporated into the Hamersley Iron agreement—I refer to the extension provisions to which I made reference a moments ago; and in view of the fact that the agreements are in most other respects practically identical, it was felt necessary to offer these amendments to Hamersley Iron, and a Bill will be introduced to give effect to these minor amendments with a view to keeping the two agreements as comparable as is reasonably practicable.

These agreements provide a secure basis on which the companies can negotiate abroad with confidence, accurately assessing their commitments, their costs, and their prices in a highly competitive market. The interests of both the State and the company are protected in the short and long term.

This agreement is based on the Mt. Newman deposits 225 miles south of Port Hedland. As was the case with the Hamersley Iron agreement, there is provision for phases which could be described as investigation, export, secondary processing, and iron and steel. The company's commitments under these respective headings may be briefly summarised as follows:—

Investigation: Expenditure of not less than £650,000 on geological, geophysical, engineering, and other investigations to prove markets and produce plans, by the end of this year, for overseas export of iron ore at the initial rate of at least 1,000,000 tons a year. It was anticipated that actual expenditure would be considerably in excess of the commitment; and, in fact, from the information which is already available, and because of our knowledge of the work of the company, this figure will be greatly exceeded.

Export: Investment of not less than £30,000,000 on all the facilities for iron ore export. These include a port ultimately capable of handling 60,000-ton ore carriers, a 260-mile standard gauge railway to deliver the ore, towns complete with power and water at the mining and port sites, ore extraction and handling facilities, and roads. Because of the big capital outlay and the size of the deposits available, there is no limit on the annual rate of export. If the company wins contracts, exports could be on a large scale —possibly 5,000,000 tons a year—subject to Commonwealth approval. The company should be ready to begin exports three years after its proposals have been approved by the Government, but there are provisions for reasonable extensions of time.

My own personal view is that the magnitude of the civil engineering works would involve a longer building period than three years from the time they started because of the major port and rail development involved, including a very considerable

dredging programme. But the agreement provides for a three-year period with reasonable rights of extension in *bona fide* cases.

Processing: Investment of not less than £8,000,000 on secondary processing plant with a capacity to treat 2,000,000 tons of ore a year before export. Complete plans of this plant must be submitted for government approval within 10 years of the beginning of exports, and it must be ready to start production two years after that. If the State can be shown that the full 2,000,000 tons cannot be treated on an economic basis at any particular time, it may temporarily reduce this figure, but not below 1,000,000 tons per year.

The reason for that qualification is related to the fact that some of the ore in certain of these fields might not produce the required percentage of fine ore to make it economically possible to produce pellets or similar material without uneconomically processing ore which could normally be exported as direct shipping ore or lumpy ore.

Royalties are the same as in the Hamersley iron agreement and cover a wide field; namely, direct shipping ore, fine ore, and fines. There is also provision in the agreement for ore which does not fall strictly within any one of these definitions. The direct shipping ore is based on 7½ per cent. of the f.o.b. price with a minimum of 6s. a ton. Fine ore is half this rate. On lower value ores varying royalties would be charged, and on ore processed within the State the royalty would be at the standard processing rate of 1s. 6d. per ton. The company would also be charged a rental when it chose mineral leases up to a maximum total area of 300 square miles from its 758 square miles of temporary prospecting reserves. Rents would range from 3s. 6d. an acre for the maximum area down to 2s. an acre for less than 100 square miles.

The project is essentially a large-scale one. Without substantial contracts the heavy capital expenditure could not be justified. The company has requested a port site at Port Hedland. This has raised complications because the Mount Goldsworthy people also wanted to go to Port Hedland, but in a different location. The Mount Goldsworthy company wanted its development to take place on Finucane Island, whereas the Mount Newman company wanted its project to be based on Cooke Point.

There was another essential difference in the requests, because the Mount Goldsworthy engineering proposals were based on having a bulk ore port in the inner harbour of Port Hedland, whereas the Mount Newman consultants preferred a bulk loading port to seaward and well outside the inner harbour of Port Hedland.

In accordance with the terms of the agreement, our engineering advisers conferred with both companies in an effort to try to arrive at a common location so as to achieve the maximum rationalisation of port development. It must be appreciated that projects of this kind involve much more than the actual loading berth and loading facilities, as provision has to be made for a large-scale rail terminal, stockpile areas, and eventually for processing plants.

All of these have to be logically located to give the maximum economic result and, in particular, to allow the ship and other loading facilities to be used to the maximum extent. Large-scale dredging operations are involved with both projects, and this made it desirable to try to arrive at a solution which would enable a joint construction or at least joint use. The dredging required to obtain the right depth of water for access to the harbour would involve three miles of dredging in one case and five miles or more in another.

The Public Works Department engaged the services of Sir Alexander Gibb & Partners to act as consultants during these discussions. After many days of consultations between the Public Works engineers, their consultants, and the consultants and representatives of the two companies, it was found impracticable to work out a joint operation. It was eventually decided to approve of Mount Goldsworthy location at Finucane Island and Mount Newman at Cooke Point.

Under the conditions approving the Mount Goldsworthy location it has been specified by the Government that its berth —that is, its bulk loading berth—will have to be relocated from the original position so as to be closer to Hunt Point and not impair the maximum ultimate development of the existing Port Hedland harbour area. Also, it will have to dredge a channel capable of use by ships with a loading draft of 30 feet down to as far as the existing Port Hedland wharf facilities. I emphasise that the channel has to go down to those facilities, but this particular company does not undertake to do anything about the upgrading of those facilities.

The Mount Goldsworthy project did not provide for a commercial port, but the provision of the channel will ensure that there is access to the existing berth area for commercial ships—as distinct from bigger bulk ore carriers to use the bulk loading berths at Finucane Island—of a capacity of 10,000 to 15,000 tons.

The Mount Newman project provides for the bulk loading berths to be in the outer area as distinct from the Mount Goldsworthy bulk ore berths which are to be located in the inner harbour. However, the Mount Newman company has undertaken as part of its project to develop a

commercial port in the inner harbour capable of handling ordinary commercial ships of 10,000 to 15,000 tons. The capacity of the present port is governed both by the size of the ships' carrying capacity and by their length. For that reason the biggest ships coming in there approximate 3,500 to 4,000 tons. The advantages of the commercial port will be of great benefit, and it is rendered necessary under the Mount Newman agreement because the company has very heavy tonnages of materials to bring in for its construction programme. Something like 600,000 tons of material have to be brought in for construction work alone. The net effect is this—

> If both companies establish at Port Hedland there will be a very good channel and commercial port additional to bulk loading facilities for ships varying from 40,000 to 60,000 tons and ultimately 100,000 tons bulk ore carriers.
>
> If Mount Goldsworthy only establishes at Port Hedland there will be a channel dredged down to the existing wharf facilities capable of taking commercial ships of 10,000 to 15,000 tons in addition to the bulk carriers which will use the company's berth at Finucane Island.
>
> If only Mount Newman establishes there will be bulk ore loading facilities to seaward of Cooke Point with a commercial port development within the inner harbour to take commercial ships of 10,000 to 15,000 tons capacity.

There are some problems in arranging the necessary areas of high land immediately behind the wharf facilities to provide for stockpiling, rail terminal, processing, and other requirements. This was one of the factors which influenced the decision to approve both locations and thus avoid any suggestion at a later date that the growth of either company was inhibited through lack of land.

It might appear rather strange that in a State such as this we run up against land problems; but it was found that in the case of both Finucane Island and Cooke Point there was limited high land that would be safe at all tides and in times of extreme seas. With plants of this magnitude we cannot afford to run any risk.

Yet another land problem is housing, as it should be borne in mind that if both companies establish at Port Hedland and develop as is expected, the population of Port Hedland will be at least 5,000 people compared with the present population of 1,400. Mt. Goldsworthy plans to establish its housing on Finucane Island.

To allow for the normal growth of Port Hedland occasioned by the iron ore development, but additional to the specific housing development related to the Mt. Newman agreement, it appears necessary to arrange for the Mt. Newman housing area to be established east of the Pretty Pool area.

If honourable members know the Port Hedland area immediately east of the present housing and other development, they will appreciate that the amount of land on high ground between the existing development and where the P.M.G. area exists will only permit housing development related to the normal growth of Port Hedland as distinct from other housing requirements. For that reason the present thinking is to encourage the Mt. Newman housing development to take place east of Pretty Pool. It will not be very far from the project itself, although it will of course be removed by up to three or four miles from the present Port Hedland development. The only thing that will overcome this problem will be the use of any land that may be reclaimed because of the major dredging programme. These are details that are yet to be worked out and have yet to be made the subject of firm submissions by the respective companies.

It might be asked why the two agreements of Mount Newman and Hamersley Iron provide for iron and steel. In view of the size of the deposits involved and the long-term nature of the projects it was felt that both agreements should contain this identical provision. However, a study of this agreement will demonstrate that sufficient flexibility has been written into the agreement to enable the government of the day to interpret the situation with common sense and in a realistic and practical manner when the time arrives. No government would expect uneconomic or unrealistic operations to be undertaken, and the provision for periodical review of operations and the power to substitute alternative operators where the company does not meet its commitments gives ample protection to the State on a recurring basis.

In practical effect this means that when the more advanced stages of the agreement are reached the government periodically has a three-year period in which to install a substitute operator on conditions not more favourable on the whole than those available to the original company if it fails to meet its processing commitments.

At the end of this period there is a period of 10 years during which the normal operations can continue if the government has not been able to find a substitute operator. At the end of this ten-year period the three-year substitute period is revived, and this timetable continues throughout the life of the agreement until such time as the company has met its full processing commitment. It appeals to the Government as a practical way of handling the situation which cannot be clearly foreshadowed at such long range.

There is some comment regarding the number of agreements that exist in respect of the Pilbara field. These agreements were inevitable as no government could expect companies to spend large sums of money and undertake highly-skilled work without clarification of their rights as a basis for negotiation. It would have been a brave government that set itself up as an arbiter as to which was the best deposit and which was the best company to work it.

With the introduction of the Mount Newman agreement, and later in the day the revised Mount Goldsworthy agreement, there will still be two major deposits on which a lot of work has been done still awaiting agreements. These are the deposits being studied by Cleveland Cliffs and by B.H.P. in the Robe River-Deepdale area. These deposits are of an entirely different nature from those covered by the Hamersley Iron, Mount Newman, and Mount Goldsworthy agreements, as they are limonitic and therefore essentially a processing rather than a direct shipping proposition.

Mr. Bickerton: Have you any idea what iron ore deposits are not tied up with some company agreement—what is left, in other words?

Mr. COURT: I could not hazard a guess as to what is outside of these areas.

Mr. Bickerton: Most of the big deposits have gone.

Mr. COURT: I would say that as far as the Government knows, the major deposits are now either the subject of agreements that have been signed and ratified by Parliament or in the process of being ratified, or are the subject of negotiations for similar types of agreements.

There may be some other areas, but I would not like to hazard a guess as to their size or nature. But I think it would be fair to say, as the honourable member has implied by his interjection, that they would not be of great magnitude compared with those mentioned in these agreements.

Mr. Bickerton: How are we going with the sales?

Mr. COURT: Very well.

Mr. Bickerton: What is the latest on that one? I am also interested in the market.

Mr. Oldfield: How much has been exported so far? Can the Minister tell us that?

Mr. COURT: Just be patient.

Mr. Oldfield: Have 100 tons been exported?

Mr. COURT: The honourable member will be quite pleased when this thing works out in its logical sequence. Be patient. I know the honourable member would dearly like me to say there is none.

Mr. Bickerton: I am very much the opposite to that: I want to see it sold, and I want to know when.

Mr. Brand: When it is sold, you will know.

Mr. COURT: There is every prospect of these B.H.P. and Cleveland-Cliffs agreements being completed in time for presentation to the current session. This is desirable so as to clarify the total position within the Pilbara area so far as is practicable at this stage. It will do much to assist in reaching finality in respect of iron ore contracts.

In each of the agreements the companies involved are experienced, reputable companies highly regarded in Australia and abroad. We feel they are companies which will not only actively open up areas for export if given reasonable contracts by the Japanese, but will also progressively develop their enterprise to provide a reasonable degree of processing within our State.

This last factor is our long-term of objective; and if honourable members study this agreement and the next one they will appreciate that everything practicable has been done to try to bring about this state of affairs. After all, it is the processing that provides employment and the big boost to the economy, but we have to be realistic about the matter. Without the direct shipping ore exports there would be no chance of getting these areas opened up.

If honourable members, in studying these very complex agreements, find any problems, or matters of query, on which they want legal interpretation, if they will let me know before the debate is resumed, I will be only too pleased to explain the position as it is understood by the Government and, where necessary, have it explained to them through the Crown Law Department.

Mr. Tonkin: Why is it necessary to exempt the company from the labour conditions which normally apply?

Mr. COURT: There is a very good reason in the case of large-scale mining such as we have with iron ore as compared with goldmining. It would be completely impracticable to enforce the labour conditions that prevail in the goldmining industry and which are written into our mining Act in the case of an industry, such as this iron ore industry, where huge tonnages are to be exported.

If the honourable member makes an analysis of the capital investment that will be involved in these projects, including the whole of the capital required for the working operations involved in such items as the mines, the towns, the railway, and the ports, he will appreciate that it

would be completely unrealistic to suggest that the existing mining Act manning provisions should prevail in these circumstances. We have to move with the times; and, when having an agreement like this ratified by Parliament, we have to provide for the special circumstances that exist in respect of iron ore.

I think it is fair to say that the undertaking of a big iron ore development is more a question of logistics than it is of actual mining. I would say the mining itself is probably the easiest of the problems to be dealt with, particularly as most of it will be open cut, or that type of mining.

When it comes to the problem of shifting huge tonnages from point A to point B and then getting those tonnages into ships, or processing them, we find that the proposition becomes entirely different from what transpires in goldmining, where the industry is concentrated in the mining area. Also, the problems of transport are different from those in the goldmining industry. The end product of a goldmine can virtually be put into the guard's van with an armed escort, and that is the transport problem. But with the iron ore industry, transport is a huge problem: it is more a problem of movement than of mining.

Mr. Moir: The goldmining law does not lay down that a great many men must be employed.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member should try to relate his remarks to the exercise with which we are dealing where the industry is spread over a huge area. It would not work out. Look at the total investment and employment involved over the whole area; and it is a very satisfactory ratio.

I understand that the honourable member who will be taking the adjournment of the debate for the Opposition, desires an adjournment for one week. The Premier has readily agreed to that because this is a complex agreement, and we would like to think ample opportunity is given for it to be studied and for questions to be raised.

Debate adjourned for one week, on motion by Mr. Bickerton.

BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Youth Service Bill.
2. Long Service Leave Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
3. Wheat Marketing Act (Revival and Continuance) Bill.
4. Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

IRON ORE (MOUNT GOLDSWORTHY) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.27 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is to ratify the agreement made with Mt. Goldsworthy Mining Associates. There have been two previous Bills before Parliament in respect of this group. The first was in 1962 and the second in 1963. The former resulted in Act No. 9/62 and the latter in Act No. 50/63. The companies involved in this group are Consolidated Goldfields (Australia) Pty. Ltd., Cyprus Mines Corporation, Utah Construction and Mining Company.

The original agreement was based on the direct exporting of ore and was not related to processing. Honourable members will recall that it was the result of public tenders. The company has very expertly and conscientiously undertaken the necessary geological, engineering, and other types of research necessary to prove the original Mt. Goldsworthy deposit and has spent a sum in excess of £1.3 million on this work.

Originally the agreement dealt with what was known as the Mt. Goldsworthy deposits, which were approximately 60 miles east of Port Hedland. The total investment foreshadowed at that time was approximately £12 million and was originally based on a deep-water port at Depuch Island with connecting standard gauge railway and all associated handling and other facilities.

The new agreement introduces a change of approach and gives rights to an increased area in return for greatly increased commitments. Depuch has been abandoned and Port Hedland substituted. The company still retains its rights over the Mt. Goldsworthy area for the purpose of the agreement which is to be ratified. This is referred to as "Mining area 'A'." The two additional areas are referred to as "Mining area 'B'" and "Mining area 'C'."

The original Mt. Goldsworthy reserve covers approximately 16 square miles, whilst the other two areas represent 252.6 sq. miles and 650 sq. miles respectively. The firstmentioned of these additional two areas covers 19 reserves located east. west, and south of Mt. Goldsworthy. These have been held by the company as temporary reserves for a considerable time and are now incorporated in the agreement. The new reserve area of 650 sq. miles is 180 miles south of Mt. Goldsworthy.

It is important I point out that if further investigation did not justify development of the additional areas the

company had a right to surrender them and revert to early arrangements for Mt. Goldsworthy area alone and would have a direct export commitment only in respect of the Mt. Goldsworthy area under the circumstances. In other words it would, for all practical purposes, be along the lines of the original agreement except that the company has agreed to some amendments which are considered to be in favour of the State.

For example, the minimum royalty previously stated was 7½ per cent. of the f.o.b. price for direct shipping ore with a minimum of 4s. 6d. per ton. The minimum under the new agrement is 6s. per ton and there are corresponding adjustments in respect of ore known as "fine ore" and "fines." There is no need for me to go into a lot of detail about the provisions of the agreement. Much of what has been said during the introduction of the Mount Newman agreement will be relevant to the introduction of this particular ratifying Bill.

It is perhaps most important that I give some information to the House about the additional commitments the company has accepted in consideration of being given additional reserve areas to prospect and prove. The size and nature of the deposits are different from those covered by the Hamersley Iron and Mount Newman agreements. It was felt they did not warrant the inclusion of specific provisions in respect of steel. This difference is reflected in the fact that the ulitmate stages of processing under this agreement involve a very advanced form of processing but not the complete stage of iron and steel.

The company's commitments for iron ore export requirements are set at a minimum of £20,000 and are subject to the winning of a contract for export of at least 10,000,000 tons over a 10-year period.

The next phase of the operations is a secondary processing phase for the production of pellets or similar blast furnace material. This is to cost not less than £8,000,000 and provide for 2,000,000 tons per year of secondary processing plant capacity. Construction of this phase may be staged so that the capacity for 500,000 tons is ready by year 11; 1,000,000 tons by year 13; and 2,000,000 tons by year 17. I would point out that this reference to years 11, 13, and 17 are the years after the commencement of exports.

There is then provision for a sum of not less than £20,000,000 to be spent on an advanced form of processing capable of producing 1,000,000 tons of this product per year. I referred to this advanced form of processed ore material when introducing the previous agreement, and it can be semi-reduced to make a high quality blast furnace feed, or it can be material which bypasses the blast furnace. Plans for this stage must be submitted not later than year 17; that is, year 17 after the beginning of exports.

Construction may be staged so that the capacity for 250,000 tons is ready by year 19, for 500,000 tons by year 21, and 1,000,000 tons by year 26. I have dealt at some length in introducing the Mount Newman agreement on the port location and I do not think I need to add anything further at this stage.

In the drafting of this agreement, efforts have been made to relate it as closely as practicable to the Mount Newman and Hamersley iron agreements, although honourable members will realise that it was impossible to make this apply to all provisions, due to the background of the Mount Goldsworthy original agreement and the different size of the total deposits to which Mount Goldsworthy now has access compared with those covered by the other two agreements.

I commend to the House the Bill, and the agreement which forms the schedule, as being a very desirable and necessary step in making it possible for the maximum development of the Pilbara iron ore field to be achieved.

Like the companies involved in some of the other agreements, the three companies which comprise Mount Goldsworthy mining associates and which are joining together as Joint Venturers in this agreement are very strong and highly-regarded companies of international repute which have a lot of experience in this particular field. They have been very active in the exploration phase and they are equally active in their negotiations to achieve iron ore contracts. It is in this field that their wide experience in other parts of the world will stand them in good stead and should react to the benefit of this State.

It is impossible to predict at this stage which of the major companies will receive contracts for the mining and export of iron ore from the Pilbara. It is not likely that they will all be able to obtain contracts at this juncture of sufficient size to warrant the heavy capital expenditure that is involved, but we are hopeful that at least one or more will receive contracts in the reasonably near future.

The terms of the agreements are such that those who have conscientiously explored and proved their areas and have conscientiously and competitively negotiated for contracts will be protected for a reasonable period so that they can participate in what would appear to be an inevitable second wave of contracts if the Pilbara region of this State is to supply the proportion of the Japanese and other overseas markets that we feel it reasonable to expect. These things cannot all be achieved in a year or two, but with the proved reserves and the calibre of the

companies involved we should see an ever-expanding volume of iron ore in raw, and later in processed form, going to the steel industries of the world from the Pilbara.

The development that will be necessary will have a much more far-reaching effect than the iron ore itself because the establishment of towns, railways, roads, and ports of great capacity will make many other operations which might currently be "marginal" highly economic with consequential development of these additional resources. I commend the Bill and the agreement to the House.

Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 3rd November, on motion by Mr. Bickerton.

BILLS (2): MESSAGES

Appropriation

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the following Bills:—

1. Iron Ore (Mount Newman) Agreement Bill.
2. Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Bill.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [5.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In doing so, I point out that the Bill contains three categories of amendments to the Licensing Act.

Point of Order

Mr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the Premier, but I understood that before the House dealt with Order of the Day No. 2, the motion moved by the Premier was that Order of the Day No. 2 be taken before Order of the Day No. 1. Would not that leave Order of the Day No. 1 to be taken now?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): We have just dealt with Order of the Day No. 1.

Mr. TONKIN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. BRAND: Before the untimely interruption—

Mr. Tonkin: It is just as well to ensure that we proceed in accordance with the rules.

Mr. BRAND: Yes; I agree. I appreciate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition keeping an eye on us in this regard. As I was saying, this Bill contains three categories of amendments to the Licensing Act, and the measure is quite a small one. Firstly, minor amendments are being made to include the word "spirits" in references which are made in the Act to Australian wine and beer licenses, as these licenses are Australian wine, beer, and spirits licenses; and also to substitute the term "limited hotel license" where reference is made to "hotel license." These are to correct omissions in the amending legislation that was introduced last year.

Secondly, the Bill seeks to amend the method of payment of licensing fees payable for various classes of licenses authorising the sale of liquor referred to in the Act. One of the effects of the amending Act of 1962 was to make licenses payable in advance instead of in arrear. As a result, members of the Australian Hotels Association have been experiencing difficulties in financing their commitments. An approach has been made to the Government for the privilege of payment of annual licensing fees in four instalments instead of the present provision of payment in two moieties, and it is considered that this is a reasonable request. The amending Bill makes provision for this method of payment for the licenses to which I have already referred.

The third group of amendments seeks to impose a penalty of 10 per cent. of the amount payable in the event of late payment of fees, and for the cancellation of a license in the event of non-payment. Under the existing provision in the Licensing Act fees in respect of those licenses which are now being considered are payable in two moieties, and the business of the Licensing Court is frequently impeded because fees have not been paid by the due dates. This occurs at present when the second moiety, which is due four or five months before the annual sitting of the court, is not paid and the position is likely to be aggravated by the proposed amendments whereby the final instalment will, in some instances, become payable within one month only of the commencement of the annual sittings.

In view of the granting of the privilege to pay the license fee in four instalments it is considered that the imposition of a penalty is not unreasonable and will to some extent ensure that licensees comply with their obligations by the due date. It will be noted that the amendment includes provision for the Receiver of Licensing Revenue to defer the payment of an instalment where circumstances justify such an application, and the interests of owners of licensed premises are protected by a provision which permits them to pay the amount due and be issued with a license either in their own names or in the names of their nominees in the event of non-payment by a licensee who is other than the owner of the premises. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hawke (Leader of the Opposition).

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 20th October. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Wild (Minister for Labour) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 1 had been agreed to.

Clause 2: Section 7 amended—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I have an amendment on the notice paper to delete paragraph (1b). I have no quarrel with the first paragraph dealing with insurance cover for workers travelling to and from work, but paragraph (1b) contains a very restrictive proviso and I see no reason for its inclusion. The qualifying terms used in this paragraph are very closely related. "Aggravation" means increasing the gravity or burden; "acceleration" means making quicker; "exacerbation" means aggravating or irritating a pain; "recurrence" means to occur again; and "recrudescence" means the breaking out of a disease again.

The restriction in paragraph (1b) hamstrings, to a certain extent, the provision contained in paragraph (1a). A worker while travelling to work might be suffering from a cold or influenza, and he might trip over and sustain an injury. These complaints or diseases might be regarded as contributing factors. We consider there is no place for such a provision. In at least two Acts in Australia—in New South Wales and Victoria—the term "injury" covers diseases, whether they be of sudden onslaught or of gradual progress.

I would like to hear from the Minister whether waterside workers who are normally engaged at a prearranged place, known as the pickup, are entitled to compensation if they sustain an injury while travelling from the place of residence to the pickup, which might be a few hundred yards from the place of employment. Should such workers not be engaged when they attend at a pickup centre, where they stand by ready for engagement but are not actually engaged, and should they sustain an injury when travelling home from the pickup, would they be entitled to workers' compensation? In other States, such as New South Wales, these workers are covered. Furthermore, in that State a worker who is on workers' compensation, and who is injured while travelling from his place of residence to the hospital or surgery, is covered.

Although the provisions in clause 2 will establish the principle of insurance coverage for workers while travelling to and from work, nevertheless I consider paragraph (1b) should be deleted. The first occasion when a similar principle was introduced in a Bill in this Parliament took place in 1924, when the late Mr. McCallum, the Minister for Labour in the then Labor Government, introduced a measure to amend this legislation; but it was defeated in another place. The same result has occurred to every Bill introduced by Labor Governments since that time.

I do not propose to read some of the statements, which have been recorded in *Hansard*, made by some members of the present Government; but suffice to say they could find no words strong enough to reject the journeying-to-and-from provision. In this Bill such a provision is being inserted, and I hope it will remain for a long time. As time goes on we hope to improve its scope. For the reasons I have given, I move an amendment—

> Delete paragraph (1b) beginning in line 38, page 2.

Mr. WILD: The provision in paragraph (1b) was inserted in the Bill because in New South Wales a number of cases have arisen in which injuries were sustained by workers, but they were of the non-accident type and were not applicable to the employment of the workers when travelling from their places of residence to their places of employment. The injuries or deaths could be caused by heart failure or epilepsy. As a result, a number of cases have arisen on which opinion has been very divided.

It is intended by this Bill to give the journeying provision a trial. If in due course we find the provision in paragraph (1b) to be wrong, there will be no reason to prevent its being deleted. As an opening gambit the Government is not prepared to delete paragraph (1b).

In regard to the point raised by the honourable member for Mt. Hawthorn of coverage between the place of residence and the place of pickup, I am prepared to agree to the insertion of an amendment to cover this, and I propose to move one accordingly.

Mr. FLETCHER: This is a very desirable amendment. I would like to bring forward the case of an employee who sustains an injury while he is travelling in a vehicle belonging to his employer, either to work or from work. In the event of the vehicle stalling at an intersection, and the employee being required to push it, would he be covered by the provisions in clause 2 if he sustained an injury whilst so doing? I would like the clause to be amended to cover such an eventuality.

Dr. HENN: In reply to the comments of the honourable member for Mt. Hawthorn one must agree that the terms he referred to mean, more or less, the same thing. The honourable member referred to the case of a worker, suffering from influenza and sustaining an injury while travelling to or from work. The disease would not be taken into account,

because the worker would not be going to, or returning from, work if the influenza were severe.

However, a worker might be suffering from incipient cancer of the leg, and slips or falls while travelling to work. The cause of such an injury might not be the slipping or falling, but might be the result of the cancer from which he is suffering. That is the reason for the inclusion of the provision in paragraph (1b).

Fletcher: Would the provision preclude a worker from coverage if he sustained a heart attack while travelling to work?

Dr. HENN: The question of a heart attack would be decided at the *post mortem* examination. I could not answer the point raised by the honourable member, but it would depend on the condition of the heart at the time of the accident. The reason for the inclusion of the provision in paragraph (1b) is to safeguard the Act in the case of certain underlying diseases which could cause accidents to be sustained by workers while travelling to or from work.

Mr. MOIR: The provisions in clause 2 are very desirable, but I must deplore their limited application. They are very restricted, compared with those applying in other States. The honourable member for Wembley evidently desires a principle to be applied to clause 2 which does not apply to the provisions in the other Acts, in that provision is made for injury, pre-accident, to be compensable. On the comments put forward by the honourable member it would appear the Government does not desire to apply such a principle to the provisions in clause 2.

I am very disappointed with the restrictive nature of the provisions. It has been mentioned that on 19 previous occasions when members sitting on this side of the Chamber attempted to insert the journeying provision in the Act, they were unsuccessful.

When one examines the legislation of the other States one finds their provisions to be ever so much wider than the one included in the Bill. The Minister made reference to the provision in New South Wales. I suppose his implication is that Labor governments have been in office in that State for many years. However, in Victoria the provision is very close to that of New South Wales, yet in Victoria the Government has been a different political complexion for many years past. Evidently the Government in Victoria saw the justification in making its provision much wider than the one now put forward in the Bill.

I am fully in accord with the amendment moved by the honourable member for Mt. Hawthorn. Workers who are unfortunate enough to be injured while travelling to and from work will be subject to the provision in paragraph (1b), which should be deleted.

Mr. WILD: The honourable member for Fremantle raised the point of a worker travelling in his employer's vehicle, and workers' compensation coverage in the event of his sustaining an accident. That depends on the conditions under which he uses the vehicle. If the worker is using the vehicle on the direction of his employer he will be covered; but if the employer permits the worker to use the vehicle to travel to and from work, then the worker will not be covered.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—21

Mr. Brand	Dr. Henn
Mr. Burt	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller.)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. WILD: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 19—Insert after the word "employment" the words "or place of pickup."

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Does the Minister understand what a place of pickup is?

Mr. Wild: Yes.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: If the Minister is satisfied that his amendment is sufficient not to cause any argument if a case is presented to the Workers' Compensation Board, that is quite all right. However, would "place of pickup" be sufficient explanation if there were a difference of opinion?

Mr. WILD: For the benefit of the honourable member, I further discussed this with the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman and the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board. The chairman fully understands what is meant. As the honourable member has said, workers—for instance, waterside workers and S.E.C. workers—do congregate at a pickup point before they go to their job.

Mr. FLETCHER: Waterside workers go to a place of pickup, but they do not necessarily work that day. They merely return home. Does the Minister envisage that such workers will be covered?

Mr. WILD: Such a worker would be covered from his residence to place of pickup and return. It is a recognised principle in the Waterside Workers' Federation that workers meet at a certain spot at a certain time every day.

Mr. Fletcher: That is so.

Mr. WILD: If a worker then returned home, his journey would obviously be from his home to the place of pickup and then from the place of pickup to his home.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 8 amended—

Mr. MOIR: I have placed on the notice paper a number of amendments to this clause because the clause contains several provisions about which I am concerned. For instance, I am concerned whether the amendments as proposed will cover a worker who dies as the result of chronic bronchitis. This clause provides retrospective application to those people who have unfortunately in the past been outside the Act and its amendments, but I am concerned about this point.

We know that this Bill incorporates several recommendations made by the pneumoconiosis committee which heard a lot of evidence last year. One of the recommendations of that committee was that chronic bronchitis should be recognised as one of the diseases from which miners suffer, and as such should be compensable. However, the clause as it stands is not very clear as to whether the dependants of a miner who dies from this disease will be covered. It is clear that a sufferer will be compensated up to the total amount; but will his dependants be covered if he dies as a result of the disease? I would like the Minister to clear up that point because a large number of miners are involved.

Another point in this clause which concerns me is the reference to the Mine Workers' Relief Act. We know that if a miner contracts T.B. as well as silicosis he is compensated under the Mine Workers' Relief Act and under the Workers' Compensation Act. However, the Minister stated that the Mine Workers' Relief Act is to be amended. The proposal may contain a certain amount of merit, but I want to know how far the Minister proposes to go.

I know reference was made in the report of the committee to the T.B. allowance paid by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth Social Services Act. However, I feel we should be very sure that we are not depriving the worker of something to which he has been entitled, so that in the event of the death of a worker from a combination of T.B. and silicosis, his dependants will not receive compensation. Previously if a worker was unfortunate enough to contract T.B. with silicosis he was regarded as a total liability and was entitled to the full amount of compensation. If he died from those complaints, his dependants were entitled to the full amount of compensation.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MOIR: Before the tea suspension I was referring to the first amendment I have on the notice paper, which is designed to put beyond doubt that proposed new subsection (1c) really provides that the dependants of a worker who contracts silicosis and chronic bronchitis, and dies as a result, shall receive compensation on his death. An amendment has previously been made in the Bill to change the designations of silicosis, pneumoconiosis, and miner's phthisis to plain pneumoconiosis.

My understanding of that word is that it covers diseases set up by dust and it would not embrace chronic bronchitis. So where death from pneumoconiosis is compensable, weekly payments apply; and where a worker contracts silicosis plus chronic bronchitis, he shall be compensated on a weekly basis, and so on.

I am moving my amendment to place the position beyond all doubt. If it is the Government's intention that the death of a worker shall be compensable when the death results from silicosis and bronchitis, then my amendment will place the matter beyond doubt and will make the position clear. I cannot see why the Government should have any objection to the amendment, which I now move—

> Page 4, line 29—Insert after the word "Act" the words "and in the case of the death of the worker his dependants shall receive compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

Mr. WILD: This question was discussed with the chairman of the board when the amendment was first put on the notice paper. I gather that in the schedule "pneumoconiosis" takes the place of all the diseases, and if a worker should die as a result of what we call bronchitis, the position would be covered. The amendment would mean the inclusion of superfluous words in the legislation.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MOIR: I accept the Minister's assurance on that point. Another part of the same clause provides—

> but a worker who, after receiving compensation pursuant to this subsection, is subsequently employed in the mining industry, whether by the same or any other employer, shall not be entitled to any further compensation or benefit, in respect of any

period of incapacity due to pneumoconiosis of any kind or to the aggravation or acceleration of any such disease, arising from his subsequent employment in that industry.

My interpretation of that provision is that we will be taking from the worker something that he at present enjoys; and it is contrary to the report of the Pneumoconiosis Committee which did a competent job, although I may differ from some of the recommendations it made. I feel this provision was not the intention of the committee.

I agree that a person who returns to the industry should not be compensated, and he is not at present compensated. A person can suffer, say, a 20 per cent. affliction, and through economic necessity be forced back into the industry. If he does that and leaves it again, and it is found that his condition has worsened beyond what it was when he returned to the industry, he is compensated for that further amount.

From this provision it appears that if he returns to the industry he not only will get no compensation while he is in the industry but will not receive any compensation for aggravation of his condition. He will receive no compensation at all. Had he remained out of the industry, and in several years' time it was found his condition had worsened, he would be compensated for the increased disability. Let me read the committee's recommendation in this regard at page 26 of the report—

> Where chronic bronchitis is found in a miner in association with diagnosable silicosis, as defined in this report, and where that miner on account of these diseases leaves the mining industry, the disabling effects of each disease shall be assumed jointly to be the effects of silicosis for the purpose of compensation; provided that:—
>
> (a) where a miner leaves the industry under such circumstances he shall not be permitted thereafter to return to the industry.

That is one recommendation which has not been adopted by the Government. The following is recommendation 9(e):—

> No payment should be made while the worker remains in the industry, or, if he shall after leaving the industry, return to it, for the duration of such return.

The committee is quite emphatic on that point, and I agree with it. It says, "for the duration of such return"; and my amendment embodies those words, and they should be included in the clause to put the matter beyond all doubt. I move an amendment—

> Page 4, lines 35 to 39—Delete all words after the word "benefit" down to and including the word "industry" with a view to substituting the words "while the worker remains in the industry, or, if he shall after leaving the industry, return to it, for the duration of such return."

If a worker returns to the industry and contracts further silicosis, or if his existing condition becomes aggravated, I fully believe he should be further compensated; because it must be remembered that even if he had not returned to the industry, his condition could have worsened and he could have become incapacitated to a greater extent than when he left the industry. My amendment will give the worker the entitlement which is his due.

Mr. WILD: Whilst I know this provision is against the recommendation of the committee, it was included because—and no-one knows this better than the honourable member—there is some shortage of skilled men; and if they want to go back in to the industry, it would be next-door to impossible, so I am told, to define the difference in the exacerbation after they return. Therefore, if a man wants to go back, he may return; but he is not entitled to get compensation beyond what he was getting before he went back.

The Bill refers to "the aggravation or acceleration of any such disease arising from his subsequent employment in that industry." Those words are included to permit these fellows to return to the industry if they so wish, but in the intervening period they are not entitled to compensation.

Mr. MOIR: I cannot accept that one at all. Is the Minister going to treat the mineworker with an industrial disease on an entirely different plane from other injured workers?

Mr. Wild: Do you think these fellows should be allowed to go back if they want to do so?

Mr. MOIR: Economic necessity may force them to go back. In my evidence before the committee I said that where a man contracts this disease he should be fully compensated for it and not allowed to return to the industry. If we follow the principle set out in the Bill, and a worker suffers from an injury to his arm or leg, is compensated for it, and returns to his employment and sustains a subsequent injury, he will not receive any compensation for it. That is too foolish for words. We know the Workers' Compensation Act has always made provision for that sort of thing. More often than not the man who gets silicosis is a skilled mineworker and as such he is of great value to the industry. The employer does not like to see him leave.

If such a worker who has contracted the disease leaves the industry and his health improves he could be talked into going back into the industry again. He still may feel 100 per cent. better than when he

originally left the industry, but he is being placed in the position where his condition could be worsened. He may work in the mines for some years and get no worse; this is a disease that does not run to any pattern. It changes with individuals.

Mr. Wild: Didn't you give evidence before the committee that you did not agree with their going back into the industry?

Mr. MOIR: Yes; I just said that. But I also said they should receive full compensation for it. For some time I have been of the opinion that when these workers contract this disease they should be fully compensated for it and then excluded from the industry. To allow a man to go back and then say, "If your condition worsens it is your own risk" is wrong. By doing that the Government is singling out these mineworkers and treating them in an entirely different manner from other workers who suffer injuries in the course of their employment. I ask the Minister, in all sincerity, to have a good look at this again. The Minister is getting away from the committee's recommendation, and I agree with that recommendation.

Mr. Wild: That he should not go back into the industry?

Mr. MOIR: If he is fully compensated. Give him the full amount of compensation and do not allow him to return to the industry.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—21

Mr. Brand	Dr. Henn
Mr. Burt	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MOIR: I move an amendment—

Page 5, lines 14 to 16—Delete all words after the word "nominated" down to and including the word "health" with a view to substituting the words "by the worker."

The proposal in new subsection (1d) for the establishment of a medical board is a new provision and it will mean a big improvement to the Act. It is something I have advocated in this Chamber on previous occasions. However, I think one important principle has been departed from in that one of the physicians should be nominated by the worker who is to appear before the board.

I agree that if a board is established and is not subject to change there is a degree of uniformity in its findings; but uniformity is not always desirable. Sometimes we want fresh ideas put forward, and from my observations of this question one of the most perplexing matters is the difference of opinion between medical men on how to assess the disability involved. There is a wide divergence of opinion in the assessment of disability as distinct from the extent of the disease itself.

There is nothing new about the proposal I am putting forward; because this Government, when it amended the Mine Workers' Relief Act in 1961, made provision for a medical board consisting of three persons and in that amendment it stated that the third medical officer shall be a qualified medical practitioner registered under the Act and nominated by the appellant. This was an appeal board set up under the Mine Workers' Relief Act and the appeal board has the final say. However, there is no appeal from the board which is proposed under this amendment; its decision is final so far as the injured worker is concerned.

The amendment would enable the worker to select a physician who was skilled in diseases of the chest to represent him on the board; and I think it would be a help to the board because it would enable the two permanent physicians to get the benefit of any fresh ideas that might be put forward by the third physician.

I would suggest to the Government that it is high time we started sending some of our physicians overseas to countries which make a greater study of this complaint, and where a great deal of research is done into the disease. I refer to America, and other countries. For instance, last year the McIntyre research organisation held a conference of all the leading authorities in the world and they discussed this disease. A great deal of benefit would flow from such meetings of experts and our Mines Medical Officer, who deals almost solely with this disease, and officers from the Health Department would gain a great deal from consultations with leading overseas authorities, who might be able to demonstrate to them matters of which they were not aware before. It would not only benefit those suffering from the disease, but it could benefit other people in the State who suffer from other diseases of the lungs.

Dr. HENN: The honourable member is quite happy with the two suggested appointments, one of whom shall be a mines medical officer and the second a physician of the Department of Public Health. He would like the third—the physician specialising in diseases of the chest to be nominated by the worker rather than by the Commissioner of Public Health.

As a general practitioner I know one of the duties of an ordinary doctor is to find out what is the matter with his patient and, if possible, to deal with it. If he cannot deal with it he passes it on to the correct specialist. I do not see who will be competent, if the Commissioner of Public Health is not competent, to decide the best physician specialising in diseases of the chest. I agree with the honourable member when he says there are few of them in this State; but that is because we are a small State. I do not disagree with his idea of sending medical officers abroad from time to time. It is a good suggestion.

Our population is small and we have not many chest specialists here. Chest specialists are a specialty within a specialty. As the honourable member said, there is no appeal from this board. Why not let us have the best board possible? I do not think any ordinary specialist physician in Perth would like to find himself asked to sit on this board. The Commissioner of Public Health would be the most competent person to know whom to nominate. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I agree with the honourable member for Wembley to some extent, particularly when he says the number of specialists in this class are few. But as the member for Boulder-Eyre pointed out, there will be no appeal from the authority it is proposed to set up. The sincerity of the Commissioner of Public Health is not in question; but a worker would be more satisfied and confident if he had a representative on the board, rather than if all three of its members were nominated by someone else.

In the case of medical boards a worker can nominate a medico to a particular board. The same applies in the case of the Workers' Compensation Board. There is a legal practitioner as chairman, a representative of the employers' organisation, and a representative of the workers. So the principle is the same as that suggested in the amendment. There are appeals to the High Court from the Workers' Compensation Board only on questions of law. Under the amendment the worker would at least feel he was being looked after, and I hope the Minister will accept the amendment.

Mr. WILD: I cannot accept the amendment. The honourable member for Wembley set the matter out clearly when he said that surely the person most competent to decide the best man to nominate is the Commissioner of Public Health. We do want the best brains we can get. If we allowed a worker to nominate a medico he might nominate somebody from Kalgoorlie; and, after all, this board will sit in Perth and it might be difficult to get people to come down from Kalgoorlie. We must rely on the Commissioner of Public Health to provide the best board possible.

Mr. MOIR: I am not concerned whether the doctors who sit on the board are the best brains about the place; but I am concerned that they should have the best knowledge of diseases of the chest to which the worker will be subject.

Mr. Wild: That is what I said: the best brains in this particular field.

Mr. MOIR: Does the honourable member for Wembley imply there are not chest specialists outside the Health Department competent to sit on this board?

Dr. Henn: I did not say that. I said there were a large number of physician-specialists but only a few of them would be what we might call chest specialists relative to mining diseases.

Mr. MOIR: Because a man works in a mine and contracts a disease it does not mean he is a fool. He may not want to select a local doctor, because he would know that the general practitioner in the country areas, while he may excel in certain fields, does have his limitations. For instance, unfortunately there are no eye specialists, or heart specialists, in the country. The argument put forward by the Minister is covered by the amendment and by the Bill. It refers to physician-specialists in diseases of the chest. There are no physicians in the country whom I know of who specialise in diseases of the chest.

I understand that before a man can specialise he must have the approval of the Australian Medical Association. This is covered by Act of Parliament. A physician-specialist in diseases of the chest has had to prove his qualifications and be given permission to describe himself as such. The injured worker would naturally want the best man to help him on the board. The worker should not be placed in the position where the Government authority that controls all insurance in respect of this disability has the right to select all the doctors.

I do not wish to cast any reflection on the people named in the Bill, because I have the greatest respect for them. I would not know the physician of the Department of Public Health who would be nominated by the commissioner, but I do know that the Mines Medical Officer does a sterling job. He is one who must have great knowledge of the conditions of the worker who comes before him to be examined. As I have already pointed out,

what is sought in the amendment now before the Committee is contained in the Mine Workers' Relief Act. This board will decide the same things as the board under the Mine Workers' Relief Act; and I refer to the worker injured with pneumoconiosis. Does the Minister suggest we have an incompetent board set up under the Mine Workers' Relief Act? Is that what the Minister was saying? It does not make sense to me. I consider the worker is being deprived of something which is his inherent right. He should be able to nominate the person he considers is a real expert on his complaint.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May

(Teller.)

Noes—20

Mr. Brand	Mr. Hart
Mr. Burt	Dr. Henn
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil

(Teller)

Pairs

Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. EVANS: I move an amendment—

> Page 5, line 16—Insert after the word "Health" the words "with the approval of the worker".

My purpose in moving this amendment is to cover the position that could arise in some cases. If experience indicated that a particular physician leaned unduly towards the insurance company, and this physician was repeatedly placed on the board, the worker could indicate his disapproval to the Commissioner of Public Health and the onus would be on the commissioner to nominate some other person. I cannot see any objection to this amendment as it preserves the principle sought by the Minister. The majority decision of the board would still be binding on the worker.

Mr. WILD: I cannot agree to this amendment. We would finish up in a position where at a board meeting there could be a separate nomination from each of the workers appearing before the board. I have no doubt that the Commissioner of Public Health would consider a request made by a worker through his representative or on his own behalf that a certain physician be on the board, provided he comes within this category.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MOIR: The Minister said that he would be amending the Mine Workers' Relief Act and that has made me wonder what is afoot. I do not know what the intention of the Minister is in this regard, and therefore I am not in a position to debate it. The amount of compensation proposed at the moment is £3,500; and I know a lot of people have been led to believe that the raising of the compensation to this amount is something very generous on the part of the Government. However, it is nothing of the sort. As I said the other night, the amount is already obsolete and is provided for in the Act although not in so many words. We have to remember that some years ago the Act was amended to provide for increases according to fluctuations in the basic wage. I think the amount of compensation payable now with the basic wage increases is £3,506, without making any amendment to the Act. So what is the Government doing? It is giving something which actually means nothing.

The amount of compensation will be going back to £3,500 when the amount is now £3,506. What a Gilbertian situation that is! Actually, £6 is being taken away from the worker who is totally incapacitated, or from the dependants of a worker who is unfortunate enough to lose his life. It smacks of the thimble and the pea trick.

In an amendment I will move I propose to increase the amount to £4,300. There is a perfectly logical argument for this. During the basic wage hearing the advocate for the Government argued that so far as wages are concerned there should be parity with the Commonwealth Government. We now have a basic wage in conformity with the Commonwealth basic wage, so let us have the total amount of compensation in conformity with the Commonwealth amount. While the Commonwealth amount is not law at the present time, I have here a copy of a letter in reply to one sent by the Trades and Labour Council of Western Australia, in which it is stated that legislation will be brought down to lift the Commonwealth amount of compensation to £4,300. This was also foreshadowed by Mr. Holt in his introduction of the Budget.

The Minister stated in his introductory speech that he had arrived at the average of the amounts paid by the various States. It is beyond me how he arrived at the average, because some States have no limit at all. The position in the other States in regard to totally or partially incapacitated workers is: New South Wales, no limit; but a limit of £3,000 for

partial incapacity in the Northern Territory and Papua-New Guinea. In Victoria it is £2,800; and the board has power to increase in the case of total and permanent incapacity.

In South Australia the amount is £3,500, in addition to medical payments already made; and there is the amount of £4,175 in little Tasmania, which is a claimant State, just as this State is. The Commonwealth Government is raising its amount to £4,300; and my authority is contained in the *Conspectus of Workers' Compensation Acts in Australia As At 1st January, 1964* and prepared in the head office of the Department of Works, Hawthorn, Victoria. So there is every justification for the amount to be £4,300 instead of £3,500. I move an amendment—

> Page 6, lines 35 and 36—Delete the words "three thousand five hundred" with a view to substituting the words "four thousand three hundred."

Mr. WILD: This applies to total and permanent incapacity. At the present moment the figure is £3,103, and it is being lifted to £3,500. If the honourable member was discussing the figure for death, then because of the basic wage increase the figure will now be £3,506. This one is being lifted from £3,103 to £3,500.

Mr. Moir: I was not referring to this one in particular.

Mr. WILD: The honourable member said the workers would have £6 taken away from them according to this clause. Until the basic wage adjustment the figure was £3,103. It is now being lifted to £3,500. The honourable member referred to Commonwealth workers, but they represent only a small section of the community. The average figure for all the States is only £3,436. We have put a ceiling on the figure of £3,500 and we will leave it at that to see how it works out. I cannot agree to the amendment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister is apparently adopting his usual dogmatic attitude. The member for Boulder-Eyre said the figure was £3,506 for permanent and total incapacity. He was not referring to that particular item, but was making a general reference.

Mr. Wild: Was he not speaking on this clause?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The ceiling of £3,500 has now been exceeded by £6 regarding compensation payable to dependants in the case of the death of an injured worker. The Minister proposes that £3,500 shall be the maximum compensation payment for permanent and total incapacity, and £3,500 for dependants in the case of the death of a worker. It is a fact that as a result of yesterday's rise in the basic wage the dependants of a deceased worker would receive £3,506. The Minister cannot deny that.

Mr. Wild: I do not; but we are speaking about this clause dealing with permanent and total incapacity.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: There is an overall figure of £3,500. If the Act is passed and proclaimed within the next few weeks, the dependants of a deceased worker will be £6 worse off than they are at present. The Opposition proposes a figure of £4,300 in place of £3,500. We feel that the figure we suggest has the force of logic behind it.

This figure will be the one laid down under Commonwealth law within a few weeks. The Prime Minister's letter indicates that the figure will be raised to £4,300 for permanent and total incapacity. That is the figure stipulated in the New South Wales Act; and I understand that the Commonwealth Government will be adopting provisions similar to those in the New South Wales Act.

The Minister said the Commonwealth Compensation Act refers to only a comparatively few workers, but the provisions of the Act will affect workers throughout Australia and the territories. Approximately 14,000 people in this State will be subject to the provisions of the Commonwealth Act. With rising and uncontrolled prices; with increases in the basic wage; and with the consumer price index showing a continual upward trend, it will not be long before the figure of £3,213 for permanent and total incapacity will exceed £3,500.

The Minister has taken 5½ years to introduce this Bill, and we thought we would receive something of a substantial nature. The figure of £3,500 is not satisfactory. In 1956 the figure for permanent and total incapacity was £2,750. With increases in the basic wage, the figure rose to £3,103, and as from yesterday it will be £3,213. The figure for death was £3,000. It went up to £3,386, and with yesterday's basic wage adjustment it is now £3,506. I hope the amendment will be carried and that the figure of £3,500 will be replaced by £4,300.

Mr. MOIR: The Government is adopting a parsimonious attitude. Members on this side of the House are concerned about workers in all industries being compensated adequately or reasonably. I do not think they will ever be compensated adequately. The member for Murchison queried the effect on the mining industry and quoted figures from the report of the State Government Insurance Office. For his information, I will also quote some figures.

On the 1st January, 1953 the premiums were reduced 80s. per cent. On the 1st July, 1953, they were reduced 60s. per cent.; on the 1st January, 1954, they were

reduced 30s. per cent.; and on the 1st January, 1955 they were reduced 30s. per cent. These are sizable reductions in anyone's language. In the Auditor-General's report for the year ended the 30th June, 1963, at page 155, there is an amount of £1,668,654 paid to Consolidated Revenue for miner's phthisis. The phthisis subsidy was £407,500. There was also a disaster risk amount of £50,000.

I cannot imagine any sudden disaster or sudden plague of silicosis occurring, but no doubt there was good reason for setting aside that amount. The amount of £3,500 proposed in the Bill is a miserable payment. If a man is totally incapacitated his family will have to exist on an invalid pension. It is high time we opened our hearts and did the right thing by these people.

The member for Murchison, in his evidence before the pneumoconiosis committee, sounded a note of warning. He was asked whether he would consider that bronchitis should be compensable under all situations. He replied, "I do not think the mining industry should be selected to make it compensable, because bronchitis is not a disease associated with mining only." That reply appears on page 128 of the transcript. The chairman asked, "Do you think there should be some way of stopping him?"

In his reply, the honourable member for Murchison suggested that a miner would have to remain in the industry and contract silicosis until he reaches the stage where he could not work any more. At that stage the honourable member for Murchison would consent to a worker being paid compensation. That is the sort of thinking we have behind the Minister. Is it any wonder the Minister will not budge and agree to this amendment? He probably thinks that, if he does not accept an appointment elsewhere, the Government when it is re-elected at the next election, will not make him a Minister if he agrees to the amendment I have on the notice paper.

Mr. Oldfield: He is going to be appointed to London next year.

Mr. MOIR: Yes, perhaps so. I consider that my amendment is fair and just, and I cannot understand any Government refusing to fall into line with legislation in other States. In some States there is no limit in the payment of compensation for such a disease. The provision in those Acts enables a worker to receive compensation for his disease until he dies. We could turn over a new leaf and treat these people more generously than we have in the past. We have made such slight advance with workers' compensation legislation during the time I have been a member of this House that I dread looking workers in the face when I meet them.

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

Ayes—20	
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—21	
Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	
	(Teller.)

Pairs	
Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MOIR: My next amendment appears on page 7 of the Bill, in lines 5 and 6, and I apologise for not putting it on the notice paper. I move an amendment—

> Page 7, lines 5 and 6—Delete the words "three thousand five hundred."

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MOIR: I move an amendment—

> Page 7, line 36—Insert after the word "process" the words "provided that the provisions of section 10A shall apply to this subsection."

Mr. WILD: It is no use proceeding with this amendment to have section 10A applied to this subsection, because in the next clause it is intended to repeal section 10A, and therefore the amendment would be redundant.

Mr. Moir: It is getting worse and worse!

Mr. WILD: No; it is not. The honourable member knows that section 10A is not used. It was inserted in the Act following a managers' conference a few years ago, but over the years it has been proved that it is redundant and innocuous. The Government, therefore, is endeavouring to obtain the consent of Parliament to have this section 10A repealed.

Mr. Moir: It is innocuous because you have not amended it over all those years.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister intends to repeal section 10A. Of course, he has the numbers, and that is what counts. We can only submit arguments to justify our amendments. The honourable member for Boulder-Eyre has sought to include in this clause a reference to section 10A at the

end of paragraph (f) on page 7; and, after all is said and done, it is not an extravagant amendment. Paragraph (f) is rather lengthy, and I draw the attention of members of the Committee to it. The amendment seeks to add the words—

> provided that the provisions after 10A of this Act shall apply to this subsection.

The Minister said I was present at the managers' conference when section 10A was inserted in the Act. That occurred in 1956. At that time the maximum provided under the second schedule was £2,400, but the amount provided for the dependants of deceased workers was £3,000. We wanted more than £2,400 as compensation for permanently and totally incapacitated workers. It was pointed out that if £3,000 was payable to the dependants of a deceased worker, then a permanently and totally incapacitated worker should also receive £3,000. After considerable argument we had to agree to an amount of £2,750.

The Minister proposes to repeal section 10A, but we propose to amend it. The amendment before us and the amendment which I propose to move, will, if passed, retain section 10A in an amended and a humanitarian form. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—21

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller.)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 10A repealed—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: This clause seeks to repeal section 10A, but my proposed amendment seeks to retain it in a different form. This section provides that the base amount of £2,750—now £3,213—shall be payable where permanent and total incapacity results from an injury. The Minister considers this section to be redundant, but I do not. I therefore move an amendment—

> Page 7, line 41—Delete the word "repealed" with a view to substituting the following:—amended by deleting all words after "where" in line 3 and inserting the words "the injury results in—
>
> (a) permanent and total incapacity for work; or
>
> (b) permanent and partial incapacity for work of a major degree.
>
> In such a case the Board may, in its absolute discretion make such award as the Board thinks proper in the circumstances, notwithstanding that the total liability of the employer as prescribed by this Act may be exceeded."

The effect of this amendment will be that a person who is permanently and totally incapacitated will receive the maximum set out in the Act, and in addition an amount over and above the maximum, which the Workers' Compensation Board will have a discretion to award. This is not a new principle, because in some of the other States the amount which can be awarded is unlimited. A permanently and totally incapacitated worker should be entitled to receive compensation in special cases over and above the amount provided in the Act.

If the clause is agreed to and section 10A is repealed, the amount of £3,500 will obtain, and the board will not be able to grant anything over and above that. The board will not grant anything over the maximum if it does not, after full and complete inquiry, consider that an additional amount is warranted.

Mr. WILD: I have been advised by the Workers' Compensation Board that section 10A is completely redundant, and is not used. The maximum amount which the Government is prepared to agree to is £3,500. As we all realise, frequently provisions are inserted into Acts, which after examination by the Crown Law Department are found to be redundant. I therefore oppose the amendment.

Mr. MOIR: The Minister has not dealt with the amendment at all; he only advanced the same arguments which he used to oppose the previous amendment. The amendment seeks to bring about a provision in section 10A of the Act somewhat different to the existing one. The Minister has not dealt with the discretion of the board to make such award as it thinks proper in the circumstances, notwithstanding that the total liability of the employer may be exceeded. This power is similar to that given in some of the other States to the authorities which administer the workers' compensation

legislation, because from time to time circumstances arise which make it beneficial for some authority, like the Workers' Compensation Board, to award an additional amount.

The amendment is very worth while, and the Minister should not oppose it on the ground that the Workers' Compensation Board cannot be regarded as the responsible body for making such decisions. That board is charged with making very responsible decisions which entail thousands of pounds, and the personnel of the board would not be appointed if they were not regarded as responsible officers.

I am quite sure this amendment would meet with approval and it would certainly be of benefit to those cases which would come within the hardship class. I urge the Minister to take another look at the amendment and see if he cannot alter his stand on it.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—21

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller.)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 11 amended—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Had the Minister suggested this section be repealed, he would have received quite an amount of support. Recommendations have been made over a period that section 11 should be repealed—

Mr. Evans: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —because it has not operated in the interests of the worker. I am not saying this in any critical or derogatory way; but if a layman were to read this section half a dozen times today and half a dozen times tomorrow he would most certainly gain different impressions of it. I am sure that a reference to the section would convince honourable members of this.

Certain authorities would like this section repealed, and that is the reason I intend to move in that direction. As I see it, a worker who is partially incapacitated should receive *pro rata* weekly payments until the total amount has been exhausted. However, I understand that certain people interpret the clause as providing that such a worker will receive the partial weekly payment until the proportionate amount is exhausted, which is a different thing altogether. The Minister merely proposes to perpetuate the situation, and include pneumoconiosis. I hope the Minister will reconsider this matter. I move an amendment—

> Page 8, lines 1 to 14—Delete all words after the word "is" down to and including the word "hundred."

Mr. WILD: I agree with the honourable member in regard to the difficulty of understanding this section. I had to read it about 20 times before I could get any sense out of it, and it was only after I had had several discussions with the chairman of the board that I understood it. The amendment would alter the whole principle. In effect, if the percentage is 45 per cent., 45 per cent. of the total sum allowed will be paid. There is no doubt that when that amount cuts out no more payments will be made. However, the amendment as moved by the honourable member would reverse that situation and a worker would continue to receive the payments until the whole of the £3,500 had been exhausted.

Mr. W. Hegney: That is fair enough.

Mr. WILD: I cannot agree with the amendment.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller.)

Noes—21

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller.)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: To be consistent, I move an amendment—

> Page 8, lines 5 and 6—Delete the words "three thousand five hundred" with a view to inserting the words "four thousand three hundred".

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I will see if I have any better luck this time. I move an amendment—

> Page 8, lines 13 and 14—Delete the words "three thousand five hundred" with a view to inserting the words "four thousand three hundred."

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 put and passed.

Clause 8: First Schedule amended—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

> Pages 8 and 9—Delete subparagraph (i) of paragraph (a).

If this amendment is agreed to I propose to move that the following be substituted:—

> (i) By substituting for the words "three thousand" in line 3 the words "four thousand three hundred."

and subsequently to move for the insertion of other subparagraphs in clause 8, paragraph (a). The existing subparagraph (i) refers to the first paragraph of the first schedule, and the figure mentioned there already amounts to £3,506 as a result of the basic wage adjustment yesterday. If the Minister pursues his amendment providing for £3,500, it is obvious there will be a reduction in the total amount of compensation payable to the dependants of a deceased worker.

I have already mentioned what happens in New South Wales, and the position in Tasmania; and the Commonwealth intends to make the figure £4,300. I have said sufficient to warrant reconsideration by the Government of the proposed maximum of £3,500. The Minister in his second reading speech said the Bill would make improvements to the Act. Can any member of the Government prove to me that it is a substantial improvement when the dependants of a man who is killed as a result of industrial employment have their compensation reduced from £3,506 to £3,500? I suggest the figure of £4,300 is not excessive on present-day standards.

A little while ago the Premier said the average weekly wage for an industrial worker was £22 7s. That is approximately £1,100 a year. If we divide that figure into £3,500, the latter amount barely represents three years earnings for the dependant of a deceased worker, and they will have to scratch gravel for the rest of the time.

Mr. WILD: The honourable member is quite right in what he said. Because of the basic wage rise today, the amount will go to £3,506. When this provision was being compiled I was not in a position to know whether there would or would not be a rise. The Government decided that in view of the fact that total and permanent incapacity was so much lower, and because deaths represented only 4.6 per cent. of the total, whereas total and permanent incapacity represents 47 per cent., it would be doing a great service for those people by providing an increase. It was decided to provide the same amount in each case, and give them parity.

Mr. MOIR: This will be another retrograde step. I thought the Minister was going to do the right thing. He explained what the position was when the Bill was drawn up and how the situation had altered with the change in the basic wage.

I thought he would say, "We will have a look at this and we will be prepared to make it conform and give the increase we thought we were going to give in the first place." But the Minister used an argument that he turned a deaf ear to a little while ago. He has taken refuge in the argument that in any case the permanently incapacitated worker is going to receive more. I think that is unworthy of the Minister. If he did the right thing he would say, "We will have another look at this and add to the amount now that the basic wage has increased the total sum." The Minister does not have to give his answer in the next 10 minutes. I hope he will have a look at this question and have the necessary amendment moved in another place. Do not let us go backwards.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am not going to repeat what has already been said, but I intend to divide the Committee, if necessary, because this is a retrograde step. The other amounts mentioned in the Bill will be increased; but if we leave this provision as it is, a deceased worker's dependants, who are now entitled to £3,506, will be entitled to only £3,500.

I want to be sure that if I call for a division, it will not preclude me from moving to have inserted in clause 8 the other subparagraph standing in my name on the notice paper.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): The honourable member will have to delete the subparagraph in the Bill in order that he may move to add the words he proposes.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is only the first paragraph of my amendment. The other paragraphs deal with other items.

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

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May
	(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Hart	*(Teller)*

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nimmo

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I propose to move an amendment as follows:—

> By substituting for the words "sum of seventy-five pounds" in lines 4 and 5 the words "weekly" payment of two pounds three shillings."

In the Bill the Minister proposes to increase the sum payable to dependent children in the case of the death of a worker. My proposed amendment would, if agreed to, be in line with the New South Wales Act which provides for a sum of £4,300 plus a weekly payment of £2 3s. for each dependent child under the age of 16 years. I do not know about the weekly payment of £2 3s.—I am not sure whether that is the sum involved—but I understand from the Prime Minister's letter that such a provision will be included in the Commonwealth legislation. I think it is reasonable to pay a dependent child £2 3s. a week instead of a sum of £100. The present sum payable is £93 and the proposal in the Bill is to increase it to only £100.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Can the honourable member indicate to me where he wants the amendment included?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: In subparagraph (ii) on page 9.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): It will not fit in there.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The first schedule has to be read in conjunction with the Bill. That is why I asked the question of you when we were discussing my previous amendment. You indicated I would not be precluded from discussing these other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): I was making reference to subparagraph (i) in the Bill. Now you propose to go beyond that point.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is why I raised the question. I want to make certain amendments to the first schedule.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): But they must be able to be fitted into the Bill.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: On page 8, in clause 8, line 37, there is reference to the sum of £75.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): But we have dealt with that and we now have to move on to subparagraph (ii) on page 9.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I purposely raised the matter before the motion was put on subparagraph (i).

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): I indicated to you that you would be able to talk on the clause from subparagraph (ii) onwards.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am sorry if I have misled you, Mr. Chairman. I had amendments on the notice paper, and I specifically asked the question whether I would be entitled to move the other amendments if the one before the Chair were defeated.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): And I intended to accept them if they could be fitted in from subparagraph (ii) onwards.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: We are dealing with the first schedule to the principal Act.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): No: we are dealing with the clause in the Bill.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: But the clause starts off by saying, "The first schedule to the principal Act is amended"; and I would be entitled to speak to the provisions of the first schedule because the Minister seeks to amend it in a number of directions.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): You are entitled to speak to the amendments to the first schedule as they are contained in the Bill.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister proposes by the Bill to increase the allowance for dependent children. I was seeking to replace the lump sum payment by a weekly payment until the child reaches 16 years of age. Also in the same schedule there is a reference to the exclusion of ex-nuptial children. To my way of thinking this is an anomaly, because it appears in the definition of "worker". In the first schedule the ex-nuptial child is precluded from receiving any allowance.

If the Minister does not agree to the proposition here I hope he will have something done in another place to get rid of this anomalous position and consider the proposal for weekly payments for dependent children instead of lump sum payments.

Mr. WILD: I move an amendment—

Page 9, lines 5 to 8—Delete subparagraph (ii) and substitute the following:—

(ii) by deleting subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (a) and substituting the following:—

(iii) if he leaves no dependants, the reasonable expenses of his medical attendance and burial, the cost of which may be awarded to and upon the application of any person by whom the expenses were properly incurred, or to whom the whole or any part of the expenses is owed.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

Page 9, lines 19 and 20—Delete the words "three thousand five hundred" with a view to substituting the words "four thousand three hundred."

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Subparagraph (v) refers to the amount of medical and hospital expenses. I move an amendment—

Page 9—Insert after subparagraph (v) lines 21 to 30, the following new subparagraph:—

(vi) Insert after the word "pounds" in line 29 of paragraph (c) of the proviso to subparagraph (c) of paragraph (c) the following proviso:—

Provided that notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Board may in its discretion award additional expenses in respect of such medical and hospital services.

This provision obtains in New South Wales and Victoria, and all reasonable medical and hospital expenses are payable. The worker is not legally liable for a penny. There is a limited amount in South Australia; whereas Queensland is on a different basis. Victoria has an amount of £1,000. A man could be seriously injured at Wyndham and need to be flown down to Fremantle for treatment, with a nurse and attendants, after which he might have to be flown back. The air fares are taken out of this amount; and, as we all know, these are fairly high.

I only seek to give the Workers' Compensation Board discretion to award amounts over and above those stated in particular circumstances where it deems it necessary. Nobody wants to see the medical fraternity or hospital organisations going without their fees. The Minister's provision will remove the responsibility from the worker for medical and hospital expenses, and we would give this discretionary power to the board.

Dr. HENN: This clause proposes to raise medical fees by £50 and hospital expenses by £100. Quite apart from this disparity there are some cases of prolonged medical treatment requiring simple operations; and I refer particularly to compound fractures requiring repeated bone grafts and burns requiring repeated skin grafts.

The honourable member for Mt. Hawthorn mentioned air fares from distant parts of the State. What he says is true; but how many such cases would there be? There would not be many. Most cases are fixed with one operation or a certain period in hospital, depending on the circumstances. We should make haste slowly. I have heard it said this money will go to the doctors. There is, however, not overmuch of it. I would like to see this in operation as soon as possible. If we were to lift the lid off this it would make it unnecessarily awkward, because not many cases would require the maximum of £425 for hospital expenses and £250 for medical expenses. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER: I support the amendment for reasons I submitted the other evening. I mentioned the case of an injured worker who spent his entire hospital and medical expenses plus his total entitlement under workers' compensation in an endeavour to rectify damage he had sustained. I described how he was struck in the forehead by a piece of timber which paralysed him down one side and impaired his sight. He went to the Eastern States for treatment but was not successful, and I subsequently filled in invalid pension papers for him. This is the type of case the amendment seeks to cover, and I think there should be some extra payment in excess of that provided to take care of such cases.

Mr. MOIR: I was rather astounded that the honourable member for Wembley should oppose this amendment. Although he said he was opposing it, the honourable member gave one of the best arguments I have heard for this amendment. He said the cases were very few; and that is what we claim. But the fact that cases are few is no reason to reject the amendment; because this is a serious matter for those unlucky few who have accidents from time to time in the mining industry, the major part of which is in my electorate.

I know of the case of a man who spent two years in hospital with injuries to his legs. We can imagine his feelings at having to meet a stupendous bill. This man came out of hospital on crutches. One can appreciate the mental strain such an injured worker would suffer. Not only has this man suffered an injury but he has been on weekly payments. He is partially disabled and confronted with this huge bill for medical and hospital expenses: a bill far in excess of the amount allowed under the Act.

In the majority of cases the amounts laid down are not exceeded, but there are exceptional cases where injuries necessitate long hospitalisation and medical care. Here I would like to pay a tribute to the medical and hospital people who care for such injured workers: those medical men who know they will not be paid for their services and still persevere and do all they can, sometimes performing marvellous jobs of surgery to restore the worker to health.

The honourable member for Wembley said we were lifting the lid off this. If he studies the amendment he will see there are adequate safeguards. The amendment leaves it to the Workers' Compensation Board, which is a very responsible body of people. This board makes decisions involving many thousands of pounds. According to the honourable member for Wembley it would seem we are vesting this authority in an irresponsible body of people and that the whole thing will be subject to exploitation.

Dr. Henn: I did not say that at all. I said some people had said that.

Mr. MOIR: The honourable member said we were lifting the lid off and there is no doubt what he meant. At Norseman a few years ago there was an unfortunate accident necessitating hospital treatment for a number of years. As a matter of fact, the man in question is still under treatment, and he will be faced with a huge bill which he has no chance of paying. Like the average Australian he has paid his way, and in his weakened condition this huge amount which he will be charged could have an adverse effect on him. Nobody, for a moment, believes that he can pay it, but that man is extremely worried and no doubt it is having a bad effect on his condition.

I say this is quite a reasonable proposition to put forward; and, as was said by the honourable member for Wembley, there are only a few cases and that is a reason why it should be granted. The cost involved would be very small when measured against the overall cost of workers' compensation, and we would be doing justice to an unfortunate section of the community that is penalised at the present time. I hope that when the Minister replies he will give some indication that we can hope to see more justice done for these people.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I would like to point out that in his second reading speech, and again this evening, the Minister stated that the sum of £3,500 was the average of the Australian States. I think he might be a little consistent so far as this item is concerned.

The amounts provided in New South Wales for ambulance, medical, surgical, hospital, nursing, and chemists' expenses are—medical expenses £500; hospital expenses £250; accidents arising out of or in the course of employment and as a result worker sustains damage to crutches, artificial members, eyes or teeth, other artificial aids or spectacle glasses shall be entitled to receive reasonable costs of repair or replacement maximum £25. The commission may grant additional expenses in respect of any of these items on application.

This is the position in Victoria: Reasonable costs of medical, hospital, nursing, ambulance and other services incurred by reason of injury or disease on and after date of disablement, payable in addition to compensation. There is no limit to the amount. In South Australia the position is: Cost of transport for medical examination or treatment, medical or surgical fees, dental costs or treatment by physiotherapist on prescription of a doctor and supply on doctor's prescription skiagrams, artificial limbs, eyes, teeth, crutches, splints, spectacles or other apparatus, etc., including necessary renewals and repairs, ambulance, nursing and hospital fees, and chemists' bills for medicine or drugs. There is no limit.

This is the position in Tasmania, which is a claimant State: Ambulance, hospital and medical charges and appliances and dentist fees payable up to £1000 and including repair and replacements to appliances up to £150. Rates fixed by regulation. The position in the Northern Territory is a reasonable cost of treatment with a maximum of £350 unless special circumstances warrant larger payment.

The principle we are trying to establish is in existence in most of the other States. I would point out to the honourable member for Wembley that the Worker's Compensation Board is a responsible authority; and I have no doubt that if this provision were incorporated in the Act the board would use its discretion. Irrespective of whether there are few or many cases, I insist that a worker who is seriously injured in the course of his employment and who is obliged to be in hospital for many weeks to obtain medical attention, should not in this day and age be legally responsible for the medical and hospital expenses in respect of that injury. An amount of £200, £100, or £50 can be nominated for medical and hospital

payments; but give the board a discretionary power to pay a higher amount in a particular case. I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment, because it is long overdue. If it is passed, the minds of workers who are now legally responsible for medical and hospital expenses will be put at rest.

Mr. NORTON: I support the amendment because I have had the experience of a particular case where a person broke his leg on a station some 140 miles from Carnarvon. It was a bad break which necessitated this person spending 15 months in Perth before his leg was amputated. Out of his hospital expense payments had to come air charges and ambulance charges from the place of accident to the hospital of treatment. If the hospital in the north-west to which a person is taken cannot treat that person then he has to be flown to Perth with an escort and the expenses incurred in this way have to come out of the medical and hospital payments.

In a case such as that to which I have referred, a person would be up for over £250 for air fares. He would come down on a stretcher and that would mean at least three seats on the plane. I understand it means more. It would then mean the return fare of the escort and the return fare of the person injured, making a total of five air fares, costing over £50 each, to come out of the hospital and medical payments. I have been told on reliable authority that when such cases come to Perth and are admitted to a private hospital, the doctors keep a very close watch on how the expenses are going and if the payments look like being absorbed, that person is transferred from the private hospital to Royal Perth Hospital where treatment can more or less be obtained at reduced rates or under conditions which would mean the expenses would be wiped off in the long run.

Unfortunately, when the amounts are absorbed, this class of person cannot claim for hospital benefits, because a question asked on the form is, "Are you entitled to workers' compensation or other claims under any other Act?" When a worker is injured he is entitled to workers' compensation and that cuts out completely any chance of his obtaining hospital benefits.

It is true there are not many cases such as the one I have mentioned, but with the developments that are now taking place further north, the number of people who will claim will increase; and it is those people whom we have to look after. If the Minister will look at this in a rational light, he will see that the request to give the board discretion to pay extra medical and hospital payments, if required, is only just.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

> Page 9, line 35—Delete the words "three thousand five hundred" with a view to inserting other words.

If this amendment is passed I propose to insert the words, "four thousand three hundred."

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 9: Second Schedule repealed and re-enacted—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: At the moment I will mention only the first seven items of my proposed amendment, which show an amount of £4,300. The other amounts are worked out on a proportionate basis, although they may be £5, £10, or £15 out. Although the Government, on a number of occasions this evening, has defeated our attempts to increase the maximum benefit from £3,500 to £4,300 it is my intention to test the Committee on the first item listed in my amendment. The present figure is much lower than £4,300. With the adjustment in regard to the basic wage it is in the vicinity of £3,000; and the Minister proposes to increase it to £3,500.

Since the Government says that Western Australia is leaping forward, is industrially sound, and there is prosperity everywhere, when a man loses the sight of both eyes during the course of his employment three years' wages is not good enough for him and we should be able to pay something better than £3,500 for the total loss of the sight of both eyes. At the risk of being monotonous all we are asking is for an amount of £4,300 because that amount applies in other States. There is no limit in New South Wales; £4,175 is paid in a State like Tasmania; and the Commonwealth Government proposes to increase its payment to £4,300. Already in regard to one item £3,500 has been accepted by the present Government; and it says this is a magnanimous gesture to the workers of Western Australia. I say it is paltry. I move an amendment—

> Delete the amounts set out in the second schedule, with a view to substituting the following:—

SECOND SCHEDULE

TABLE

Nature of Injury	Amount of Compensation Payable
	£
Total loss of the sight of both eyes	4,300
Total loss of the sight of an only eye	4,300
Loss of both hands	4,300
Loss of both feet	4,300
Loss of a hand and a foot	4,300
Total and incurable loss of mental powers involving inability to work	4,300
Total and incurable paralysis of the limbs or of mental powers	4,300 and in addition, when a medical practitioner certifies the injury to be total and incurable paralysis of the limbs, an attendant's remuneration at a rate not exceeding three pounds per week

SECOND SCHEDULE—*continued*

TABLE—*continued*

Nature of Injury	Amount of Compensation Payable £
Total loss of the right arm or of the greater part of the right arm	3,450
Total loss of the left arm or of the greater part of the left arm	3,700
Total loss of the right hand or of five fingers of the right hand, or of the lower part of the right arm	3,000
Total loss of the same for the left hand and arm	2,720
Total loss of a leg	3,200
Total loss of a foot or the lower part of the leg	2,580
Total loss of the sight of one eye, together with the serious diminution of the sight of the other eye	3,200
Total loss of hearing	2,580
Partial deafness of both ears	Such percentage of £2,580 as is equal to the percentage of diminution of hearing.
Complete deafness of one ear	860
Total loss of the sight of one eye	1,720
Loss of binocular vision	1,720
Total loss of the thumb of the right hand	1,290
Total loss of the thumb of the left hand	1,120
Total loss of the forefinger of the right hand	860
Total loss of the forefinger of the left hand	680
Total loss of a joint of the thumb	680
Total loss of the first joint of the forefinger of either hand	340
Total loss of the middle finger of the hand	510
Total loss of the little or ring finger of the hand	465
Total loss of the great toe of either foot	860
Total loss of a joint of the great toe of either foot	430
Total loss of any other toe or of a joint of a finger	250
Total loss of a joint of any other toe	80
Partial loss of the sight of both eyes	Such percentage of £4,300 as is equal to the percentage of the diminution of sight measured without the aid of a correcting lens.
Partial loss of the sight of one eye	Such percentage of £1,720 as is equal to the percentage of the diminution of sight measured without the aid of a correcting lens.

I hope the Committee will agree to this amendment. I do not believe that the amounts are extravagant, and if the Committee agrees to the amendment it will be a gesture to the people of Western Australia. It will indicate that this Parliament has regard for those who fall by the wayside and who suffer serious injuries or permanent and total incapacity in the course of their employment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10: Third schedule amended—

Mr. MOIR: I move an amendment—

Page 11, line 6—Delete the word "Dermatitis" and insert the words "tendon sheath."

I am concerned about the disease of dermatitis. I am aware that early in the third schedule provision is made for dermatosis. The description is given as "any industrial process." I have received legal advice that under no consideration should the word "dermatitis" be removed from the schedule. It could mean that persons could no longer be entitled to receive compensation for this condition, or there could be considerable doubt regarding the entitlement. The dictionary defines dermatitis as being the formation of bony plates or scales of the skin.

There are various types of dermatitis in the mining industry where workers are exposed to various chemicals such as cyanide. They contract cyanide rash. Workers underground come into contact with heavily mineralised water which can cause skin infection. This infection is termed dermatitis by the medical profession. Under the present Act a worker who is incapacitated with dermatitis receives compensation. The word should be retained because it will remove any doubt from a legal aspect.

Dr. HENN: The honourable member is concerned that workers will not continue to be compensated for dermatitis. He defined dermatitis as being scaly skin. When he refers to the difference between dermatitus and dermatosis I suggest that he is splitting hairs. There is no intention of not including dermatitis as in the past.

Mr. WILD: I made inquiries of three medical men, and I understand that dermatosis covers the whole field of dermatitis.

Mr. MOIR: We have to consider the interpretation of the Workers' Compensation Board when a case comes before it. With other members, I had an unfortunate experience. A committee of managers was appointed and I was appointed to represent this House. A clause was agreed upon by the six members of the committee and it was decided that a certain thing should be done. The Parliamentary Draftsman drafted a clause which was approved by the committee of managers who reported to their respective Houses. Their recommendation was adopted and the clause was incorporated into the Act. When the first case came before the Workers' Compensation Board, the clause was interpreted in an entirely different manner. I am not worried about what we think about the matter here; I am worried about the interpretation which any judicial authority might place on it. If there is no intention to remove this from the Act, then what is wrong with leaving this one word in?

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MOIR: I move an amendment—

Page 11—Insert after paragraph (c) in lines 11 to 19 the following new paragraph:—

(d) by adding the following to the schedule:—

First Column	Second Column
Occupational Deafness	Employment in an occupation where the worker is or was exposed to excessive noise.
Effects of x-rays, radioactive substances or other ionising radiation	Employment in an occupation or situation where the worker is or was exposed to radiation from x-rays, radioactive substances or other ionising particles.
Poisoning by other chemical substances	Employment in an occupation or situation exposing the worker to the effect of known toxic chemicals, whether by ingestion, inhalation or absorption.

Occupational deafness has long been recognised and it is compensable in Acts of other States. A good deal of research has been carried out and it is well known that workers in certain other types of industry suffer from occupational deafness. I have here a report of the Commonwealth Acoustic Laboratories which contains an article entitled "Hearing Conservation in Industrial Noise." Research has been carried out into the degree of loss of hearing occasioned in various types of industry and the findings are contained in this report. Last year the Department of Public Health, in conjunction with officers of the Commonwealth Acoustic Laboratories, carried out tests in the mining industry. I have not seen the report, but I know that many workers in the industry suffer from loss of hearing.

I do not propose to read the whole of this report, but on page 4 there is the following comment under the heading "Difficulties on the Job":—

> At work, a hearing loss can lead to misinterpretation of instructions and warnings, causing accidents, damage and loss of time and money. Subsequent promotion of a deafened skilled worker is limited, because of difficulties in using telephones and following discussions in groups and conferences. Personality changes in a deaf person alter his capabilities.

So it can be seen, from that observation alone, that a person who has his hearing seriously affected when he has been exposed to loud noises—and we know that workers are subject to loud noises in many industries today—can have his earning capabilities greatly impaired. It is recognised by these people that a worker not only fails to obtain promotion, but also he can be demoted from the position he occupies as a result of impaired hearing.

I have here a decision of a Victorian board on the loss of hearing. I do not propose to read it to the Committee, but it is available to any honourable member who cares to read it. The report indicates that these cases do happen and that the workers who are affected in other States are compensated. It has also been found that a worker who has had his hearing affected in industry is handicapped in his social activities because a change in personality occurs. He withdraws into himself and, as a result, it has an effect on his family also. The effect of loss of hearing on a worker is set out on page 5 of this report which is quite an interesting publication. Anyone who has read it will realise the disabilities a worker can suffer and how they can affect his earning capacity. There is no doubt that occupational deafness occurs in industry and I do not see why we should not provide in our legislation for the payment of compensation to a worker who is affected.

The same applies to workers who are affected by X-rays and radioactive substances. I think we should move with the times and compensate workers in industries who are handling these substances and who ultimately become affected by them. It is entirely unreal when we do not provide in our legislation for compensation to be paid to such people.

There are also other items. With the march of science we have all sorts of complaints. Most people are not aware that many substances contain dangerous material or poisons and they expose themselves to toxic chemicals often by ingestion, inhalation, or exhaustion. I therefore hope the Committee will agree to the addition of this paragraph (d) to provide for the schedule, as suggested.

Mr. WILD: The first part of the schedule which is sought to be incorporated in the Act by the amendment before the Committee deals with occupational deafness, which has been the subject of medical research for many years. It is a technical and extremely difficult subject and one upon which members of the medical profession have great difficulty in arriving at a final determination.

Furthermore, it is appreciated that, with age, one's eyesight becomes impaired, as does one's hearing. For that reason alone the medical profession has great difficulty in determining whether deafness in any person has been caused by his occupation, or has been brought about merely by old age, I therefore cannot accept the amendment. If, after further research into the subject in the future it can be definitely proved that a worker has had his hearing impaired because of the work on which he is engaged, the matter can be reviewed in the light of the additional information.

The effect of radioactive substances is already covered by the Act. The Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board has told me that cognisance is taken of that already. The effect of poisoning by other chemical substances is far too wide for it to be covered by this legislation. It

would introduce too many aspects and more thought should be given to that before a provision relating to it is incorporated in the legislation. For that reason I cannot agree to the amendment.

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

Ayes—19

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller)*

Noes—20

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Wild
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neil
	(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Hall	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Curran	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Hart

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

POISONS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 22nd October, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [10.57 p.m.]: This is an important Bill and, as far as I can see, one well worthy of the support of the House. The development of certain drugs and poisons, which are being introduced into all types of industry and agriculture, has made their operation and use very wide. Originally, all these drugs were controlled by a council, six members of which were drawn from the Pharmaceutical Society of Western Australia.

It is now proposed to amend the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, Compilation Act, and place the control of drugs under the Public Health Department, and the Commissioner of Public Health will be chairman of the proposed committee. It is also intended that the advisory committee, which will be constituted under the Bill, will consist of 12 members, two of whom will be *ex officio*. The members of the committee will cover a wide range of industry, commerce, agriculture, and medicine.

On examining the list of the 10 nominee members of this poisons advisory committee, it is found that one is to be a pharmacologist nominated by the Senate of the University of Western Australia; one is to be a medical practitioner employed by the Department of Public Health, and specialising in occupational health; two will be medical practitioners, one of whom is to be a specialist physician nominated by the Western Australian branch of the Australian Medical Association; and another shall be an officer of the Department of Agriculture. I think the appointment of an officer from the Department of Agriculture is a very wise move because that department introduces into its work a large number of potent drugs and poisons for the control of weeds and other pests.

There shall be two persons one of whom shall represent the wholesale dealers and one the Australian Chamber of Manufactures. They will represent the manufacturing side of drugs and poisons. There will be a veterinary surgeon and a person nominated by the Pharmaceutical Society of Western Australia. The final member will be a member of the Pharmaceutical Guild (W.A. Branch).

So it will be seen that there will be quite a good cross section of people representing all aspects of pharmaceutical and poisons distribution. The legislation also provides for the drugs and poisons to be divided into eight different categories or schedules. Looking through them it would seem that they have been quite well divided, although it is hard for a layman to pick out how the distribution will take place, because many of the names used are not known to the layman. Looking through the various parts of the schedules we find they cover most venues in which poisons and drugs are used.

In the first schedule, for instance, we find substances which are extremely dangerous to humans, and are to be supplied only through pharmacists. I will later refer particularly to this section in respect of a substance used in agriculture for the destruction of vermin. Schedule two contains dangerous poisons which may be supplied by pharmacists or by specially licensed persons five miles or more from a pharmacy. I do not think it is intended that all drugs in that list will be allowed to be sold by persons who are specially licensed. I think it refers to special drugs and poisons in common use in agriculture.

The third schedule deals with poisons to be sold only by pharmacists, and includes quite a long list with such drugs as thalidomide and so on. Schedule

four contains substances or preparations which may be supplied only by pharmacists and only when prescribed by a medical practitioner, dentist, or veterinary surgeon.

In schedule five we have substances which can be harmful and which require precautions in balancing or packing. No restriction will be placed on the sale of these substances, and sellers will not require a license. This would include such things as methylated spirits, kerosene, and similar commodities generally used in households.

The poisons contained in schedule six may be sold by licensed storekeepers, and they include a wide range of potentially dangerous substances which are in common use in industry and agriculture. These would include sprays, insecticides, and so on.

Schedule seven contains a group of highly dangerous poisons requiring special care in handling and use. These include the more potent pest destroyers.

The group in schedule eight is confined to drugs with addiction-producing characteristics, and they will come under the Police Act. It will be seen therefore that these drugs and poisons are very well covered in their various aspects.

It is also pleasing to note that the committee which will control this legislation will not admit any new poisons or drugs to the list until they have been approved as safe for use by the public. I understand that the committee will have access to the Commonwealth laboratories in order to prove the suitability or otherwise of such drugs for sale.

The sale of poisons is very well covered in this legislation, and it requires every person who sells them to be licensed. There is, however, one aspect of this licensing which has me a little puzzled, and that is the period in which a license is available. The license takes effect as from the 1st July in each year, but expires on the 13th June. I wonder whether the Minister, when replying, can explain why it is that it falls a little over a fortnight short—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Where does it say this?

Mr. NORTON: In clause 26 at the bottom of page 17. It seems that although a person is given a license for 12 months it expires actually 17 days before the end of the year, and is then renewed again on the 1st July That is how I read the clause.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: When did you say it expires?

Mr. NORTON: On the 13th day of June.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You mean on the 30th day of June.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister is quite right. I misread the date. I wish to make some comment on the sale of poisons, which comes into the general provisions. I refer particularly to the sale of dog baits, which is practically unrestricted. Under the first schedule strychnine or any substance which contains 0.2 per cent. of strychnine must be sold by a chemist or pharmacist, and a record kept of all sales.

There has been quite a bit of trouble in some country towns where these dog baits have been distributed in front of shops, along roadways, footpaths, and so on. They are cubes of meat three-quarters of an inch square, in the centre of which is injected a half grain of strychnine. These are sold in containers of 1,200 baits. This means that any person can purchase one of these containers and have in his possession 600 grains of strychnine, which is quite easily removed from the baits. One might say therefore that it is quite easy to buy strychnine in bulk, and no record need be kept of these particular poison baits. But if this legislation is enforced as shown in schedule one then these baits will have to come under that particular schedule and be sold by pharmacists.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Doesn't this come under the Dog Act?

Mr. NORTON: No. The Vermin Act is mentioned, but not the Dog Act. The provision in clause 32 states that a person shall not, except as provided by section 130 of the Vermin Act, sell or supply any poison unless he is authorised. All that the Vermin Act provides is to give the power to the Vermin Board or local authorities to sell poisons for the destruction of vermin at any price they may deem to be warranted; that is, when a person is in poor circumstances, the shire council can sell it without profit.

I understand that at the present time stock firms are selling poison baits, and it is quite a simple matter to obtain these without records having to be kept. This was evident in Carnarvon when a large number of dog baits were purchased and spread around the town. It was difficult to find where the poisons came from. No evidence could be produced in this respect. It will be interesting to find out whether pharmacists will sell these baits, or whether stock firms will be able to distribute them, as they have done in the past.

As I understand the position, unless a person is five miles or more from the nearest chemist, he will not be able to obtain a special license to sell poisons. These will have to be sold through pharmacists and not registered persons.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not so.

Mr. NORTON: There is one clause in the Bill which contains that provision. Generally speaking the Act seems to cover everything that is required to be covered, and it covers points which have not been covered by legislation previously. The Bill

will make the sale of some drugs considerably more difficult, particularly drugs of addiction which come under the Police Act.

In that regard there is one point on which I would like some clarification from the Minister. Clause 55 (2) states—

> A warrant given under subsection (1) of this section authorises the member of the police force named in the warrant, within one month from the date of the warrant, and with such assistants as may be necessary—
>
> (a) to enter into and upon and search the house or premises . . .

Why should it be necessary to issue a warrant for a month's duration? Surely a member of the Police Force does not require a month to carry out a search! Clause 56 states—

> For the purposes of this Act any person on whose behalf a sale is made is deemed to be the person who sells, and every employee, assistant or apprentice or such person is liable to the like penalties as the person on whose behalf he makes any sale.

One of the employees could quite innocently make a sale on behalf of the pharmacist. The pharmacist could make up a packet containing poisons or drugs, and tell his assistant that when a particular person came in the package was to be handed over. That would be deemed as a sale made by the assistant, although he did so innocently.

Some protection should be provided by which assistants, employees, and apprentices are not linked with the person on whose behalf the sale is made. That provision in the Bill seems to be rather harsh. The package could be sealed and bear no description on the outer wrapper. The assistant might not know what he was asked to do, and he would be innocent of any breach of the Act.

Clauses 46 to 51 are worth-while provisions, because they require the labelling of poisons and various drugs which are harmful, and their use for other purposes is prohibited. All in all, the Bill is a very worth-while measure, and I support the second reading.

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands) [11.16 p.m.]: In supporting the second reading of the Bill I would like to point out to the Minister certain features that are possibly not in accordance with fact. It might be advisable to have a look at one or two matters contained in the Bill. If passed in its present form it could have a great effect on the insecticide manufacturing industry of Australia. I say that, because we must have regard to the fact that most insecticides and sprays being manufactured in Australia, especially for household and domestic use, appear mainly in aerosol form in cans, and they are nationally advertised. They are placed in common canisters and common packages for sale throughout Australia.

Under this Bill certain substances are required to be marked as hazardous substances in Western Australia, when they are not required to be so marked in the other States; and pyrethrum spray has to be nominated as a hazardous substance when it contains up to 10 per cent. pyrethrum, and as a poison when it contains above that percentage. What the Minister is trying to achieve could be undone if we reach the stage where safe substances have to be declared unsafe. If that situation should arise, manufacturers who will not have the advantage of selling their product as a safe product will then attempt to use much cheaper unsafe substances, be they placed in canisters or aerosol spray. They will do that because the unsafe raw material is so much cheaper, and they will not enjoy the advantage of advertising their product as safe. These are not really unsafe substances.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What is this substance?

Mr. OLDFIELD: Pyrethrum. I might point out that pyrethrin—or pyrethrum—is not declared under the schedule to any poisons Act in the world or Eastern Australian States as a poisonous or toxic substance.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not hazardous?

Mr. Craig: Not poisonous?

Mr. OLDFIELD: No. The effect of pyrethrins is to paralyse the lungs of the insect.

Mr. Fletcher: How do you kill the insects—knock them down with the canister?

Mr. OLDFIELD: The effect is rather amazing. I have seen people demonstrating the safety of pyrethrum by spraying the contents of the aerosol canister on a sandwich and eating it. They would not do that with gamma benzene hexachloride, lindane, deildrin, or some of the other well-known pesticides and insecticides.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You wouldn't do it with pyrethrum.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I would. It does not taste too good, but it is harmless. In regard to aerosol spray, people cannot drink the liquid because if the canister is opened the contents immediately evaporate. I understand the manufacturers are not concerned about pyrethrum liquid sprays with a kerosene base. Kerosene is a hazardous substance, but not altogether hazardous; and they use only .09 per cent. pyrethrum in the kerosene base spray. In aerosol insecticides they use .35 per cent. pyrethrum, which is 1/30th below the amount permitted under the Act before it goes from a hazardous substance to the field of poison.

I might mention that it is economically impossible for a manufacturer to use 10 per cent. pyrethrum because an aerosol canister now retailing at 10s. would probably cost something like £5, £6 or £8 owing to the cost of the pyrethrum. I would point out, too, that nowhere in the world does pyrethrum appear in the schedule of a poisons Act as a poison; and when the British Government ruled Kenya, the pyrethrum board of Kenya advertised pyrethrum as a safe non-toxic insecticide material.

In the United States of America the regulations for the enforcement of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act states as follows:—

> Pyrethrum to be acceptable for registration for the usual uses, no precautionary labelling is required on the basis of this ingredient.

This means that in America if you use pyrethrum and it is the only insecticidal ingredient in the insecticide, that product does not need to be labelled poisonous, hazardous, toxic, or anything else. Furthermore, I understand that at the present time in America a Bill is about to be passed which will provide that not only is no precautionary labelling required, but manufacturers will be permitted to label "non-toxic" any insecticide which has pyrethrum as its agent. This means that such a product will be in what they call a special label category.

This is rather significant when one realises that only recently the words "non-toxic" were banned in the United States for use with any insecticide; and it was a blanket ban such as we have had in Western Australia regarding the words "non-poisonous" in relation to any of these products.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I must confess I do not like the term "non-toxic" myself.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I have been informed by those who fully understand the industry that this Bill falsely declares pyrethrum to be a poison. This is done in the sixth schedule, dealing with pyrethrum of more than 10 per cent. which it is not. Pyrethrums, which are completely safe in the porportions they are used are, in this Bill, being grouped with a very toxic or poisonous substance known as gamma benzene hexachloride. That is to say, it is hazardous to human health and not permitted to be used in aerosol insecticides in the U.S.A.

In the United States of America and in Queensland not more than .5 per cent. of gamma benzene hexachloride is permitted to be used in liquid insecticides; and even when less than .5 per cent. is used in a liquid insecticide, the following precautionary wording must appear on the label:—

> Caution—May be absorbed through skin. Avoid inhalation and skin contact. In case of contact wash immediately with soap and water. Avoid contamination of feed and foodstuffs. Do not use on household pets or humans. Harmful if swallowed. Keep out of reach of children.

Here we are treating pyrethrum the same as gamma benzene hexachloride, but in America they distinguish that one does not require precautionary labelling, whereas the other does. However, we are grouping them in the same category, saying that one is as toxic and poisonous as the other.

It is interesting to note that in the United States of America, when they are milling flour for storage, they mix pyrethrum with it to prevent weevil infestation; and they do likewise when stockfood is stored. So if the American people are prepared to mix pyrethrum with flour to be stored—flour that will be later used in bread, for domestic purposes, and for human consumption—they must be certain that it is not a hazardous substance. Therefore I would like the Minister to have a good look at that.

Those who have had experience in the manufacture of pesticides and insecticides feel it is wrong to declare pyrethrum a poison when such is not the case. This is quite opposed to gamma benzene hexachloride, which is most dangerous. Yet they are put on the same footing in the Bill. If the Minister would let his officers have a look at this, possibly they might readily agree to pyrethrums being removed from the Bill when they are being used in quantities of less than .5 per cent. This would enable advertising on a Commonwealth basis that pyrethrum is an ingredient which is harmless to humans. I would point out that troubles did arise in Victoria and Queensland on occasions over the decision as to whether pyrethrum was a toxic or non-toxic substance. However, after much investigation by the Public Health Departments of those States they did acknowledge the fact that pyrethrum does not require special attention and should be classed as "safe."

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Health) [11.30 p.m.]: I would like to thank the two honourable members who spoke on this important Bill, these being the honourable member for Gascoyne and the honourable member for Maylands.

The honourable member for Gascoyne made certain minor criticisms or raised questions about parts of the Bill. One of the principal points concerned dog baits and the strychnine in them. Dog baits are prepared under the guidance of the

Agriculture Protection Board, and any queries regarding the method of sale and distribution of these baits could be directed to the Minister for Agriculture. If any detail were required it could be obtained from the board.

Mr. Norton: It is a direct sale of strychnine.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes; and I would think that it would be necessary for that to be permitted; otherwise it would be impossible to have them dealt with by pharmacists.

Mr. Norton: I am concerned about records being kept.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think a check might be made with the Minister for Agriculture who could determine whether this is so. The honourable member raised the point, on clause 55, as to whether it was necessary for a search warrant to be held for one month before action might be taken. This could be necessary because men might not be available to carry out the search; and on the other hand it might be a deliberate intention to delay a check, awaiting the right time. It is not possible at all times to determine when a search should be undertaken and so the discretion is left to the holder of the search warrant to determine this matter.

The honourable member referred to clause 56 which reads—

> 56. For the purposes of this Act any person on whose behalf a sale is made is deemed to be the person who sells, and every employee, assistant or apprentice of such person is liable to the like penalties as the person on whose behalf he makes any sale.

This is a form of protection and has been deliberately included to ensure that mistakes will not be made or that, by making everyone responsible, mistakes will be minimised. Poisons and poisoning are matters of considerable concern to those who deal in them and to those who are entrusted with public health.

The honourable member for Maylands raised the point in regard to insecticides, and mentioned pyrethin. He wanted me to check to ascertain whether this substance is safe or whether it is properly known as a hazardous substance as named in the Bill in the fifth schedule. I will make inquiries into this matter because it is desirable that as far as possible schedules will be uniform throughout the States.

Mr. Oldfield: The users of it claim that it is not even a hazardous substance. They spray the export fruit with it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will have this checked, because it is desirable to achieve uniformity in the schedules. That is the objective of all the health authorities throughout Australia.

Mr. Oldfield: You agree it would be unfair to declare it a poison or a hazardous substance when it is not?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is what I will endeavour to find out.

Mr. Oldfield: Thank you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If it is as the honourable member says, then an adjustment will undoubtedly be made.

Mr. Oldfield: Thank you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would say that in any case the Bill is so framed that when it becomes law changes can be made to the schedule without any reference to Parliament. It can be done by Executive Council action. Therefore, if these inquiries are delayed or if subsequently any one of the substances—not necessarily pyrethrin—has to be deleted, it can be done by direct representation to the Commissioner of Public Health who will determine whether it should be deleted. The commissioner will seek advice from authorities and, if necessary, from other States or from the National Health Research Council. In any case, the matter can be easily rectified if the situation is as the honourable member says. I reiterate that the Bill and the schedules have been worded so that changes to the schedules will be easy. That is absolutely necessary to ensure the Bill functions properly.

I think it would be appropriate at this stage to pay a tribute to the Pharmaceutical Council which has, over many years, discharged its duties in a highly responsible and ethical manner. It is only in comparatively recent times, with the flood of industrial and agricultural poisons, and poisons for domestic use, over which the council has no control, that this change has been necessitated. I pay tribute to the council for the work it has done.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committtee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 23 put and passed.

Clause 24: Licenses to sell poisons—

Mr. NORTON: I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill, but I wish to seek clarification on a point. It has to do with dog baits. I refer the Minister's attention to subclause (4) (c). Dog baits include more than .2 per cent. of strychnine and, if wrongly used, could be dangerous substances. A person can quite easily buy up to 600 grains of strychnine in tablet form.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will inquire into this matter and will inform the honourable member. It appears to me that

the commissioner may grant licenses to anyone to sell strychnine, and control can be effected according to the prescription laid down by the Commissioner of Public Health. However, I will inquire into the matter.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 25 to 47 put and passed.

Mr. Heal took the Chair

Clause 48: Prohibition against hawking, etc.—

Mr. CROMMELIN: I move an amendment—

> Page 26, line 18—Insert after the word "not" the passage, ", except pursuant to a licence issued by the Commissioner,".

This clause prohibits a person from selling or attempting to sell, or from hawking, peddling, distributing, or causing to be distributed, as a sample any poison in any street or public place or from house to house; and there is a penalty of £50.

There is in this State a local company which manufactures sheep dip and sells this product in competition with similar products from the Eastern States. The clause, as it stands, would prohibit this company from selling its product because it would not be allowed to sell it from house to house, or cause it to be distributed as a sample. Consequently I think it is important that this local company should have the opportunity to compete with the Eastern States, otherwise it will automatically go out of existence. The Bill provides that the commissioner shall have power to issue a license, and I have moved the amendment to enable him to grant the company in question a license so that it can carry on its business.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member for Claremont did make some mention of this amendment to me, and it is one to which I can agree. The way the clause is worded it could prevent what is happening in actual fact today and, from what I have been informed, almost wipe out the worth-while activities of a local company which manufactures sheep dip and distributes it through the country areas. The amendment has been tied in correctly to the clause, and I simply refer to the fact that on page 15, clause 24 states that the commissioner, subject to the Bill, may grant a license to manufacture any poison, to manufacture and distribute or sell by wholesale any poison, and so on. The amendment fits in with that and I think it should be agreed to.

Mr. GAYFER: I should like to ask the Minister, through you, Mr. Deputy Chairman (Mr. Heal), what the distributors of poisons in country towns will be required to do that roving traders will not have to do. We in the country maintain that country tradespeople should be protected and too many concessions should not be given to hawkers who distribute their goods at the farms. Can the Minister tell me what, for instance, the large firm that distributes a lot of sheep dip in the country towns will have to do, and what the hawker will have to do?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The principle thing that will have to be provided by each type will be a sense of responsibility. The license would be granted to these people depending on how they handle their poisonous substances. I think the amendment is desirable to protect a local industry, and it is for that reason I am supporting it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 49 to 64 put and passed.

Appendices A (first to eighth schedules), B, and C put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with an amendment, and the report adopted.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 22nd October, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health):—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [12.1 a.m.]: This amendment to the Police Act is purely complementary to the Bill to amend the Poisons Act which the House has just passed. In the Police Act is contained a list of narcotics and poisons over which the police have more or less control and supervision. The sole purpose of this measure is to amend sections 94A, 94B, 94C, and 94E, all of which relate to the sale and control of narcotics.

As these are now coming under the eighth schedule in the Poisons Act these amendments to the Police Act are necessary, and I support the second reading.

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.

House adjourned at 12.3 a.m. (Wednesday)