

Western Australia will progress satisfactorily. We must aim at increasing the market for our primary products.

Today, we are faced with a slump in the meat industry and, to some extent, a slump in the dairying industry. If we are able to step up industry in Western Australia and bring additional people to the State, then we will provide a market for these products. I ask the Government always to keep this point in mind when framing policies. I support the motion.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

House adjourned at 4.46 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 27th August, 1968

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

CONDOLENCE

The Late Hon. Sir Charles George Latham, Kt.: Motion

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.33 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That this House expresses its deep regret at the death of the Honourable Sir Charles Latham, a former President of the Legislative Council, Minister of the Crown, Leader of the Opposition, and member of the Legislative Assembly, places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious public service, and tenders its profound sympathy to the members of his family in their bereavement.

It is customary for this House to move such a motion upon the death of a former President of the Legislative Council, and on this occasion it is in connection with the death of Sir Charles Latham who had a very long and varied career in the public life.

He was born 86 years ago in England and came to Western Australia as a very young boy. He worked on the land as a farmer for many years, and in 1921 became a member of the Legislative Assembly, representing the York electorate. He was the Minister for Lands and Health in the Mitchell Government, was at one time the Leader of the Opposition, and was also Leader of the Country Party.

In October, 1942, he was elected to the Senate by a Joint Sitting of both Houses of the Western Australian Parliament, and

held the seat until the election in the following year, 1943. Following this he was appointed Deputy Director of the Commonwealth Loans and National Savings Organisation and also recruiting. Sir Charles was a sergeant in the Army in World War I, and was very conscious of military matters.

Three years passed following his appointment as Deputy Director of the Commonwealth Loans and National Savings Organisation, and recruiting, and he won the East Province seat for this Chamber in 1946. In 1948 his public service to the community was recognised, for in that year he was knighted.

When I first entered this House in 1953, having previously served in the Legislative Assembly for a period, I sat next to Sir Charles Latham, where Mr. Fred White now sits; and he was of very great personal assistance to me when I came into this Chamber as a young man. He was elected President of the Legislative Council in 1958 and retired as such, and as a member also, on the 21st May, 1960.

For several years after his retirement from public life he maintained his interest in and contact with Parliament—for as long as his health permitted him to do so. I had the pleasure of seeing him personally but on only rare occasions between 1960 and his death. Sir Charles gave many years of his life to public service as a civilian, as a soldier, and as a member of Parliament; and he was held in very high esteem by both his political supporters and his political opponents.

He will, I am sure, be remembered as a true friend to many people. He leaves two sons, and we extend our very sincere sympathy to the members of his family on his passing.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [4.39 p.m.]: I support the remarks of the Leader of the House in connection with the death of Sir Charles Latham. Words written in books, depicting the achievements of this man during his lifetime, would never do justice to the man himself. He was, in my estimation, a great man in every sense of the word.

He came to this country in humble circumstances. He took up land at a time when it was a most difficult process to win from the land even the most humble living; yet he did so, and in the course of his lifetime was acknowledged as a successful farmer. He spent 35 years of his life serving the interests of the State in either the Legislative Assembly or this Chamber—a truly wonderful record. He was a sincere man—one who adopted his line of politics obviously because of the background he had developed in the formative years of his lifetime when he worked with his hands on and in the land.

He believed fiercely in those people who worked on the land and was always their champion, so much so that I personally have always been impressed by the occasion when he had to defend what he believed in most. He was at his emphatic best on that occasion and was a most capable advocate for the principles in which he believed.

I first saw Sir Charles, in a political sense, in 1927, when I was a young boy. Of the galaxy of the then leaders in Government, this man impressed me most of all. I little knew at that time I would ever have the opportunity or the honour to sit in the same Chamber with him.

In the period when he held the position which you now hold, Mr. President, he carried on the tradition that had been established by Presidents of the past. His great versatility, his great knowledge, and all the years of experience that he had accumulated stood him in good stead in that position. He filled the office of President with dignity and he had a great capacity.

His relatives must remember him with great pride. Those who were close to him must be proud of the very great moments he gave to his family during his lifetime. There are men in this Chamber who have been associated very closely with him over the years and they must be very proud to have had the opportunity of that association.

It was fitting, Mr. President, that he should be knighted; such a man deserves the accolade because of his sheer ability to rise above humble circumstances, to become a leader in the State, and to prove himself of such great value in the political life of the State over the years.

The Mitchell-Latham Government was in office way back in the 1930s—in that terrible period of time; namely, the depression years. The depression must have been one of the most nerve-racking experiences for a Cabinet to go through. However, Sir Charles emerged even from that with greater distinction than when he went into it. It is with great respect that I accept the privilege of being able to support the motion.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North)
[4.43 p.m.]: I desire to be associated with the motion. I knew the late Sir Charles Latham from the early 1930s until his departure from the Parliament a few years ago. I had the privilege of sitting in both Houses of Parliament in the State at the same time as Sir Charles Latham.

I first met Sir Charles when he was Minister for Lands and I was an officer serving under him. It was the time when the initial experiments in connection with cotton and sorghum were being conducted in the Wyndham area. I had the privilege of driving him from Wyndham to Perth

by road in 1931 at a time when roads were really horror stretches—and not the sort of horror stretches which are mentioned today.

At that time, the late Sir Charles was going through the troublous days referred to by my leader, when to farmers the price obtaining for wheat was 1s. per bushel and wool was sold at pence per pound. In those days, hundreds of people were walking off the land.

His contributions in both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council of the State will always be highly regarded by those who remember him. His great worth to the State in those trying years and his later work in the capacity of Leader of the Opposition will be remembered through the records.

Sir Charles Latham was a man who could be wholly trusted, even to the degree of exchanging speech notes with him before the speeches were made. I have for him a very high regard which I have always held. I think it is a great tribute that from a humble Englishman there emerged a very great Australian.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central)
[4.45 p.m.]: I wish to be associated with the remarks made by other speakers on the occasion of the passing of Sir Charles Latham. As the Minister said, he had a very long association with public life in this State. For many years he was closely associated with my late father. I refer to the years from 1921 to 1950 when they were associated in public life in the Parliament and outside. Of course, I was associated with the late Sir Charles Latham from 1950 until 1958. Mr. President, as a member for the same province, you were associated with Sir Charles from 1952 until the time Sir Charles vacated his seat in the House in 1960.

I always found he was a wonderful colleague with whom to work. During his lifetime he did many wonderful things for the State. Mr. Wise mentioned the depression years, around 1931. My memory goes back to one thing he did during those years; that is, he provided for a moratorium on the debts of farmers who could not meet their commitments because of the low prices obtaining for primary products. That was a milestone in his life. It was something he did because he thought it was the right thing to do; and it certainly was the right thing to do. He did what any big-hearted and capable man would do.

I was associated with Sir Charles in other organisations and I found him to be a wonderful gentleman in all respects. For some years he was a member of another place where, also, he was leader of the Country Party. During that time he led the party very well.

We must all sincerely regret his passing and hope that where he is now he will receive his just reward.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [4.48 p.m.]: I would like to add my remarks to those which have already been made in connection with the passing of Sir Charles Latham. I can go back a little further in time than most members—to 1920 when Sir Charles was clearing his land by axe and he employed me as one of his helpers. I will always remember him for trying to obtain assistance from the banks for the people in the Naremburn-Bruce Rock area. He never let up on the fact that, if there was any intention on the part of banks or industries of that day to move out into the country, they had to do it through the farming community, and the farmers were the ones who had to be helped.

At the time I have mentioned we were earning 11s. 6d. per acre for felling trees by axe and clearing the land of salmon gum and gimlet timber. Sir Charles fought to get 21s. per acre.

I particularly wish to be associated with a remark, often expressed publicly as well as privately, by the late Evan Davies. He was speaking about soldiering in France and Sir Charles was in the same group as Evan Davies. He said that of all the soldiers he had ever seen, if ever a man deserved the honour of a V.C. for what he did for and on behalf of his country, it was Sir Charles Latham. I wish to be associated with this motion of condolence to his family.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [4.50 p.m.]: Before asking members to stand to carry this motion, I would like to add a few words of condolence to the sons of my late colleague, Sir Charles Latham. I had many years of association with Sir Charles. I was a very young man serving the industrial cause of the farmers when I first met Sir Charles Latham and our friendship was extremely close over all the years.

As previous speakers have mentioned, his efforts on behalf of those he represented were almost boundless. Some of the acts he performed when he was temporarily acting as Treasurer of this State, as alluded to by Mr. Wise, included an attempt by him to ensure that farmers obtained their superphosphate during the depression years. To achieve this objective he gave a Government guarantee. This was a tremendous act for one man to undertake, but that was the stature of the man. He had a problem, and he knew he had to attend to it. He knew the people he was representing; he knew the State he was representing; and he represented them ably. I ask members please to be upstanding and to carry the motion in silence.

Question passed, members standing.

QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE PERISHABLES

Road Deliveries to the North

1. The Hon. G. W. BERRY asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) During the road closures north of Meekatharra, due to recent heavy rains, was it imperative for perishables to be delivered to Port Hedland and other towns by road?
- (2) Was the food situation as serious as was quoted over the A.B.C. news, both national and State?
- (3) Was there any damage to roads caused by transports making deliveries to the towns?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Large quantities of perishables were already in course of transit by road to the north when roads became closed due to heavy rains. Losses totalling many thousands of dollars would have resulted if delivery could not have been effected.
- (2) A copy of what was said over the A.B.C. news is not to hand, but food supplies were depleted as a result of the holdup in deliveries.
- (3) Under extreme weather conditions the passage of all vehicles causes more than a normal degree of damage to roads, and trucks carrying perishables would have contributed towards this.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES

State Representation

2A. The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister inform the House how many times the State has been represented at Commonwealth Parliamentary conferences as follows:—

- (a) General conferences overseas by—
 - (i) members of the Legislative Council;
 - (ii) members of the Legislative Assembly;
- (b) Australian area conferences; by—
 - (i) members of the Legislative Council;
 - (ii) members of the Legislative Assembly?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) (i) 2.
- (ii) 12.
- (b) (i) 6.
- (ii) 15.

PARLIAMENTARY STUDY TOURS AND CONFERENCES

Attendances by Members

2B. The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Mines:

How many study tours, parliamentary courses, or other conferences or activities have been attended, by—

- (i) members of the Legislative Council;
- (ii) members of the Legislative Assembly?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
Study tours since commencement 1966—

(i) Nil.

(ii) 3.

Parliamentary courses, Westminister.—

(i) Nil.

(ii) 2.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Class Enrolments

3. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it a fact that in 1965 primary school headmasters were instructed to see that no class had an enrolment exceeding 45 pupils?

Year	Contracts Let		Private Architects			Departmental		
	No.	Value	No.	Value	Percentage of Total Value	No.	Value	Percentage of Total Value
		\$		\$			\$	
1961-62	280	8,031,868	32	1,661,180	20.7	248	6,370,688	79.3
1962-63	286	9,320,972	65	4,113,182	44.1	219	5,207,790	55.9
1963-64	272	23,830,878	110	(a) 10,769,584	45.2	162	(b) 13,061,294	54.8
1964-65	272	14,269,352	95	5,261,714	36.0	177	9,007,638	63.1
1965-66	241	8,857,653	78	5,885,016	59.8	163	3,971,742	40.2
1966-67	299	14,203,612	122	7,403,510	52.1	177	6,800,102	47.9
1967-68	304	19,833,569	133	6,749,569	34.0	171	(c) 13,184,000	66.0
Total	1,954	99,397,909	635	41,844,655	42.1	1,317	57,553,254	57.9

(a) Includes Government offices (\$4,700,000 approximately).

(b) Includes Bunbury and Geraldton Regional Hospitals (\$2,600,000 approximately and \$2,900,000 approximately).

(c) Includes Northam Regional Hospital (\$3,800,000 approximately).

BEER DRINKING

Survey by Dr. Tofler

5. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Health:

Will the Minister make available the findings of a survey of Perth beer drinkers made by a team led by Dr. O. B. Tofler of the Department of Cardiology, Royal Perth Hospital?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:
Dr. Tofler's findings are in the process of publication.

- (2) If the answer to (1) is "No," what was the policy of the Education Department regarding maximum size of classes at that time?

- (3) What is the present policy regarding maximum enrolment of primary school classes?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) A progressive reduction towards an average class size of 40 pupils.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Number Constructed and Cost

4. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) For each of the years 1959-1962, 1962-1965, and 1965-1968, what was the total number and the total cost of public buildings constructed under the supervision of—

(a) Architectural Branch of the Public Works Department; and

(b) private architects?

- (2) Could any indication be given of the various classes of such buildings referred to in (1)—schools, hospitals, police courts, etc.?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2)

COAL MINERS' WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st August.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [5.1 p.m.]: This Bill is, basically, a validating measure for things which have occurred—some of which were outside the scope of the original Coal Miners' Welfare Act—in that originally the Act sought to provide amenities for Western Australian coalminers only. The fund is operated by a board, and under the Act it

is not possible to cater for other than coalminers. Over the years I think this has been found to be impracticable in all circumstances, and there has been a gradual increase in the activities of the board, particularly on a welfare basis, to the point that people other than coalminers have benefited—through their residence in the township—from some of the amenities with which the board has been associated.

It is logical to expect that dependants of miners should participate in amenities which are provided for the general benefit of the miners, and indeed the people residing in a town—whilst not necessarily being miners themselves, but being closely affiliated with the miners and with the work that goes on in the town—should also participate.

The Bill seeks to give retrospective authority to the board to validate anything which it might have done, and which could be considered as doubtful, under its authority, and to give it authority in the future to do the things which it wants to do in the exercise of its powers.

There is mention in the Bill of the provision of a home for aged people, and this will be run in association with the Silver Chain Nursing Association. I understand this institution will be operated as an incorporated body. This is quite a big project, the cost of which will total in the vicinity of \$100,000. The welfare board will participate in the provision of this home to some extent, but not to the sole extent. The home will also be provided with a considerable contribution from the Commonwealth; and there will also be some money available from the funds raised by the Collie people themselves.

Under the circumstances, the board will have at heart the general welfare of the town, the miners, and those associated with the miners. Those people, I am sure, will give their approval to this legislation, not only from the aspect of validating the actions of the board, but also because of the board's desire to erect a home which will prove of great benefit to the aged.

I sound a note of warning in respect of this legislation. A tendency could develop whereby too great a call would be made on the welfare board, by expecting it to participate in the provision of very many of the facilities which are the responsibility of semi-governmental authorities, and which are so badly needed in many country towns. This aspect should be guarded against, even though in the extension of amenities, the building of swimming pools is very desirable, and the provision of playing fields is very necessary. However,

the cost of provision could be laid disproportionately on the welfare board, in asking it to come to the party when projects of this type are commenced. I do not say that will happen; I merely make the statement that it could happen. I realise that provision is made in the parent Act for all such proposals to be submitted to the Minister, and in that respect there is a safeguard.

Nevertheless, the project envisaged in the Bill before us is a large and comprehensive one involving, as I have said, \$100,000. Projects as big as this one, whilst they are necessary to the community, should not become the rule. The capacity of the board to move in directions of welfare should be watched closely, in association with the finance it controls. So far as the Bill itself is concerned, I offer it my support.

THE HON. T. O. PERRY (Lower Central) [5.7 p.m.]: I also rise to support the Bill. It will be the means of enabling the Coal Miners' Welfare Board to set aside certain funds for the building of an aged people's home in Collie. Over the years the welfare fund has been built up out of the funds contributed by the coal-mining companies—Amalgamated Collieries and the Griffin Coalmining Company. Funds have been allocated towards the cost of the swimming pool at Collie, towards the miners' institute, and towards the infant health clinic; and certain sporting bodies have received financial help from this board.

It is now proposed to allocate funds for the building of an aged people's home, so that the people who have lived in Collie all their lives may retire amongst their friends and relatives; instead of having to leave the district to receive care in an aged persons' home in the metropolitan area or elsewhere. In future the aged people of the Collie district will be able to enjoy the company of their friends and relatives. The cause is a worth-while one, and I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.8 p.m.]: Briefly in thanking Mr. Willesee and Mr. Perry for their support of this Bill I should say there was, in the first instance, a slight tendency on the part of the board to overload its commitments, with a good purpose in mind. It wanted to assist, and in my opinion would have over-committed itself.

When the representatives of the board saw me by way of deputation I pointed out that the course of action it was proposing to take would not attract any Commonwealth subsidy. I suggested that

it should not load the fund for a long period, and thus earmark a very large percentage of its earnings for that purpose.

I suggested another course of action; that was, the board should set aside some of its income for the proposal it had in mind, but it should also request the local people to raise some of the money. I understand they have now raised \$10,000, and this amount will attract \$20,000 from the Commonwealth. The board is well on the way to providing something which it can capably handle, leaving some of its income for other purposes.

As far as I am concerned the board will expect me to keep a watch, to ensure that the proposals it puts up are sensible ones. The first proposal it has embarked on, the subject of this amending Bill, is of distinct advantage to the people of the district who will benefit from the home when it is erected.

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.

ILLICIT SALE OF LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st August.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [5.12 p.m.]: As the Minister explained, this is a very simple and a small Bill which intends to double the penalties for illicit trading in liquor; or as the Minister said, for running sly-grog premises.

The existing penalties were introduced way back in 1913—or 55 years ago—in the days when our parents were paid in sovereigns, half sovereigns, silver coins, and copper coins; and when the pound note bore a promise to exchange to the value in gold on presentation of the note. Today the position is quite different, and the dollar note reminds me of the shin plaster I used to see in Derby many years ago.

The object of the Bill is to increase the penalties for illicit dealing in liquor, or for having liquor for sale on unlicensed premises. For a first offence, the increase in the fine is from \$100 to \$200; and for a second offence from \$400 to \$800. At present the penalty for a first offence is a fine of \$100 or three months' imprisonment; and for a second offence a fine of \$400 or 12 months in gaol. The terms of imprisonment have not been altered, but the fines have been doubled.

I do not think anyone can raise an objection to the penalties being increased particularly—as the Minister for Police

pointed out—as during the past 12 months something like 24 convictions were recorded against night club proprietors who were dealing in liquor. We were told the persons concerned were convicted and fined substantial amounts.

I take it that the term “substantial amount” means the full penalty of \$100. I point out that increasing the penalty from \$100 to \$200 does not mean the court will fine a person the full amount of \$200. That is the maximum which can be imposed as a penalty.

I see no objection to amending this section of the Act. In fact, only one section of the Act is affected by this amending Bill. I would draw the Minister's attention to the definition of “premises.” The Act says that any person who sells liquor, or has liquor for sale in or about any premises, shall be deemed to be unlawfully dealing in liquor within the meaning of the Act.

The definition of “premises” is as follows:—

“Premises” includes any house, shop, booth, shed, tent, stall, or place, and extends to every room, closet, cellar, yard, stable, out-house, or any other place whatsoever, belonging to, or in any manner appertaining to such house or place, and also includes a ship, vessel, or boat.

Since the Act was framed, aircraft have come into the picture. I am not too sure but aircraft might be covered under the heading of motor vehicles. They might be, and they might not be; but the Minister could check that point. Somebody could fly into an area with an aeroplane loaded with liquor, open up, and start to sell that liquor. Perhaps the Minister could look into that aspect to see whether such a person would come under the provisions of the Act. I support the Bill.

THE HON. C. E. GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [5.17 p.m.]: I wish to make a few comments on the Bill. It would probably be one of the tiniest Bills I have seen since I have been in Parliament. I wonder why we have to take the steps proposed in the Bill, and why it is necessary for a measure such as this to be introduced.

The Minister stated that it is necessary to introduce this sort of legislation because the present penalties are not sufficient to serve the purpose for which they were provided. I have read all the debates which took place in 1913, when the principal Act was introduced, and I then read the Minister's speech in which he suggested we should do that anyway.

I agree that some rather interesting speeches were made in 1913. After reading those speeches, one of the conclusions I came to was that everybody who spoke

to the measure in those days supported it in its original form. However, the main reason that everybody supported the Bill—and one of the main reasons for its introduction—was not that the illicit sale of liquor was necessarily interfering with the business of publicans, and those who ran licensed premises, but the fact that the sly-groggers were not content just to sell liquor without a license; they started to manufacture it themselves. Mention was made of the fact that the illicit sale of liquor was interfering with the business of licensed people, but not a great deal of stress was laid on that point by anybody except the Colonial Secretary, and he mentioned it only briefly. Any resemblance which sly grog had to the liquor sold on licensed premises was purely coincidental.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The effects were the same.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The effects were worse because, as the Minister has already explained, some of the drinkers finished up in homes for the insane, and many others ended up in gaols and in hospitals as a result of the various concoctions being sold.

It is very interesting to read, in the *Hansard* of the day, how people selling illicit liquor went about in old drays and carts, and pulled up at the various work camps in the timber country, and on the goldfields of this State. They employed many different methods to get rid of their liquor.

The Minister made some reference to the fact that the prevalence of sly-grogging is just as serious today as it was in those days. That could be so, but I do not think the positions are comparable because the people who sell liquor illegally today at least are selling the same sort of liquor as the licensed premises. They are not selling concoctions which they themselves make; at least, I do not think so.

However, I do not think this is what we are worrying about. Some people are selling the right sort of liquor, but at the wrong time and in premises from which society does not want the liquor sold. I think this is a different kettle of fish from the problem which existed in the days when this legislation was first introduced. The main purpose of the original legislation was to overcome the manufacture and sale of weird and wonderful "jungle juices."

I thought it was rather humorous to read in *Hansard* of how the sly-groggers worked, and I think one instance is worth repeating. One character, with his horse and dray, used to go once a month to a workman's camp in the timber country. He used to stop in the bush a little way from the camp and fire a shot. This was the signal to the workers that he was there and was ready for business. Of course, the workers would flock to that

spot and consume the liquor to their own detriment, and to the detriment of their families. Generally, after spending several hours drinking the liquor, they spent a couple of days in bed, and some even had to go to hospital.

Not only did the families suffer, but the employers also suffered, because they did not have enough men to do the work. I thought it was rather funny that the sly-grogger used to fire a gun into the air as a signal that, "She was on."

The Minister has suggested that he is sure the situation has not been overcome, and I am just as sure that the Act has achieved what the original legislators intended it to do. I say that because nowhere today is "home brew," or this sort of concoction, sold to the detriment of the health and sanity of the people. At least, I do not know of any instances. I feel that the Act has certainly served its purpose.

However, a new problem has arisen—if we can call it a problem—which is, perhaps, as serious as the original one. I would say that the selling of liquor in night clubs and other places—which have been referred to—by people who do not have licenses is possibly a serious problem. I certainly do not condone anybody breaking the law.

In 1913, when the Colonial Secretary referred to the reasons for the introduction of the legislation he said, amongst other things, that since the passing of the Licensing Act in 1911 the incidence of sly-grogging, and of people carrying on that sort of activity, had increased. This makes me think that perhaps the licensing laws themselves are one of the reasons for having to increase the penalties in this legislation. The Colonial Secretary suggested in 1913 that the licensing laws, as they existed in those days, were one of the reasons for the introduction of the original Bill.

The *West Australian* newspaper has some fairly strong views on this matter, as we can see from the leading article of Monday, the 26th August. I agree with some of the comments; I disagree with others. However I make the point here and now that I do not agree with the contention that the drinking age should be altered. I will not have any part of that, and I do not think that altering the drinking age will overcome the problem at all.

The newspaper did mention that the extension of trading hours for restaurants from 12.30 a.m. to some other time would probably stop some people breaking the law. I think there is a great deal of merit in that suggestion, and perhaps we could give some thought to it.

If people in the licensed restaurants are some of the law-breakers—and I am not suggesting they are—and are selling liquor

after 12.30 a.m., I think the same situation should apply to them as applies to the proprietors of restaurants or night clubs which are not licensed to sell liquor. My argument is that liquor can only be sold to people who want to buy it. If people want to buy liquor, and they are over the age of 21 years, for the life of me I cannot see why they should not be able to buy it.

I cannot see any difference at all between my having a drink—if I wanted it—at 12.30 a.m. and 1.30 a.m., or 2.30 a.m. I am wondering whether we should not try to overcome the cause of the problem, and not necessarily increase the penalty.

I had an occasion recently—together with some associates of mine—to entertain a visitor from Sydney. We had to take him to a restaurant for a meal, and to discuss some business. The restaurant happened to be licensed premises and, quite frankly, that did not make any difference to me. I did not choose the restaurant, but, co-incidentally, it happened to be licensed.

Some of the people in the party were having an occasional drink of some liquor. We were having a discussion when suddenly those who were partaking of liquor decided to order some more. They were told that they could no longer drink liquor on the premises. It did not make much difference to me, but some of the group thought that as they could not get any more liquor there was no purpose in continuing the discussion on those particular premises. Then, for that or some other reason, they decided to go somewhere else. So where did they go? They went back to the hotel where one of the group was staying and the business discussions were continued at that hotel; and some of the members of the group who wanted it were served liquor at the hotel.

They could have continued drinking at the hotel all night had they so desired, or certainly until they had finished their discussions. That shows how absurd the position is. These fellows were drinking liquor on licensed premises but, at a certain time, they were refused further service in the way of liquor. But they were able to go to some other place and they could have continued drinking there for as long as they wished. This hotel was in the heart of the city and the discussions were continued at that hotel.

Now it is proposed to overcome the problem by doubling the fines. Apparently this proposal is designed to stop the proprietors of licensed premises from selling liquor, either in the bottle or in glass, after hours.

During the course of the debate in 1913 somebody suggested that the fine should not be \$100 for the first offence but that it should be \$200. The section in the Act provides for a fine of \$100 or three months' gaol, or both, or something like that; but in 1913 one member suggested that the penalty should be \$200 and six months'

gaol. He did not suggest that it should be a fine of \$200 or six months' gaol, but that it should be \$200 and six months' gaol. However, that proposal was not accepted. But now, after 55 years, we have decided that we will overcome the problem by going at least halfway along the road suggested by that honourable member in 1913, and we propose to increase the fine to \$200.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That honourable member could have been a wowsler.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not know what he was. I am not particularly concerned, one way or the other, whether people go to licensed premises and continue to drink after 12 o'clock. It would not concern me if the licensed premises to which I have referred were closed down; and it would not worry me if the brewery were closed.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: You speak for yourself.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am speaking for myself.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: We would need a lot of money to build a waterworks if we were to close the brewery down.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The Minister suggested that as there have been 24-odd convictions since the 1st July, 1967, we could assume—

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There have been more than that.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS:—that the penalties at present provided are not a sufficient deterrent. That assumption is reasonable enough, but I wonder—and had I been given more time I would have put a question on the notice paper, but no doubt the Minister will be able to answer me when replying to the debate—how many of the 24-odd people who were convicted were given the maximum penalty provided for in the Act. In other words, how many of them received three months' gaol for the first offence, and how many of them received 12 months', or whatever the Act stipulates for a second or subsequent offence?

If not one of these people was given the maximum penalty, how can we assume that the penalties now provided for in the Act are not a sufficient deterrent? Members of Parliament do not impose the penalties. They legislate and stipulate the penalties, but it is the magistrates who, in their wisdom, impose the penalties. In this regard, I differ from Mr. Strickland. The way I read the Act the fine for a first offence is \$100—no more and no less. Perhaps the Minister could tell me whether I am right or wrong.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think your knowledge of the law is as lamentable as your reading of the Bill!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am asking the Minister. He does not have to be as sarcastic as he usually is. I am asking him whether I am right or wrong. Obviously I can assume, from the manner in which he answered my question, that I am wrong. However, I shall surprise the Minister; strange as it may appear, I intend to support the Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would have fooled us.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: If the Minister thinks I will stand up in this House, because he tells me to get up, and say "Yes" to every little thing the Minister said in his speech, he has another think coming. I do not intend to do that. I can be as nasty as anybody else can.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure of that.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Of course the Minister is sure of it. I am trying to speak to the Bill in an objective way and I have been asking whether it is necessary to increase the penalties in the Act under discussion.

If the present penalties do not provide a sufficient deterrent it means that one or the other is happening: The law is wrong or the penalties are not sufficient. Therefore I believe I am perfectly justified in suggesting that perhaps something in the law may not be correct or proper in the light of present-day requirements. I certainly do not want to get hot under the collar about this matter, and I believe the Minister will adequately handle the situation when he replies to the debate. He will certainly go to great lengths to tell me where I am off the beam, and I bow to his better judgment on the matter.

I support the Bill for the simple reason that people are breaking the present law and I do not condone that. If the Minister believes that the amendments will be the means of stopping people from breaking the law, then I certainly support them. However, I hope some thought will be given to the points I have brought forward. I support the Bill.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [5.40 p.m.]: This Bill intrigues me, too, but I have to agree with the second reading speech of the Minister so far as the intentions of the legislation are concerned.

There was a distinct reference in the Minister's introductory speech to night clubs and the statement was made that the proprietors of these establishments are purchasing liquor for resale. In other words, the liquor is being sold illegally—the proprietors are engaging in sly-grogging. However, with the 24-odd convictions, how many of those concerned were breaking the law in a flagrant manner? Were they just the unlucky ones who were

caught? I ask this question because, as Mr. Clive Griffiths said, if a person is denied liquor in one premises he will go somewhere else to obtain it. In the instance quoted by Mr. Griffiths, those concerned went to a hotel where one of their number was staying, and because he was a house guest he could be supplied with liquor.

However, I decided to speak to the Bill because of certain discussions I had with a group of young people last Sunday. These young lads discussed the question with me and a couple of them are old enough to drink legally. In the past 12 months or so, they have been going to various night clubs and, as is the case with hotels, young people under age are served with liquor with no questions asked. In the case of the night clubs I refer to instances where groups take their own liquor and pay a corkage fee for service received. They hand the liquor over to one of the attendants and it is stored in a storeroom or a refrigerator at the back of the premises.

I suggest to the Minister that perhaps the liquor branch could make some investigation into this aspect because I believe that some of the night club proprietors are getting extra liquor for sale, or resale, through young people leaving it behind when they go. Let us take an extreme case and say that a group took a dozen bottles of beer to a night club. They might use seven bottles, and they pay corkage on the liquor used. When they decide to leave they probably forget all about the other bottles they had and they leave them behind. These the proprietor of a night club can sell at a premium price. I draw the Minister's attention to this matter because I believe it is a common practice.

As I have said, I believe the liquor branch could investigate the matter to find out where those who are sly-grogging—if that is the term to use—are purchasing their bulk supplies. I know one can buy a fairly large quantity of liquor from a gallon licensee but maybe the people to whom we have been referring are purchasing their supplies from the brewery or from liquor merchants, and these sources could supply information to the liquor branch.

I am not altogether happy about supporting an increase in penalties; because, like Mr. Clive Griffiths, from what I have read in the Press I do not believe the fines that have been imposed have been anywhere near the maximum provided for in the Act. I still believe there are other ways of handling the problem, either by amendments to the Licensing Act, or, if people are conducting unlicensed premises, we can do something within the provisions of the Health Act to close them down.

THE HON. G. E. D. BRAND (Lower North) [5.44 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on this amending Bill; and at

the outset let me say that I support the measure wholeheartedly, but perhaps from a different angle from the one mentioned so far.

I did not realise how venomous the business of illicit liquor could be; as a matter of fact I was not particularly interested in the matter until one evening I had a discussion with a detective. There had been a robbery in South Perth and I rang the detective office and a young detective whom I knew was sent out on the job. After he had either caught the robber, or had made sure that he was not in the neighbourhood, we had a discussion as to what was happening to the young people of Perth as a result of their being supplied with liquor by illicit sellers.

This young officer wanted me to accompany him in the police car one night—I daresay that would have been all right, because I was a member of Parliament at the time—when he said he would show me just what was happening, and what could happen to the youngsters of Perth who obtained illicit liquor from these places while they were under age. The liquor they obtain is not always the right sort of liquor either. He said he would show me what happened to these young fellows on their nights out on the weekend; even on Sunday. He said frankly he was worried.

The officer in question was a young fellow, and I daresay he had done his fair share of drinking during his life. I was astounded at the very grave consequences to which young people are subjected by being sold illicit liquor.

Mr. Griffiths was worried about people who make their own beer. Some of this beer is quite palatable. I have been told by a chemist who works in a brewery that the art is not confined to the making of the beer; keeping the cork on the bottle is equally important. If the cork is not kept on the bottle one does not have any beer.

When the police visit the night clubs all they can do is watch the youngsters dancing and drinking; they cannot take any action. I daresay, however, if these young fellows leave a night club drunk they are probably put in charge. I do not know whether the police are permitted to enter night clubs now, or whether they are able to do anything about the young people drinking at these places.

Another thought which occurs to me is that if the hotels are closed and the normal source of supply of bottles is thus cut off, invariably one of the young fellows seems to know where he can obtain liquor. This of course is breaking the law. They should have all the bottles they need for the occasion; like the Boy Scouts, they should be prepared.

Most of the difficulties in connection with the sale of illicit liquor are caused by our liquor laws being completely out

of date, and out of line with those which exist in other parts of the world. I recall Mr. Dick Burt mentioning this fact on his return from a world trip. He said that overseas it was possible to obtain liquor at any time of the night and, as a result, one did not get drunk quite so quickly.

I daresay all these aspects are being kept in mind by the department concerned, but I suppose the problems will continue until such time as we establish sensible drinking laws, similar to those that exist in other countries.

Another feature of these night clubs which appals me is something which came to light a short while ago. I refer to the practice adopted by the staff and proprietors of draining the contents of the glasses and bottles and presenting them to customers when they ask for liquor. This is a dreadful thing, and it should be stamped out. With those few remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Justice) [5.49 p.m.]: This has been an interesting debate, and once again the point is proved that whenever an amendment is introduced to any law relating to licensing it usually brings forth quite a deal of discussion.

Mr. Strickland raised the point of an aircraft bringing in a load of liquor and depositing it somewhere, and the principals setting forth to sell that liquor. I think this situation would be covered, because the aircraft would have to put down before the sale of liquor could take place. We will probably find that the word "premises" might cover the situation in the event of anybody wishing to sell liquor from an aircraft.

We listened to a very interesting dissertation from Mr. Griffiths. He told us how he started off in a night club, and because his party could not obtain any alcohol after certain hours it was necessary for them to move to another place where they could obtain alcohol to enable them to continue with their deliberations.

This is not strictly correct. His party did not have to move; they moved because they wanted to; they moved because, according to the law, they could not obtain any more liquor from the place at which they started their deliberations. Mr. Griffiths said it is the smallest Bill he has seen and, consequently, I had hoped that his speech might possibly be the smallest speech he has made; but that was not to be the case.

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: You want me to do that all the time.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want the honourable member to follow my dictates, and I have never suggested that. If that were done we would cut short quite a deal of entertainment which is provided from time to time.

If we look at the title of the Bill we will find it is an Act to amend the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is what it is for.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Exactly. If members refer to section 2 of the Act they will find the definition of "licensed premises." Section 3 of the Act provides—

Any person who—

(a) sells liquor; or

(b) has liquor for sale in, on, or about any premises . . .

and who is not licensed in accordance with sub-paragraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) breaks the law.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Anybody who is unlicensed breaks the law in any case.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is just what I am saying. We must start with that premise in mind. Admittedly this law was enacted a long time ago for the purpose of offering a deterrent in relation to sly-groggers; people who were not permitted, in fact, to sell liquor within the meaning of the law. Such people were selling liquor and breaking the law, and that situation obtains today.

I am not sure about this, but I do not think that today there is much manufacture of the type of liquor to which Mr. Griffiths referred, because liquor is now more readily available from the manufacturers. When the legislation was placed on the Statute book in 1913 liquor was much harder to come by and there was not the same extent of manufacture as there is today.

The fact remains that the law provides, by a process of licenses, for certain people to sell liquor. The newspaper suggests that I could overcome this difficulty by encouraging everybody to become licensed. I suppose I could discourage a number of heinous crimes by removing them as crimes from the Statute book. I have never read so much nonsense in my life.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Having made this suggestion, the article in the newspaper then says it is impracticable to carry it out. But people read this material and some of them take notice of what is said. I do not think it becomes the leader writers of newspapers to write this sort of thing for people to read; to accuse me on the one hand of having a narrow mind and at the same time write this sort of article for public consumption. Some leader writers should inform themselves a bit more on the point before they seek to criticise.

Mr. Griffiths raised the point of the penalty of \$200 for a first offence; or for any subsequent offence after a previous conviction, \$800, or imprisonment with hard labour for 12 months, or both.

These are maximum, not minimum penalties. If it were a minimum penalty, the words, "minimum penalty" would be used. As I have said it is a maximum penalty left to the discretion of the court to impose.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: In a money sense what is the relative value of the fine today?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The extent of the increase in fine is not in equal proportion to the depreciated value of money today; not by any means. But the magistrates and the judges take their lead from what is done by Parliament; and the magistrates will interpret the passage of this legislation in such a manner as to feel that Parliament regards seriously the offence of sly-grogging or the sale of illicit liquor.

Where a magistrate previously saw fit to impose fines, according to the circumstances, of \$100 and \$400, he will now, according to the circumstances impose fines of \$200 and \$800; and he will take into consideration Parliament's feelings on this matter.

We are all entitled to drink liquor in certain licensed premises under certain conditions. Apart from this we are also permitted, if we so desire, to take our alcohol to private premises, cafe premises, or a night club, and have it served to us. Some of the people who run these night clubs charge what is referred to as corkage. This is a fee which the owner of the premises charges for taking the cork out of the bottle and for providing the glasses necessary to serve the drink to the customers. I think it is reasonable that a corkage fee should be charged for the services rendered, as long as the fee is within bounds.

I am not accustomed to frequenting these places, but we then reach the point—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You had me curious. I wondered how you managed to get that corkage bit so pat.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I read about it in the newspaper. If the corkage fee is reasonable I think it is all right. There are cases, however, where I understand the corkage fee is most unreasonable, but there is, nevertheless, no law controlling this aspect.

The type of person whom the amendments in the Bill seek to control is the person who goes out and gets a supply of liquor from some source or other for the purpose of selling it to customers, and thereby breaking the law. Such a person sells liquor in an illicit manner; it is against the law, and no matter what he

charges for it he is still breaking the law. I understand some of the charges are pretty high.

As I explained during my second reading speech, the profits from this sort of business are apparently so great that the fine of \$100 or imprisonment provided in the Act is not sufficient to deter people from carrying on in this way. This Bill is presented with the idea of asking Parliament to double the penalty in order that magistrates may be able to impose upon offenders a larger penalty than is now possible under the Act.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It provides for a larger financial penalty, but it does not alter the term of imprisonment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The term of imprisonment has not been altered, because when considering this matter we felt that whilst money values have changed, the value of time has not.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It would cost more money to keep people in prison.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have heard a number of comments about that, and if the honourable member does not mind I will not enter into the matter whilst dealing with this Bill. Perhaps I might have something to say about it a little later.

I am pleased with the support the Bill has received. I do not think it is a very momentous Bill in its presentation or in its result. I was also pleased to hear my colleague, Mr. Griffiths, support the Bill at the end of his remarks. At first I was not sure whether he was going to support it.

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: I prefaced my remarks by saying I was going to support it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am glad of that. I thank members for their support of the measure.

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.

Sitting suspended from 6.4 to 7.30 p.m.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st August.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [7.30 p.m.]: This is a very short Bill, as was explained by the Minister, but it was surprising to find it is so necessary. Apparently the provisions in the Cremation Act do not tally with the provisions in the Cemeteries Act. As the Minister explained, the Cremation Act contains no

definition of a dead human body and consequently doubt has arisen as to whether or not it is lawful to dispose of the remains of a stillborn child. A recent amendment to the legislation concerning births, deaths, and marriages has accentuated the position and the amendment in this Bill is merely to bring the provisions of the principal Act into line with those in the Cemeteries Act.

Looking through the Bill, my first thought was that as it contains so simple an amendment, it was a pity we could not make it merely a matter of administration. However, on second thoughts I decided it was best that it be presented to Parliament because the Minister, in his short introduction, gave an explanation which was very clear to everyone. He said—

The Cremation Act has a somewhat similar framework, but does not contain a definition of a dead human body, nor does it draw a line below which it is lawful to dispose of the remains of a stillborn child . . .

The Minister then emphasised that whilst this legislation would produce uniformity between the two Acts, a relative could, under the Act as it stands, bury the body of an infant of less than the prescribed gestation period. Therefore the Minister's explanation elicited the fact that there is nothing at all to prevent a parent from taking action in his own right in this matter.

As the Cemeteries Act and the Cremation Act are so closely allied I am wondering whether perhaps this would not be the opportune time to combine the two into one Act with a joint title. We would then obviate any future necessity to correct any slight imbalance which might exist between the two pieces of legislation. There may be some reason why this cannot be done, but I offer the suggestion in view of the necessity for this Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [7.36 p.m.]: I rise purely and simply to answer the last small query of the Leader of the Opposition and, incidentally, to thank him for his comments.

Probably Mr. Willesee is quite right and the possibility of the two Acts being combined has been overlooked. I think the original reason for the two pieces of legislation was that the Cremation Act did until recently concern the Commissioner of Public Health. Members might recall that last year or the year before an amendment was made to obviate the necessity for the commissioner to give a certificate if any ashes had to be removed. I think the certificate was necessary in the past because of the old methods of incineration. These were rather crude and a health risk was involved. I am only guessing, but I would say that this was why the matter

came under the Health Act. It was only a year or two ago that legislation was introduced to remove the necessity for the issuance of a certificate. We now have more efficient methods of incineration.

All this being so, I think the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition is well worthy of investigation, and I will have one carried out forthwith.

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.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 21st August.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [7.40 p.m.]: Although this Bill contains only three simple amendments to the principal Act it involves a very important principle which was referred to when the legislation was originally introduced in 1962, and also by the Minister in his second reading speech on this occasion. It has become a principle that we must regard mental ills in the same light as we regard physical ills; and the amendments in this Bill are to bring about uniformity with regard to admissions and discharges from mental institutions and those with regard to general hospitals.

If I indicate just what conditions are required for admission to a general hospital, members will see how the two can be lined up. Regulation 10 of the regulations governing admissions to general hospitals provides as follows:—

No patient except maternity cases shall be admitted to the hospital unless ordered by a medical practitioner. Provided that in cases of emergency, the matron may admit any patient to the hospital but such cases shall be referred to a medical practitioner as early as possible after admission.

The Act provides that in the case of informal admissions, they can be made on the recommendation of the superintendent of a mental institution or of a psychiatrist. The only difference between the admission of patients to a mental institution and the admission of patients to a general hospital is that under the Act the admission or discharge of a mental patient requires an application in writing on a prescribed form.

By removing this provision, uniformity is obtained between admissions to and discharges from general hospitals and mental institutions. I agree with this principle.

I would like to clear up a couple of points, for the information of members. Part IV of the Act contains seven divisions, some dealing with admissions, and the others dealing with other relevant aspects, such as discharges. The only division with which we are concerned is division 1 which deals with informal admissions. Such admissions are involved when a relative or some other person desires a patient to be admitted. In these circumstances, provided the superintendent or a practising psychiatrist agrees, a patient can be admitted. The patients have what is called status one. Ample provision is made for patients with other statuses, such as admission by referral or admission following a reception order by a magistrate or Government official. Such admissions are not covered by status one.

I consider the legislation is desirable. It does make me wonder, because when the present Act was introduced the Minister said that the measure was drafted with the consideration that admission to a mental hospital should be similar as far as possible to admission to a general hospital, which is exactly the same reason the Minister now gives for bringing forward these amendments; that is, to bring the position into line.

Another peculiar thing which I noticed when I looked through the debate on the measure when it was introduced initially was that neither in the case of section 27 nor section 51, which are being amended now, was there any comment from members who took part in the debate. It was a very thorough debate, yet they overlooked this principle.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If they did not overlook a few, we would have very little work to do.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Now, of course, the Government is bringing it into line. I agree with the proposed amendments and support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (North-East Metropolitan) [7.47 p.m.]: Mr. President, I think I should say something on this Bill. All members are aware of my interest in mental health and it gives me the utmost pleasure to speak about a progressive point. The suggested amendments should make us feel happy instead of the way we used to feel about mental health.

I would like to pay a compliment, too, to Dr. Ellis and the officers of the Mental Health Services at Claremont. We were lucky to get a man of the ability of Dr. Ellis to come to this State and make the vast changes which have been made. I am well aware that the head of any service cannot make changes unless he has the Government behind him, and I pay a tribute to the Minister at this point. Claremont is very different now from what it used to be when I went there in the

past in an endeavour to get children out or to improve their conditions in some way. It is so very different now that it is difficult to believe such a metamorphosis could come about.

I met Dr. Ellis in Melbourne when I was doing my world survey into mental health, epilepsy, and other matters. At that time he struck me as being a very progressive man. I will mention a simple point, but it will serve to show how one can take notice and draw conclusions. In one of the homes I went to in Melbourne all the little boys were wearing different coloured guernseys instead of the usual issue of grey ones. The guernseys were dyed on the premises and the boys were very neatly dressed.

The children in one section were suffering from weak legs and arms. There were bicycles of every shade and size for the children who used to squabble continuously through wanting to use them. However, while they were doing that they were exercising their legs but previously the doctors had found it impossible to get the children to do anything about it. I thought at the time that there was someone behind the idea and that he was the one who had made the bicycles available. I found out that Dr. Ellis was responsible for it, and I was very grateful for the action that had been taken. When I returned I mentioned to the Minister that I had seen Dr. Ellis.

There is a great swing forward in the world today in the field of mental health. In England it has become necessary since the war to pay much more attention to mental health than previously, because nervous breakdowns were very common in England during and after the war. I saw this, too, when I was doing my research into epilepsy and mental health.

To know of the new facilities at Claremont is a pleasure, and I am bringing this matter forward because I am the one who complained so bitterly about the Claremont Mental Hospital. Mr. President, you would remember that. To see such a metamorphosis is very heartening. I know that a Labor Government, had it the opportunity, would do the same as this Government has done. I commend the Government for its action. I do not often commend the Government as you, Sir, would know, but on this occasion I commend it for what has been done and for the happiness which has been brought to mothers—whom I see but the Minister never sees—who have children at Claremont.

I am working on something at the present time. A lad at Claremont constantly falls and a helmet has been bought for him. However, it has not been possible to buy him one which will not break. I am on my way to doing something about it now. That is the kind of thing that is going on.

I have been mixed up in this type of work over the years in trying to do something to improve the conditions. It gives me much satisfaction to see some improvements being carried out. As I have said, I do not often rise to say nice things about the Government, but I do on this occasion. I support the Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [7.50 p.m.]: I feel constrained to thank Mr. Dolan for his analysis of the Bill and Mrs. Hutchison for the nice things she said. I do not think we should let such a rare occasion pass unnoticed. It is very nice of her and I appreciate it. I shall certainly convey her thoughts to Dr. Ellis.

Over the last couple of years we have been extremely fortunate also in having secured Dr. Blackmore who is currently Superintendent of Claremont Mental Hospital. Indeed, the staff of the Mental Health Services is one of which we can all be justifiably proud. We are not at the end of the road yet, but I think we are making progress and working together and I am quite sure we can continue to do so. This Bill is a very little step, as Mr. Dolan said, but nevertheless it is a step forward. We hope that gradually the work will continue and year by year we will see improvements in the lot of these unfortunate people.

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 7.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 27th August, 1968

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

QUESTIONS (36): ON NOTICE KALGOORLIE WATER SUPPLY

Adequacy

1. Mr. T. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Apropos his answer of the 21st August, will he detail the possible methods under consideration whereby the source of supply of water in Mundaring Weir may be augmented?