

There is one other matter in regard to drilling operations at the open-cut at Collie Burn. The present open-cut is almost worked out and it would appear from the item in the Estimates that the intention is to continue boring operations with a view to extending the open-cut. Of course it may refer to drilling operations for the purpose of obtaining information in regard to the seams lower down. It is not desirable to extend open-cut operations and I would be glad if the Minister could give me some idea of the intention in regard to item No. 14. I think the Minister knows that there is a good deal of opposition to open-cut mining and I would like to get some information on the point.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Friday, 12th December, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Motions: Housing, as to land prices to servicemen, Melville district, passed	2973
Superphosphate, as to equalisation levy, Midland railway districts, passed	2993
Bills: Licensing Act Amendment (No. 3), 3r.	2978
Medical Act Amendment, Com., remaining stages	2978
Assembly's message	3007
Abattoirs Act Amendment, 2r., remaining stages	2978
Health Act Amendment (No. 3), 1r., 2r., defeated	2986
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2r. (points of order), remaining stages	2986
Loan, £19,627,000, 2r., remaining stages	3001
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Assembly's message	3007
Appropriation, all stages	3009
Complimentary remarks	3010
Adjournment, special	3011

The **PRESIDENT** took the Chair at 2 p.m., and read prayers.

MOTION—HOUSING.

As to Land Prices to Servicemen, Melville District.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [2.3]: I move—

That this House requests the State Housing Commission to re-adjust the prices charged to ex-servicemen (clients of the War Service Homes Commission) for lots purchased from Melville Road Board about July, 1947, to a figure more in conformity with the cost to the Housing Commission.

I have put this notice of motion on the notice paper because I would like to get an expression of opinion from the House regarding certain transactions of the State Housing Commission in connection with land it has acquired. Members will notice that the motion is in different terms from what it was when I gave notice of it yesterday, because I have included in parenthesis the words "(clients of the War Service Homes Commission)". I would like the permission of the House to amend my motion in this way.

Motion, by leave, amended.

HON. G. FRASER: In 1947, the Melville Road Board, which comprises the Palmyra, Bicton, Applecross and Mt. Pleasant wards, advertised in the Press a large number of blocks for sale for non-payment of rates. Before the sale eventuated, the State Housing Commission interviewed the road board and, as a result, acquired many of the blocks. I obtained from the Melville Road Board the amount that was owing by way of rates on the various blocks, and I thought the Commission purchased them for this amount, but I have learned since that it resumed them.

Once land is resumed, it is a question of negotiating with the owner, so I cannot give the true figures that were paid by the State Housing Commission for the lots, but I have the amounts that were paid to the Melville Road Board for the rates that were owing. As these blocks were advertised for sale, one can assume that the compensation payable as a result of the resumption, would not be very great, so to all intents and purposes the figures I shall quote regarding the various blocks, allowing for another £10 to £12 for advertising and other incidentals, will be somewhere near the actual cost to the State Housing Commission.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Water rates?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, I am allowing for water rates in the £10 to £12. The water rates on vacant land would be very small, and it would take some time for them to amount to anything worth while. Many of these blocks have since been taken over by clients of the War Service Homes Commission. The method adopted in respect of the disposal of blocks to war service homes clients is different

from that adopted by the State Housing Commission with respect to the War Service Homes Commission.

When any large number of blocks are taken over by the State Housing Commission, I understand it asks the War Service Homes Commission if it requires any of them. If the War Service Homes Commission says it would like certain of the blocks, they are sold to the Commission at the cost to the State Housing Commission. If, later, a client of the War Service Homes Commission, who has no land of his own, comes to the State Housing Commission, he is shown the lots that it owns, and he is told he can pick any one of them that he requires. If he picks a particular block, it is earmarked for him and sold to the War Service Homes Commission.

I make this explanation to show the different treatment meted out under the two headings. If the War Service Homes Commission takes a parcel of land from the State Housing Commission, the blocks are sold at cost. The War Service Homes Act stipulates that the War Service Homes Commission can charge its clients only the cost to itself of the land and the buildings. If, on the other hand, a client selects a block that is owned by the State Housing Commission, the procedure has been to charge him the valuation, and that is the point at issue.

A number of instances that I have will give members some idea of the difference in the payments made by ex-servicemen when taking over land that has already been purchased by the State Housing Commission, and when taking over land that will be bought for the ex-serviceman by the War Service Homes Commission. I have a list of all the blocks concerned, but I intend to deal mainly with the Applecross-Mt. Pleasant section and merely want to cite a few cases to emphasise the point I am raising. For instance, there is a block of land in Mt. Pleasant situate at 31 Ullapool-rd. The sum paid by the State Housing Commission to the Melville Road Board for rates owing was £22 2s. 1d., but the client of the War Service Homes Commission had to pay £160 for the block. There is another block, Lot 83, Sleat-rd., for which the State Housing Commission paid the Melville Road Board £30 16s. 2d. for rates owing, but the War Service Homes Commission client was charged £150. Another block in the Applecross area, Lot 204, Reynolds-rd., was purchased for £29 13s. 3d. from the Melville Road Board.

The Minister for Transport: That was the amount owing for rates?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. These blocks were advertised for sale for the non-payment of rates. The amount charged by the State Housing Commission was £180. On Lot 205, Reynolds-rd., the amount paid to the Melville Road Board was £26

19s. 8d. but the War Service Homes Commission client was charged £175. I could quote dozens of other cases, but I think I have cited sufficient examples to give members an idea of the difference between the sum paid by the State Housing Commission and the charge to the clients of the War Service Homes Commission. I should say that approximately £10 or £12 would cover the payment of other incidental expenses, and then, of course, some compensation might have to be paid to the owners of the land because of its resumption.

Take the case of one of the lots in Reynolds-rd. The sum paid to the Melville Road Board was less than £30 and let us assume that other incidental expenses amounted to £20. That would make a total of £50 but the State Housing Commission charged £175, making a difference of £125. The point is that if that land had been taken over for the War Service Homes Commission originally, before it was selected by the client, the War Service Homes Commission could have bought it at cost. Because it was purchased later on for a particular client of the War Service Homes Commission he had to pay this terrific price.

The Minister for Transport: The actual cost must be taken into account, plus the chance of compensation claimed by the owner.

Hon. G. FRASER: I said that I did not have that information.

The Minister for Transport: How do you arrive at your cost?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am going on the figures I have—that is the cost to the State Housing Commission. The Commission paid to the Melville Road Board the amount of rates owing and in the case I quoted I allowed £20 to cover water rates, land tax, advertising expenses and other incidentals. I mentioned that the State Housing Commission paid less than £30 for Lot 204, Reynolds-rd. and, allowing £20 for incidental expenses, it would make a total of £50, whereas the client was charged £180.

The Minister for Transport: But there may have been a contingent liability from the previous owner.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would say that very little compensation would be due to the owners of the land because it was to be sold for the non-payment of rates. What that compensation figure was I do not know, but the difference between the actual known cost to the State Housing Commission and the sum charged to the client in one case was approximately £125. I do not think we ever intended, when we established the State Housing Commission, that it should set itself up as a real estate agency. There should be no difference in the treatment accorded a person who is a client of the War Service Homes Commission when he selects a block of land

himself and that shown to a person who has the land purchased for him originally by the War Service Homes Commission.

That a Government department such as the State Housing Commission should set out to make a profit under conditions such as those I have outlined amazes me; more particularly as the Commission carries out the work of the War Service Homes Commission in this State. Both sections are in the one building and are interlocked in many ways. I have not been able to check the figures relating to all the lots in Reynolds-rd. so I do not know whether those particular blocks were advertised in the paper. But one of the blocks I have mentioned has been purchased by a man who is battling to build a home. He cannot afford to pay out a large sum of money unnecessarily because he is building under the self-help scheme and it will take him from two to two and a half years to complete the house. Yet the State Housing Commission is making a profit out of these people! Opposite Lots 204 and 205 there is a block of land—I do not know its number—which must have been taken over by the War Service Homes Commission. That block was sold for £90 and there is the ridiculous position of the State Housing Commission selling, in one street, three blocks of land for £180, £175 and £90.

The Minister for Transport: What would be the difference in time?

Hon. G. FRASER: They were all sold at about the same time. If that sort of business is to go on, we can look forward to a lot of dissatisfaction. I mentioned earlier that the State Housing Commission is so interlocked with the War Service Homes Commission that one might consider them as one department. Yet we find these terrific differences in charges! It makes it even more outstanding when one knows the spirit of the War Service Homes Act and I would say that the same spirit permeates the State Housing Act. Both organisations were set up with the idea of assisting people to get homes at the cheapest possible rate. Yet we find a State department taking advantage of some technicality in order to extract huge profits from its transactions. I know that Mr. Craig will not agree with me. He would applaud the Commission if it made thousands of pounds in profits.

Hon. L. Craig: I do not think any department should incur a loss.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not want it to.

Hon. L. Craig: You are suggesting it has made huge profits. That is not so. It is an acquisition levy, and that is customary.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is making huge profits out of this deal. I would say that we never gave the State Housing Commission power to resume land in order to make huge profits out of such transactions.

I think the hon. member will agree with that. We did not give the State Housing Commission power to resume land and sell it to the clients of the War Service Homes Commission at differing rates.

Hon. L. Craig: It has to carry some of the overheads.

Hon. G. FRASER: There is no doubt it has, but not under different headings. No doubt when the War Service Homes Commission wants twelve blocks, all those overheads are taken into consideration before the price is fixed between what the State Housing Commission paid for it and what the War Service Homes Commission gave.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you think that has general application throughout the State?

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know what is happening in other parts of the State; I would assume it has. I do not think there would be different treatment for different parts of the State. I can only speak for my district and what I have mentioned seems to be wrong. If the War Service Homes Commission said, "We want those twelve blocks", they would be sold to the War Service Homes Commission at cost price and passed on to its clients at cost. But if the individual client of the War Service Homes Commission selects one of the State Housing Commission blocks and it is sold by the Commission to him, he has to pay £150 to £160 more.

If members feel that it is the right thing to do, I would like them to try to convince me of the fact. I can see nothing right in it at all. The main spirit behind the State Housing Act and the War Service Homes Act was that neither department should make profits but that a service should be rendered to those particular individuals, because if the Commission were to make profits, I would agree with members that the business should be handled not by State departments but by private enterprise.

We set these departments up in order to assist the people in the community who most require their help. We have also to take into consideration, to my way of thinking at any rate, that the spirit of the War Service Homes Act has been broken not by a private individual or a company but by a State department. Let me read from the War Service Homes Act the condition under which they sell buildings and land to their clients. It is as follows—

The price shall not exceed the capital cost to the Commission of the dwelling-house and land.

Hon. L. Craig: Has the Commission broken that condition?

Hon. G. FRASER: No, it has not; but the State Housing Commission has broken it. It is for that reason that I have moved the motion.

The Minister for Transport: I think that is assumption, not fact.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is a fact. I would like the Minister to show me where my facts are wrong. If he is right, he can do that by letting me know what compensation was paid on any of this land; I would like him to explain away the margin of £150 I have mentioned. I will be ready to admit I have made a mistake if the Minister can show me by figures that it has not made a profit out of it. When we see the difference in the prices of three blocks in the same street, it will be difficult to convince me that I am wrong. In this case there was a difference of £180.

The Minister for Transport: There was no indication that they were finalised.

Hon. G. FRASER: Of course they were finalised; the individuals are erecting their homes on them.

The Minister for Transport: What about the contingent liability to the State Housing Commission in regard to the unsubmitted claims.

Hon. G. FRASER: Do you think, Mr. President, the Commission does business in such a way that it does not know the contingent liability in regard to the different claims of the clients?

The Minister for Transport: No.

Hon. G. FRASER: Neither do I. Therefore the full liability is there when the land is sold to the individual, and that is what happened in this case. So I submit the motion to the House, believing it is a fair and reasonable one; one respecting which I can confidently expect members to agree with me. The motion is not an instruction to the State Housing Commission, but is more in the nature of a request. It should have the full support of the members of the House, because, when all is said and done, we have set out to do certain things and whether it be of the State or the Commonwealth that is concerned, we ought to endeavour to carry out those obligations on behalf of the ex-servicemen in return for the service they have given to this country. All I am asking is that all the ex-servicemen with dealings under the War Service Homes Act be treated on a par, and not in the way I have set out.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT

(Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [2.27]: I do not question for one moment the sincerity of the hon. member in bringing this motion forward, nor do I question his belief in the assumptions he has drawn from the facts as submitted by him. I do not question the actual figures he has submitted. However, I am sorry that I did not have particulars of those individual cases in regard to which the full story could have been obtained. We would have been in a position then to have given the House the other side of

the picture, which I think would have furnished a satisfactory explanation with regard to each of the cases the hon. member mentioned.

For the information of the House, I have been given some data along general lines and I think members can perhaps gauge from that that the State Housing Commission at least does not seek to make profits out of any of its clients, particularly ex-servicemen. I think members will also see that the aim is to give these people service without making profits out of them. So far as the motion goes, I do not think it would request the State Housing Commission to do more than it is already doing at present. The only point I am sorry about is that it is not possible at this stage to answer the contentions of Mr. Fraser in detail, as it might have been if we had an appreciable portion of the session still to go.

The general information given to me was that these locations were not purchased from the Melville Road Board but were acquired by the Commission by resumption prior to sale by the road board for non-payment of rates. On acquiring these blocks it was the Commission's intention to make them available for home building to any applicants irrespective of whether they were ex-servicemen or not. The blocks were paid for out of funds provided under the State Housing Act.

It was the decision of the Commission that the blocks in question would be disposed of at taxation valuation at the date of sale. The Commission was responsible for payment of the local road board rates where rates and land tax were outstanding on the properties, together with any compensation that might have been claimed by the owners. In some cases claims have been received and paid. Land is acquired by the Commission for war service homes purposes with funds provided by the Commonwealth, and those blocks are made available to applicants at cost. It is felt by the Commission that if an ex-serviceman desires to obtain a block other than one of those acquired for war service homes purposes, he should pay the taxation value. If cheaper land is required, he has the alternative of selecting within the areas acquired under the war service homes scheme.

Where a war service client wishes the Commission to take full responsibility for building the home—that is to say, finance, design, specifications building etc.—or where it is building under the war service group scheme, he must await priority of application. If he is at the bottom of the list, he might have to wait a number of years before being able to get a home under this scheme. At present men who applied about May, 1949, are being given homes. If an applicant has no block and provides his own architect,

builder, etc. he may proceed to build under war service finance without delay provided his plans and specifications etc. are approved by the Commission.

Some applicants do not wait to build on blocks held by the War Service Homes Commission because they prefer a suburb where there are no war service homes. They are at liberty to buy blocks purchased under the State Housing Act, but then they must pay the taxation value. These are very good building areas and most people wishing to live there are prepared to pay more than the figures quoted. If the persons referred to by Mr. Fraser had wanted cheap blocks, they could have had the choice of many war service homes blocks in other areas, which would have been available to them at cost. The Housing Commission is not making profits after allowing for all costs.

While this statement does not apply to the particular cases quoted by Mr. Fraser, it should be realised that in some cases where the Housing Commission acquires an estate, develops it by subdividing and arranging for roads, water supply, lighting and possibly sewerage connections, laying out the property so that there are shopping areas and so forth, the value of the land immediately increases beyond the purchase price, but, generally speaking, the overall profit of the Housing Commission is not very great when we take into account all the costs it incurs. These are assessed at taxation valuation.

I have been advised that, in the opinion of the Housing Commission, taking the whole of the properties in the Melville area, the blocks are well up to the values and in some cases above the values that the Housing Commission has charged and the purchaser could, if circumstances permitted, dispose of them and recover their full value and probably more. I have been able to give an explanation only along general lines, but if these individual cases were examined, other facts could be revealed which I believe the mover of the motion does not realise and which might put the case in quite a different light and certainly in a light not disadvantageous to the Commission. As I see the position, if the motion be carried as a request, it probably will do no harm and probably will not do much good. It will merely be asking the Commission to do something that it is already doing.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [2.35]: I cannot support the motion in its present form, but I believe that some ground exists for it and I was in the act of drafting an amendment for the consideration of the House. If the mover of the motion proceeds with his reply, I shall be only too pleased to hear what he has to say and, if an opportunity is afforded, move an amendment.

Hon. G. Fraser: I do not want to prevent you from moving an amendment, but if I reply, that will close the debate.

Hon. A. R. JONES: As the hon. member has put up a particularly good case for consideration to be extended to these servicemen, I move an amendment—

That all the words after "House" be struck out and the words "draws the attention of the State Housing Commission to what is considered an anomaly whereby ex-servicemen (clients of the War Service Homes Commission) were called upon to pay in excess for land previously purchased by the department in the Melville Road Board area about July, 1947," inserted in lieu.

HON. G. FRASER (West-on amendment) [2.38]: I wish that I could accept the amendment, but I feel that it contains more of a demand than my motion does. Many of the points raised by the Minister could be applied against the amendment, but could not be regarded as opposition to my motion. I am requesting that if these things did occur, some adjustment should be made. I was very careful in drafting the motion. For these reasons I cannot accept the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. G. FRASER (West—in reply) [2.40]: I shall be brief. Most of the statements made by the Minister traversed remarks I had made.

The Minister for Transport: Not in that way.

Hon. G. FRASER: Certain points advanced by him do not affect the position at all, but the Minister did back up many of the statements I had made. He mentioned that in various cases taxation values were being charged.

The Minister for Transport: That was under the State Housing Act.

Hon. G. FRASER: But not under the War Service Homes Act.

The Minister for Transport: Those would come under the war service homes scheme.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the point I am concerned about. I want the State Housing Commission's cost to be charged, not the Commonwealth taxation value.

The Minister for Transport: One was purchased from the Commonwealth straight-out; the other includes contingent liabilities.

Hon. G. FRASER: There is ample margin between the known costs. I have given practically all the known costs and allowed a large margin to cover the difference between them and any contingency for compensation that might arise. I cannot see that any large amount could

be allowed as compensation because the blocks had already been advertised for sale for the non-payment of rates.

The Minister for Transport: But they were not sold; they were resumed subject to compensation.

Hon. G. FRASER: They had been advertised for sale and could have been bought for almost any figure.

The Minister for Transport: They could have been, but they were not.

Hon. G. FRASER: Nobody at that stage could have expected much compensation. Allowing for all the known liability, there are margins of £150 and £160. I could have quoted a case where the charge was £250 and the amounts paid by way of rates were £18 9s. on Lot 223 and £10 6s. 11d. on Lot 224, Gibson-st. Allowing £20 to cover water rates, land tax, advertising costs and so on, that leaves a margin of well over £200 for any compensation in these instances.

The Minister for Transport: Would not the sale values be the comparable market rates of other blocks sold locally?

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not understand the interjection. The taxation value would be about the valuation of the block. I am concerned that the cost to the Commission should be the price to the individual.

The Minister for Transport: Is it not open to the previous owner to claim compensation?

Hon. G. FRASER: When the previous owners had failed to pay rates for a period of at least five years—which is the time laid down in the Act—before the blocks could be advertised, as these were, they could not make out much of a case for compensation. I have in the past purchased for £30 a block sold for the non-payment of rates, while the Taxation Department valuation of it was £200. The previous owner could not get much compensation for a block in these circumstances.

The Minister for Transport: You were protected by law, in that case.

Hon. G. FRASER: No great amount of compensation could be claimed by a person who for over five years had not paid his rates on a block.

Question put and passed; the motion agreed to.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Subsection (2a) added to Section 11 (partly considered):

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on the clause to which an amendment had been moved to add a further paragraph, to stand as paragraph (e), as follows:—

All the expenses of the examination shall be borne by the applicant.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [252]: I secured the adjournment of the debate last night in order to have an opportunity of examining the Bill, but, in the short time available, I have not been able to peruse its contents thoroughly. The measure seeks to appoint a board of management to control the Midland Junction abattoirs. For a considerable number of years abattoirs throughout Western Australia have been controlled by one person, but the suggestion contained in the Bill is that there should be appointed a board of management for the Midland Junction abattoirs, and that the Controller of Abattoirs should become the general manager.

It is strange that a measure such as this should be brought down so late in the session in view of the fact that the controller has given good service and has been largely responsible for the reorganisation of abattoirs in this State. I see no necessity at all for the appointment of the board. We often hear that many of the boards appointed in this State are not really necessary, and I do not think the one proposed here will serve any good purpose. The board sought to be appointed is to consist of three persons and it will not be a full-time board.

The Bill proposes that the present controller shall be general manager of the Midland Junction abattoirs but will remain controller of the abattoirs at Fremantle and elsewhere throughout the State. That will make for dual control. Instead of having one man in charge of the industry, there will be a part-time board controlling the main abattoirs, of which the controller shall be the general manager and he will also be con-

troller of the rest of the abattoirs in Western Australia. If this course is followed, the controller will have to wait until the board meets before he can make any decision with regard to the abattoirs at Midland Junction, and I am at a loss to see what advantage could be gained by the suggested change.

A further point is that it is proposed to appoint the board for a period of five years. Most of the boards appointed in this State have a term of three years and I cannot understand why it has been suggested that the term in this instance should be five years, which I think is far too long. If the term of five years is agreed to, it could easily be necessary, if we are to appoint men of knowledge and experience, that some will be appointed who will reach the retiring age before the term of appointment has elapsed. With a shorter period of appointment, that position would not be so likely to arise.

In spite of the fact that the present controller has had experience over a number of years, it is proposed that he should not be permitted any longer to control the Midland Junction abattoirs, and I cannot support that proposal. I do not agree that the board is necessary, particularly in view of the fact that it is to be an advisory board. I do not suggest that it should be a permanent board, because that would involve a further charge upon the abattoirs of the State and particularly upon that at Midland Junction. If the board is considered necessary by the powers-that-be, it appears to me that its members will not represent the interests of the State. I understand that three persons will be appointed who will represent various interests. However, it would be quite possible for a person to be appointed who is not closely associated with the sectional interests he is to represent. I consider that the employees also are entitled to a representative so that better relationship between the employers and themselves may be engendered.

I cannot see any reason for the Bill being brought down. I have always understood that the Controller of Abattoirs is regarded as a man who knows a great deal about the industry. I understand that from time to time he has had opportunities to accept appointments in other places, but, in the belief that he came to this State to reorganise the administration of our abattoirs, he thinks he should carry out his job. It is regrettable that a Bill of this description should be introduced, because I do not think it will be in the best interests of the consumers, those engaged in the meat industry, the State or the department which has jurisdiction over the abattoirs. I cannot give my support to the Bill, and I trust it will not be passed.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [3.31]: Although I have only had since about 1 a.m. today to study the Bill, there are one or two features which I consider need clarification. The Bill proposes to appoint the board members for five years, and I believe that is two years too many. One of the reasons why I say that is that the man who has supervised the handling of meat in this State to ensure the health of the community will not be appointed as a member. I would also like to point out that the members of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, who handle millions of the State's money and take charge of millions of pounds worth of shipping, are appointed for only three years, and the chairman of the trust holds office for only 12 months. No one will deny that that is a most efficient organisation and one of the best of its kind in the Commonwealth.

One of the matters that always intrigues me is that it appears to be held that before a man can be appointed to a high official position he must be about 50 or 60 years of age. That is similar to the argument put forward that a man cannot offer himself as a candidate for election to this House before attaining the age of 30 years. The members of most boards, when appointed, are nearly always approaching the age of retirement. Therefore the position should be watched carefully, because it might happen that if members of similar age were appointed, one, two or perhaps more vacancies might occur simultaneously. Such a position is avoided in this House because only a certain number of members come up for re-election periodically.

Hon. L. Craig: Is it such a great handicap that vacancies will occur on the board?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is exactly the question that I wanted a member to ask. There always comes a time when there is a change of Government; in fact, there are some members in the House today who believe that the Government may be changed next year—and they are not all Labour members. Has the present Government the right to appoint a body of men for a period of five years, and so tie the hands of the succeeding Government? I do not think that is fair; it is not business ethics.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not usually your point of view; you are usually generous in your outlook.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am being generous now.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are being narrow in your outlook now.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister should not be hard on me; I am only a little chap! The board that is to be appointed will be in the nature of an experiment. It is an entirely different posi-

tion from reappointing men to the Apple and Pear Board, the Potato Marketing Board and the Onion Marketing Board, which have been in existence for some years, and there are many members who will not agree that those boards are all that they should be.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is rather a different proposition, I think.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The only gentleman I have heard of who will be connected with this board as general manager is Mr. Rowland, and I have only gleaned that information from the Press. From the way I read the Bill, it appears that a member cannot be removed from the board unless he commits a felony.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not the only thing.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: All I am saying is that unless he commits a serious misdemeanour, he cannot be removed from office. The Bill also provides that a chartered accountant shall be a member of the board, and I think that is a most necessary appointment. However, if we are to have such a man appointed it would be possible that he might have no regard to the interests of the consumers, but he might be on the board to look after the interests of all sections, including master butchers and farmers.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: The farmers will have a representative.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Yes, they may possibly have two, or even three. I have heard it said that there are two officers in this State who hold high executive positions that carry out their duties with great efficiency, namely, the Controller of Abattoirs and the Conservator of Forests. I understand that the present Controller of Abattoirs, Mr. Rowland, is to be the general manager. Will the Minister tell me if that is correct?

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: If he is to be the general manager, and the board is to be part-time, he will be performing his duties subject to the deliberations of the board. If he were appointed chairman of the board and it met regularly, he would be in a better position to implement its decisions in his capacity as general manager. Suppose, however, that the board meets only four times a year—it might have ten meetings a year—what position would the general manager be in then? I certainly would not like to be in the same position. I think the Bill ought to provide that the general manager should also be chairman of the board in order that it may function efficiently.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you find that done in any private company?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am merely debating a Bill which proposes to appoint a board to control the abattoirs; I know

nothing about private companies. I cannot find anything in the Bill to warrant my supporting it.

The Minister for Agriculture: The hon. member should not commit himself!

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [3.15]: I cannot see any reason for objections being raised to the Bill. The management of the abattoirs has been in the hands of Mr. Rowland for some years and under the board it will be still in his hands. The change that is envisaged will be considerable, but it is held that the board will assist Mr. Rowland with regard to matters of policy. The board will lay down the policy and it will be carried out in the abattoirs under the management of Mr. Rowland. The undertaking will become more socialised than ever. In the circumstances, I cannot understand Labour members objecting to it. I do not like the socialisation of industry.

Hon. G. Fraser: But because the Government moves in that direction, you support it!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is not so at all. The altered situation will be helpful to the small butcher who will not in future be, as he has been in the past, at the mercy of the master butcher. The small man will be able to buy off the hoof.

Hon. E. M. Davies: He can do that now.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He cannot.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Of course he can.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know something about the business. He may be able to buy off the hoof; but if he does, he gets a rough spin when it is a matter of getting his meat slaughtered. I know something about it.

Hon. E. M. Davies: So do we.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The change will guarantee to the small butcher the right to go to the yards and buy off the hoof. He will also be able to make sure that the beast he buys will be slaughtered for his own use. That is a very strong point in favour of the Bill. As for the objection raised to the appointment of the board for a period of five years, a board member can be dismissed at any stage if he is not carrying out his duties in a proper manner. That provision is contained in the Bill. If a board member proves to be incompetent, he can be sacked. I cannot see any reason why the appointment of the board for a period of five years should cause any objection to be raised to the Bill. As I view the measure, it is making the undertaking more democratic than ever. It will still be under Government control despite the setting up of the board.

Hon. E. M. Davies: The same system applies in the other States.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Then I fail to see why any objection should be raised to the Bill.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Why have another board?

Hon. A. L. Loton: Because this one will carry on the undertaking better.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, for all concerned. If members think that the appointment of an accountant as the consumers' representative on the board means that he will not be able to represent the consumers adequately, they should bear in mind that, unless he is a vegetarian, he will be a consumer of meat and will therefore be interested from the consumer's point of view. I support the second reading.

HON. C. H. HENNING (South-West) [3.18]: In his introductory remarks, the Minister said that the increase in the population necessitated different methods of handling stock at the abattoirs. If members peruse the original Act of 1909, they will find that most of its provisions deal with the regulations that might be made. That was 43 years ago. Are we going to adhere to the principle of as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be—

Hon. G. Fraser: Amen.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: —or are we to change with the times and approve of the provisions that are now required to deal with the meat industry in this State? Personally, I cannot see anything but good in the Bill. Objection has been taken to the setup of the board.

Hon. G. Fraser: I think I have heard members objecting in the Chamber to the setting up of boards.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. C. H. HENNING: If there should be a change of Government, which might result in Mr. Fraser belonging to the new Ministry, would not his Government agree to a board like this? It has been stated that Governments change. If a Government had not changed six years ago, a similar measure to that under discussion might have been introduced. Members of the meat trade tell me that they were consulted by Hon. F. J. S. Wise when he was Minister for Agriculture about this very matter, and that is some time back now.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is the only bad thing about this! We are following the Labour policy too much!

Hon. C. H. HENNING: At that time, the creation of a board was recommended by Mr. Dunbar, the then Controller of Abattoirs whom Mr. Rowland succeeded.

The Minister for Agriculture: He was Mr. Dunbar's second in command.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: In the circumstances, it is not asking too much if we claim the support of members here. I have

visited the abattoirs at Gepp's Crossing in South Australia. I understand from all I heard from those associated with the meat trade, that those abattoirs are probably the most up to date in Australia. That undertaking is controlled by a board just as is proposed under the Bill. I feel certain that in South Australia those concerned recognised that power should not be placed in the hands of one man to control the abattoirs, which is such an extremely big organisation. We must bear in mind that as the population increases, the operations of the abattoirs here will be expanded, necessitating the erection of more buildings, the purchase of more plant and the adoption of modern trends. We must also remember that whatever revenue is gained by the abattoirs is derived from the producers and the meat trade. From time to time complaints will be raised, and if one man is placed in charge of the abattoirs the position may be difficult. I do not say that Mr. Rowland is not a capable man.

The Minister for Agriculture: He is a very capable officer.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: If he is a member of the board, what chance has a man who appeals for redress? It would be in the nature of an appeal from Caesar to Caesar.

Hon. L. Craig: Quite contrary to Labour policy.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: I would not be surprised. I have yet to find out the reasons for Labour members' opposition.

Hon. L. Craig: The wrong Government has introduced the Bill.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: The Government is to be commended for not making the manager a member of the board. The controller works under the Minister now, and the board will function under the Minister as well. I think the position of the controller in future will be more important than ever. I cannot see anything wrong or humiliating as regards Mr. Rowland in what is proposed. In other places where boards have been established the personnel is more numerous than that proposed under the Bill. Better management and better control is always derived from small boards than from large ones. Under the Bill, the controller will be the general manager of the abattoirs and the chief executive officer of the board.

The Minister for Agriculture: That gives him an important standing.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: It makes his position most important, much more important than his present office. He will have a more responsible position than he has occupied in the past. I ask members who oppose the Bill to compare its provisions with the Act and see how the Bill can make it most progressive. The measure contains one excellent provision. If, for one reason or another, there should be

disagreement on a matter being dealt with by two members of the board, a decision must be deferred until a full board meeting can be obtained. There is also the safeguard that the Bill provides for a limit upon the expenditure incurred by the board, seeing that any amount over £1,000 cannot be spent without the approval of the Minister. I support the second reading and may deal with one or two other points at the Committee stage.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [3.25]: I have listened to the arguments on both sides, and I freely admit that I had not intended to support the Bill. I always attempt to be reasonable and, having listened closely to both sides of the argument, I have decided, in the circumstances, to support the measure.

The Minister for Agriculture: Hear, hear!

HON. C. W. D. BARKER: I believe that Mr. Rowland is a thoroughly good and efficient man in his position. There can be no doubt about that. Some years ago he was offered a position in connection with the abattoirs in Tasmania, but the late Mr. Wood persuaded him to stay in Western Australia. I understand that he was offered a very good position in South Australia, but he turned it down in favour of his present post. I think most generous consideration should be given to a man of that type. I cannot see any real objection to the appointment of the board. It should prove helpful to the small butchers, which will be a good thing. I shall ask the House to agree with me in one respect regarding the appointment of the board for a term of five years.

The Minister for Agriculture: We will think that over.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER: I am being reasonable and I expect the House to be reasonable, too. All the other boards that have been appointed have had a term of three years, and when the Bill is dealt with in Committee I intend to move an amendment to Clause 10 to reduce the term of office of the proposed board to three years. I can see no objection to that. The board will be on trial and if at the end of the three-year period it proves to be successful, we can appoint it for a further term. What objection can there be to that? In the meantime, I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [3.28]: Mr. Barker is of the same political kidney as others who have opposed the Bill, which serves to indicate the freedom of Labour members in this Chamber in dealing with legislation. We would like members of other parties to have the same freedom.

The Minister for Agriculture: They have! Lots of them have supported you at times, much to my annoyance.

HON. G. FRASER: Members have said they cannot understand the objections to the Bill. I cannot understand the arguments of supporters of the measure who favour the board. I can recollect over the years past those self-same members objecting to the creation of boards. Now they support one to operate in an industry that has been so successfully managed that there is no need to set up the board.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you not think there is any need for a change?

HON. G. FRASER: Not in this instance.

The Minister for Agriculture: I bet you will eat your words before I have finished with you!

HON. G. FRASER: The remarkable thing about this is that the board will have charge only at Midland Junction, and the man who has been controller up till now will retain control of every other abattoirs in the State.

The Minister for Agriculture: Nothing of the sort!

HON. G. FRASER: This board will not have that control.

The Minister for Agriculture: The local authorities control them in pretty well every other place.

HON. G. FRASER: Wherever there is a Government abattoirs, this man will be in control.

The Minister for Agriculture: Where are they?

HON. G. FRASER: If a board is required, why was it not made to cover the State, and not just Midland Junction?

The Minister for Agriculture: Kalgoorlie is the only other place.

HON. G. FRASER: Why was not the Kalgoorlie abattoirs included in the board's control? Under this Bill the controller who has done the job for years will control the Kalgoorlie abattoirs. If a board were to be appointed to control any abattoirs, one would think it would be those removed from the metropolitan area, but this board is to control only one abattoirs and the others are to be left under the controller. I would not mind if this were an advisory board only, but I do not like the idea of its taking control away from the controller.

The Minister for Agriculture: It will not.

HON. G. FRASER: Of course it will! Otherwise, why is a board to be appointed?

The Minister for Agriculture: If you sit down, I will tell you.

HON. G. FRASER: When I have advanced one or two other arguments the Minister cannot reply to, I will sit down. It is remarkable that the Minister says the board will not be the controlling body. I have never known a board that has not been the controlling authority. Would the

Minister have me believe that the secretary of a concern has power over that concern? Of course not!

Hon. L. C. Diver: I know an instance.

Hon. G. FRASER: This board will have the power, and the controller will have to carry out its dictates. It is a misnomer to use the word controller now, because this man will not be the controller at all. He will have to do what the board says. This industry is subject to a lot of industrial trouble.

The Minister for Agriculture: No; it is very well run.

Hon. G. FRASER: Industrial troubles have been common over the years. In an industry such as this, I would prefer to have one man in control because he would be much more easily approachable and able to settle troubles quickly on the spot. Have we not seen the work held up at the abattoirs because the men considered that not enough hooks were available?

The Minister for Agriculture: That was at Fremantle.

Hon. G. FRASER: It was at Midland Junction. With a controller on the spot, little pinpricks could be overcome quick and lively. If a board is appointed, disputes will have to be referred to it and a meeting will have to be convened. Two members must form a quorum. One member of the board will represent the butchers, another the producers and a third the consumers. The controller would be in a much more advantageous position to smooth out difficulties than would the board.

I have not heard any argument that would make me alter my view that authority should not be taken away from the controller. If a board is to be appointed, I would prefer it to act in an advisory capacity. I would like to see a trade representative on the board. I would have no objection to an advisory board, but I would have all the objection in the world to the appointment of a board over the controller. If the Bill is carried, I hope the Minister will delete the word "controller" and substitute some other designation, because in the circumstances "controller" will be a misnomer. I oppose the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. Sir Charles Latham—Central—in reply) [3.36]: The whole argument seems to have centred on the board. That board will have nothing to do with the active management of the works; that would be impossible. One of the members is to be a chartered accountant and he will look after the interests of the consumers. It will be his responsibility to see that the distribution and the charges made are to the benefit of the people he represents. The second board member will look after the interests of the butchers who pay for

the slaughtering of their cattle, and he will see that their meat is well looked after until it goes to the consumers. The third member will look after the producers in the field. He will see that the supply of stock comes into the market as and when required, and that there is not a big supply one day and a small one the next. This board will be in the same position as a board of directors. Would members tell me that the board of directors is likely to interfere with the manager of Foy and Gibson?

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: They do with the big oil companies.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Of course they do not! The board of directors of Boans Ltd. would be lost if it tried to control the manager. The board's responsibility is to see that the shareholders' money is safeguarded, that the public is attracted to the business and that service is rendered. That will be the case with this board. In the past every butcher has had his own gang of slaughterers, and that is not easy to organise. Every butcher wants to start at eight o'clock in the morning. I cannot understand Labour members, and particularly Mr. Lavery, who stands extraordinarily well with the men who work hard with their hands. These men at the abattoirs will be Government employees in future and not employees of the master butchers. They will be under the Controller himself.

Hon. H. Hearn: That is socialism!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't you start interjecting and spoiling the show! In this case we are going to have organised slaughtering under the direction of this wonderful controller. I echo every word that has been said about him. At my age I feel qualified to express myself about a man who has the qualifications to do a job.

Hon. G. Fraser: Yet you are taking his power away.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, I am not. If I put the hon. member on the board as the consumers' representative, would he dare to go into the slaughtering yard and say that this must be done or that must be done? No man with any commonsense would do that; and I hope these men will have common sense.

Hon. G. Fraser: So do we!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They will, if it is left to me. Members know Charlie Latham, and they know he will not make many mistakes.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Said he, modestly!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am extremely modest at times. No board of management would take charge of works like these. This board will determine policy and see that the whole machinery operates well; and if

the members are sensible people they will rely on the knowledge and skill of the controller, who will be the executive officer. The use of the words "executive officer" means that he will have complete control of those working under him. I thought I would have the whole-hearted support of members of the Labour Party here because we are taking away from the master butchers their small slaughtering gangs and organising the men as Government employees in one team.

Members asked why this was not done before. The abattoirs have been in operation since the Act of 1909 was passed, and the concern has served its purpose. The undertaking has become too small for the business to be transacted and it is anticipated that somewhere between £600,000 and £700,000 will have been spent before the work is done under decent conditions. It is hoped that by April or May of next year we shall be able to open up portion of the new works and create the organisation necessary to have the men working as one team.

The trouble today is that all the master butchers want to have their cattle slaughtered as quickly as possible. The animals fret in the yards and by the time they get to the killing pens they have lost some weight and their flesh becomes tough. The anxiety of the butchers is to get the meat into the freezing works as quickly as possible. There is always terrific congestion and very unfavourable public comment has been expressed about our slaughtering facilities. That is due to the fact that there is such congestion that the place cannot be kept clean. The abattoirs started with 35 employees. To-day there are 68 working in the same space. I am anxious to see the work pushed on as rapidly as possible. My only grievance is against the Government, because not sufficient money has come forward to enable the work to be done more rapidly. I hope that members will not think that the board will deprive the executive officer of the responsibility that is his.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: It would be a good board if it were appointed for only three years.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member wants me to weaken, and it is not very difficult to make me weaken. I weaken very easily. The responsibility we are asking these men to take is something they are not accustomed to, and it will take them fully five years—the same time as it takes to train a doctor—to become efficient.

Hon. H. Hearn: And some members of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Some are fully fledged when they come into this building.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: And some never learn.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. Not one member here would say that I am not fully qualified to make the right selection.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: For three years.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The board has not got its own way because almost everything it does is subject to the Minister. The boards I have complained about have sole authority, and the Minister has no control over them. But in this instance the Minister is to have the say. The distinction between this and other boards is that when, with respect to the others, something happens, the Minister gets the kick, although legislative power is handed over to an outside body to which he cannot say boo. In this instance everything is subject to the Minister, and then the Minister can stand up here and members can belt him as much as they like with their words, and make him take the responsibility. I hope I have smashed that argument.

Members seem to think that the Controller of Abattoirs controls all abattoirs in Western Australia. He does nothing of the sort—only Midland Junction and Kalgoorlie and the slaughtering portion at Robb's Jetty. All other slaughtering places come under the local authorities and from time to time we assist them by the advice of our expert officers. Do not think we can build this State and have everything letter perfect! That is not possible, but there may come a time, not far distant, when we will be able to extend our operations. Mr. Rowland went to Bunbury a little while ago to assist in the lay-out of the abattoirs there. As the port towns grow, I hope they will ask for and accept his advice. The controller will only have to manage Midland Junction, which will be his big job, Kalgoorlie, which he does today, and the slaughtering for local consumption at Robb's Jetty. The board will not instruct him in his ordinary work, but it will if the work becomes slovenly, and such like. But I know Rowland very well, and I am not concerned about him.

Hon. E. M. Davies: He may tell the board something.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He will from that angle.

Hon. G. Fraser: If he is a competent man, he will object to being told.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He will not be told any more than I will be told by the hon. member how to farm.

Hon. G. Fraser: He would walk out.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He will not walk out. I do not think that members have been in touch with him. It may be suggested that they have been approached by Mr. Rowland, but I do not think so.

Hon. G. Fraser: Not to my knowledge.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He is strong enough to carry his own responsibilities. I have been asked about a certain type of slaughtering that goes on, but so far no one has been prepared to tackle it. Unfortunately it occurs throughout the world. It is horrifying, but I would not like to be on the board and have to deal with it. I do not think five years will be too long a period for the board. We will have new works, and they will grow, and I feel sure that those members who are in the House five years hence will be able to say, "This is a good board". Those who are over 65 years of age will have to be replaced by someone else. The quorum of two members was mentioned.

The Bill has been very well drawn, because if the two members agree, the decision is the majority decision, but if they do not agree, the matter has to be referred to the three members. I have desired the board to be kept as small as possible. I have been asked to provide for representation from here and there, but the board will consist of three people. One will represent the consumers, and I hope we get an efficient man to look after their interests and to see there is no waste and that meat is supplied as cheaply as possible. The second man is to look after the slaughtering—the butchers; and the third man is to represent those who send in the stock to feed the people.

Members sometimes come to hasty decisions and I feel that some of them will be sorry, later, that they did not support the second reading of the Bill. I did this sort of thing in my youth, and I still do. Mr. Barker knows that after all he is the wisest man who can see the mistake he makes and rectify it. I hope that Mr. Lavery, Mr. Davies and Mr. Fraser, who represents the leadership of the Opposition in the House, will decide that it is worth while reversing the decision they previously made.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Part II added:

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clauses we have dealt with were amendments to the Act itself. Clauses 12 to 36 are new clauses which will be added to the parent Act.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subsection (4) of proposed new Section 12 the word "five" be struck out and the word "three" inserted in lieu.

I think three years is long enough for this board to operate. The Minister said that men need longer to be trained to become efficient at the work, but I do not agree with him.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Clause 10 ends with the word "Act."

The CHAIRMAN: No. The Act ends at Section 11. Clause 10 proceeds to add a completely new part to the Act. It commences, therefore, at proposed new Section 12, so Clause 10 is the only remaining clause in the Bill, and it covers the various new sections to be added.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Thank you, Sir.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Once we agree to Clause 10, we agree to the rest of the Bill?

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I cannot see why there should be objection to the amendment. Other boards have been given a life of three years.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: I oppose the amendment because to limit the life to three years might mean that certain persons that the Minister invites to become members of the board will not be interested. I agree with the Minister that these men should be appointed for a reasonable length of time. We cannot, by any stretch of imagination, look on three years as reasonable.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I cannot accept this as a valid reason why the amendment should not be agreed to. Members of another place, which conducts more vital business than the board will do, are elected every three years; and there are always plenty of people offering themselves for election.

Sitting suspended from 4.0 till 4.35 p.m.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I am not greatly concerned whether the term be five years or three years, but I am concerned that all three members would be appointed at the same time and possibly would retire at the same time. To make provision in that way is exceptional because of the risk of an entirely new and inexperienced board taking office at the one time.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I move an amendment—

That after the word "years" in line 4 of the proposed new Section 12 (4) the following words be inserted:—"except in the initial appointment of the board by the Minister when one shall be elected for two years, one for four years and one for five years."

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope the hon. member will not insist on his amendment. Much thought was given to this provision. We considered that a member might reach the retiring

age, or not wish to be reappointed, and that changes in this way would result in the requisite adjustment to secure continuity of policy. I want members of the board to feel that there is a future before them, and equally I want to inspire confidence in the people who will be represented.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: There is much to commend the amendment, which I shall support.

The Minister for Agriculture: Normally yes, but not in this instance.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: One of the most desirable features of any board is provision for continuity in office of one or more of its members, whereas under the clause, all three members might retire at the end of five years. This would create an undesirable situation. The amendment would ensure that at least one member would remain who had had some experience of the working of the board.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	15

Majority against 5

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. E. M. Heenan

(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. J. O. Hislop	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. L. Craig
Hon. A. L. Loton	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT
(No. 3).

Received from the Assembly and read a first time (Hon. G. Fraser in charge).

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT
AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 4th Decemboer.

HON. H. HEARN (Metropolitan) [4.45]: I have examined the Bill and I believe the time has arrived when some controls are necessary over factories and shops from

the point of view of what are known as nuisances. Apparently the Government has been uncertain of its powers under the Act in respect of nuisances caused by gas, dust, fumes, impurities or noise from a factory which are reasonably likely to interfere with the personal comfort of any person outside the factory. This has particular reference to many industries that are vital to the progress of the community.

Another factor that has caused the Government to bring down this legislation is the rapid development of our industrial areas, particularly in those parts where there are to be established the oil refinery and, subsequently, heavy industries. It was felt that it would be necessary to clarify the legislative authority in regard to nuisances that could seriously affect nearby residents in that area. I listened with interest to what Dr. Hislop had to say and felt that, from a long range point of view, there was much in what he said.

The Government is making a serious effort to improve the position, in view of the conditions that might develop in the next few months, making it even more necessary than at present for this authority to be granted. The Bill seeks an amendment to Section 55 to provide for authority to deal with nuisances caused to people living near a factory, and for the amendment of Section 56 by providing for the Minister to appoint competent persons to hold an inquiry into any complaint and subsequently to report to him. That is necessary to obviate the Chief Inspector of Factories being the sole authority, and to allow a committee to investigate. If that were not done, it would be within the power of one inspector to cause the closing down of a vital industry.

Under the provisions of the Bill the Minister, upon receiving a complaint, will appoint a committee to investigate it and the personnel of the committee will be chosen having regard to the nature of the complaint. Having made its investigation of the complaint, the committee will advise the Minister, who under Section 55, will consider framing the necessary regulations, at the same time publishing notice of the proposal to do so. Any objection in respect of the draft regulation can be made to the Minister on behalf of the person concerned. It is felt that these are questions applying more to secondary industry than any other phase. We have no objection to the Bill and agree that the position should be clarified. I support the second reading.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [4.50]: I have given this Bill much study and have found it interesting. We, in this State, must face up to the problem of industrial nuisances both inside and outside factories. In the course of my researches I have found that the main

item of industrial nuisance is the pollution of the atmosphere by dust, smoke or gases, and I believe that such nuisances exist both inside and outside factories. It is my belief that this is a question of public health.

Western Australia is suffering from industrial growing pains and it is time that we dealt with this problem. Much could be done by emulating the efforts of countries such as England and America. We could well benefit from the experience and scientific knowledge that they have gathered over the years, and I believe that the Government would be well advised to lay this measure aside until next session, because I do not think that in the dying hours of this Parliament we have sufficient time to give this measure the consideration it merits.

Search as I will through the libraries, I can find no relationship between this measure and the Factories and Shops Act. In almost all other countries of the world this problem is treated as one of public health. Our factories and shops inspectors are trained only for a short period, and I maintain that they are not competent to do this work, which really calls for the services of highly qualified staff such as a fuel technologist, qualified industrial chemists, doctors and engineers.

In support of my contention that this is a public health matter, I will refer to a pocket book on hygiene published by the St. John Ambulance Association. At page 91 it states—

Air Pollution:

The atmosphere which surrounds us and which we breathe may become uncomfortable or unhealthy from various causes. These causes may be broadly divided into three groups.

- (1) Pollution by smoke, dust and germs.
- (2) Pollution by gases.
- (3) Heat stagnation.

I would remind members that this small book deals with health and has nothing to do with factories or shops. I took the liberty of searching through all the libraries at my disposal, and I have listed 19 different abstracts dealing with the subject, all of them referring to this question as one of public health.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It depends upon the type of nuisance.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I agree, but I maintain that the matter generally is one of public health. I will not read all of these 19 abstracts, but would refer first to "Smoke and the Public Health", Medical Officer, 1947, 11th October. This is an abstract from the Public Health Department library.

Hon. Sir Frank Gibson: What would the average health inspector know about it?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I will deal with that later. The next is the report of a Committee on Air Pollution. This is an abstract from the American Journal of Public Health and the original is available in the Public Health Department library. I think I have made my point that this question has no relationship to the Factories and Shops Act, but is a matter of public health, and so long as the measure is treated in the present way I cannot support it. I listened closely to Dr. Hislop and agree that the only practical way of dealing with the difficulty is to form a committee or board of highly trained technical officers to tackle the job from a scientific point of view.

There is reference to that point in the American Journal of Public Health dated June, 1948, where, at page 38, appears the following:—

The organisation of the necessary administrative and technical activities in a health department will be governed to some extent by the facilities that can be made available. Trained professional personnel and technical facilities are required if air pollution is to be abated.

In America the authorities consider this matter important and believe that the only way in which to tackle it efficiently is to appoint a board of qualified technical officers to undertake the task. We are years behind England and America in the public health field, but there is no reason why we should not benefit from their knowledge and experience.

The proposed committee or board would act in an advisory capacity to the Public Health Department and would consist of a highly trained technical staff. We would also need a small staff of inspectors such as the inspectors of the Health Department, who would be employed as observers to spot where the nuisances occurred and report them to the board for consideration. This matter could not be left in the hands of inexperienced persons because they would be given power to close factories, offices, workshops and even private houses that were constituting a nuisance. The power could not be placed in the hands of untrained men, but the inspectors already in the Health Department could be further trained as observers, within a short period. It would require highly qualified technical men finally to deal with the matter.

If a new factory were to be built, it would be the duty of its executives to submit their plans to the board and its qualified engineers would make their recommendation to prevent nuisances from occurring from the inception. The more I study the subject the more involved it becomes and the more I realise that the work must be handled by a trained technical staff.

I do not think with the time at our disposal that we can give the measure fair and just consideration.

We need more time to study the Bill. To place it before us in the last few dying hours of the session is wrong because this is a matter that could prove to be very serious. It could be serious to Mr. Hearn who said he did not care if the Bill went through. If it does go through, he will be a sorry man because one day an untrained man will visit his factory and close it up.

The Minister for Agriculture: I would like to see him sorry.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Now is your chance to get square.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I have no desire to get square. I have a job to do and at all times I try to do it to the best of my ability. I will now quote a paragraph on page 363 of a book which I found in the Parliamentary Library and which bears the title, "Recent Advances in Public Health." This paragraph is very appropriately subheaded "Conclusions," and it reads—

The time has come for action on the following lines on which much better and wider provision should be made:—

Approved appliances for domestic buildings;
supplies of smokeless fuel;
grading and washing of coal;
extended use of alternative methods of heating;
training of stokers.

There is a growing realisation that smoke constitutes an inherent threat to physical and mental well-being. Its challenge to our civilisation is gradually being taken up by public authorities and the general public alike. But there can be no Utopia without action and there must be hard work and sustained effort before this curse is eliminated and we can say with the poet:—

Ships, towers, domes, theatres
and temples lie

Open unto the fields, and to the sky:

All bright and glittering in the
smokeless air.

I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Suburban) [5.3]: I was of the opinion that this provision should be brought under the Health Act until I studied it more closely and I then arrived at the conclusion that a health inspector would be only a minor official with insufficient technical knowledge when it came to dealing with matters such as this.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are very technical matters, too.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Nuisances created by dust, gas, fumes, etc., are matters beyond the jurisdiction of the local board of health or the central board of health under the terms of the Health Act. Under that Act a nuisance is defined and provision is made for any complaints that may be received with regard to a nuisance. The Factories and Shops Act has provisions to deal with major matters, one in particular being the problem created at the cement works at Rivervale which has existed for many years.

That is not a matter for a health inspector. It is one for engineers who could give instructions as to how the nuisance could be abated. I think one could say that the fumes emitted from the cement works are deleterious to health. The Bill is a very good one because it provides that such nuisances can be abated and appeals can be made to duly qualified persons; not health inspectors, but engineers, as Mr. Barker has said. Subsection (9) of Section 182 of the Health Act defines various nuisances as follows:—

Where an offensive trade is so carried on as to be injurious or dangerous to health or unnecessarily offensive to the public.

One could carry on an offensive trade, of course. The proviso to Section 182 includes the following—

(b) In the case of an alleged nuisance under Subsection (9) of this section, that the offensiveness is not greater than might reasonably be expected, having regard to the nature of the trade, and also that the best practicable means have been used to minimise the offensiveness and abate any nuisance

If this provision were brought under the Health Act there would be a complete answer to a charge for not abating the nuisance. The Government is wise in agreeing to a new clause for the abatement of these nuisances under the Factories and Shops Act so that experts will be able to render valuable advice as to how the nuisances could be abated, and I do not think that they could be dealt with adequately under the Health Act because, as I have pointed out, there would be a complete answer to the charge under that measure. That is the position that applies in regard to the cement works at Rivervale.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [5.8]: I am not convinced the Bill has been brought down as an amendment to the correct Act. Unlike Mr. Parker, I think the proper place for this provision to be inserted would be in the Health Act. I do not intend to oppose the Bill because I believe that its provisions under the Factories and Shops Act will prove to be of benefit but, at the same time, I think

they could be challenged in a court of law. Under the Health Act it would not mean, as some members seem to think, that only the health inspector would be the person to take action, because the local board of health has power to deal with some of these questions.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: And the central board of health.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: Yes. There must be a little confusion as to where in the Factories and Shops Act the necessary authority appears to deal with nuisances that occur outside factories and other such premises. I think the Health Act should be amended to provide for these matters. One of the provisions of the Bill proposes to amend Section 55 of the Act by—

- (a) adding after the word, "dangerous" in the fourth-last line of Subsection (1) the words, "or where the Minister is of opinion that any noise, gas, dust, fume or impurity generated in a factory interferes with the personal comfort of any person whether employed in the factory or not he may certify the noise, gas, dust, fume or impurity to be a nuisance under this Act."

Firstly, a complaint must be made to the Minister and if a committee has investigated the complaint, the Minister has to make a decision, which will be followed by the gazettal of regulations and the publication of them in a daily newspaper for some days. A second amendment is proposed under the same section as follows:—

- (b) adding after the word, "Minister" in line two of Subsection (2) the words, "having regard to such related matters as he thinks fit but having regard in any case to such expenditure, such local conditions and such circumstances as are reasonably likely to be involved in the application of the regulations shall consider the draft of the regulations and".

This is a very cumbersome way of dealing with the question and the proper place for such provisions to be inserted would be the Health Act. However, I have no objection to them being set out in an amendment to the Factories and Shops Act because if they are placed in two Acts some remedial measures may be taken under one or the other. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that it is proposed to insert them in the Factories and Shops Act, technical men will be available to make inquiries.

Some members have a doubt as to whether a health inspector would have sufficient knowledge to deal with these problems, but he is supposed to be effi-

cient and have a good knowledge of the contents of the Health Act. If a health inspector is of the opinion that a nuisance is being created and that it needs to be abated, he could report the matter to the local board of health and that board should have the authority to require the complaint to be investigated and call for expert advice before taking action.

However, it does not necessarily mean that, under the Health Act, before action could be taken regulations would have to be framed and published in the "Government Gazette" and a daily newspaper for several days. Therefore, not much harm can be done by incorporating these provisions in the Factories and Shops Act, but I repeat that I consider they should be brought under the other Act so that we could be doubly sure that action will be taken either under the Factories and Shops Act or the Health Act.

Point of Order.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I am somewhat concerned at there being before the House two Bills that deal with practically the same subject. We have a Bill to amend Section 55 of the Factories and Shops Act, dealing with gases, fumes, dust and impurities generated in factories, and the Bill seeks to give power to deal with those matters. Then we have a Bill to amend Section 182 of the Health Act which also deals with gases, fumes, dust and impurities generated in factories and proposes methods of dealing with them.

I am just wondering whether there is any conflict between the two Bills, and I desire to draw your attention, Mr. President, to Standing Order No. 176, which reads—

If more than one Bill dealing with the same subject appear on the notice paper, the Council may decide that any one or more of them shall be withdrawn or deferred, or that they shall be consolidated.

I submit that these two Bills deal with the same subject and may be dealt with under that particular Standing Order.

The Minister for Agriculture: In my opinion, the Health Act Amendment Bill is not before this Chamber.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I realise that.

The Minister for Agriculture: The extraordinary aspect of the position is that the Bill to amend the Health Act has been circulated amongst members before the second reading stage has been reached, which is quite unusual. We ought to deal with the point of order raised by Mr. Dimmitt when the Bill is really before the House. If the circulation of the Bill had been delayed until the second reading stage had been reached, we would not know anything about it.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: We are cognisant of the Bill being here, as the Minister has indicated, and it has been read a first time.

The President: That being so, if the Council so decides the two Bills may be consolidated or one may be deferred under the provisions of Standing Order No. 176. I take it, therefore, that when we come to deal with another Bill, it will be competent for the Council to decide what steps shall be taken. In the meantime the debate on the second reading will continue.

Hon. E. M. Davies: On a point of order, I desire to emphasise that one Bill deals with the Factories and Shops Act and the other with the Health Act.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Yes, but each deals with the same subject.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is the position.

Hon. E. M. Davies: But they are two different matters!

The President: The two Bills deal with the same matter and Mr. Dimmitt has drawn attention to that fact. The House, in its wisdom, may later on decide that the Bills shall be consolidated or one of them withdrawn under the provisions of Standing Order No. 176.

Debate Resumed.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT
(Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland—in reply) [5.20]: I desire to reply to the debate and I would suggest that the point raised by Mr. Dimmitt be considered at a later stage. The subject matter of the Bill before the House and the objects which it seeks to achieve are quite understandable to all members. The only question that seems to have been raised is whether the powers in question should be incorporated in the Factories and Shops Act or in the Health Act. The purpose of the Bill now before the House is to insert these provisions in the Factories and Shops Act and I have obtained some advice in that respect.

At the outset, I may mention that Dr. Hislop was concerned that the Bill might be ultra vires the principal Act. However, I can assure the hon. member that the Government received advice that the legal position was satisfactory, otherwise it would not have proceeded with the Bill. Further, the view has been taken that all the nuisances are actually created during the processes in the factory, and, consequently, any remedy must be part of the factory equipment and have the added necessity for inspectors to watch that it is kept operating efficiently by the removal of waste matter which is collected or dropped, the installation of various other factors, fans, screens, water pressures, etc., and, finally, the disposal of the waste matter in a satisfactory manner where it will not further create an added nuisance.

Some factories do have good devices for collecting dust and smoke, but many times they are found not to be in use or that tons of material is left to choke the chambers and immediate environs because neglect has been displayed in not properly taking it away. In the metropolitan area the major concerns are not great in number and consequently instead of taking the time of a committee as suggested by Dr. Hislop the co-operation of the factory managements is sought. Usually those running a concern have a first-class knowledge of what should be done because of their lifelong study of the means and development of the project in which they are interested.

By far the greater number of complaints are due to small establishments usually under given conditions—such as an east wind for a few days—and these would comprise more than 90 per cent. of the nuisances to receive attention. Even if a committee were brought together, it is doubtful whether, without a specialist from the firm making the equipment or a highly specialised smoke engineer, it could arrive at a decision. The Kwinana project has been mentioned on several occasions during the debate on the Bill, and it is a fact that, in every section of the construction or work being undertaken, specialists from old established firms in other parts of the world are being appointed to give advice. This even applies to the construction of the jetties.

Whilst speaking on this particular project, attention is also drawn to Section 3, Subsections (2) and (3) of the Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Limited) Act, 1952, which states—

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, the provisions of clauses one, three, four and five of the Agreement shall have effect as if the same were repeated in and enacted by this Act, and for such purpose clause five of the Agreement shall be read and construed as if the words "It is hereby mutually agreed as follows" in line one of the clause were omitted therefrom.

(3) Without limiting the generality of the provisions of subsection (2) of this section, all other Acts, and also all present and future regulations, bylaws, rules, orders and proclamations made and notices given under other Acts are, by force of this subsection, waived, suspended or otherwise modified to the extent necessary to give effect to the Agreement, or to ensure that all rights, powers, authorities, discretions and exemptions thereunder may be fully exercised and enjoyed.

It is difficult to appreciate the view taken by Dr. Hislop regarding the closing down of a factory. The Minister has full control of any action taken under the pro-

posed amendment and no executive officer of the Civil Service would take such drastic action unless he had proof that life or limb was in danger.

The amending Bill does not provide any action of this sort, although under the Factories and Shops Act, the Chief Inspector may now forbid premises from being used if they are not suitable for the purpose for which they are used or intended to be used, subject to notification in writing being served on the applicant for registration of the premises requesting . . .

- (i) The defects to be remedied; and
- (ii) structural defects to be made satisfactory.

It must also be borne in mind that in all these matters the Government departments co-operate, and the Departments of Industrial Development and Health, the Government Analyst, the Principal Architect and others exchange views and render each other such advice and assistance as may be necessary for an authority to do the right thing in the best possible way.

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Hislop quoted from several books and publications, but all these extracts apply to concentrated areas which contain a population in a district greater than in the whole of Western Australia and where also there are possibly ten smoke stacks in an acre or two as compared with very few in the wide areas of this State. Such places as Pittsburg, Oklahoma, Chicago and other highly concentrated manufacturing centres in the United States, as well as those of Great Britain, do not show any outward signs of improvement and are still very dirty areas. We may even come nearer home to various outlying districts of Melbourne and, in particular, the Port Kembla and Newcastle districts in New South Wales.

The services of a highly qualified and experienced committee, such as the hon. member suggests, would be necessary if we had such a problem as these districts, but the Bill seeks by its provisions to afford ample safeguards for the Minister to make sure that full co-operation and the best brains available to the Government are used if any difference of opinion should arise between the parties responsible for the running of the factory and production, and the inspectors concerned. There is the additional advantage that the inspectors, by virtue of their long experience and knowledge of all the varying processes in industry, have a background which will enable them to appreciate and assess to a very fair degree the disabilities which may occur as the result of the introduction of any remedy to relieve the dust and smoke nuisances.

Great Britain probably has the most progressive all-over legislation, but then again the centres in that country have

been built up for over a hundred years. The American aspect also is that the Acts and regulations to which the hon. member refers are not of a Federal nature, but apply piecemeal to a few States, and then according to the degree of integrity and purpose of the local administration. To suggest that a highly qualified committee should deal with all repairs, renewals or alterations to plant would be possibly to place a far greater hold-up on production. It might cause much discussion on a theoretical basis when the immediate needs of a concern having its own long-trained specialised officers available, required some urgent or special work to be carried out. There is also the aspect that quite possibly it would be a material setback to the use of our local Collie coal.

The Bill seeks to take a step forward in a more or less investigatory and trial form. As a result, the information which comes before the Minister may enable him to assess in a year or two the actual measure of the problem and a separate Bill may be necessary. In the meantime, however, while this assessment is proceeding and the information is being gathered, some measure of remedy is able to be taken, and consequently members are asked to assist the Government by voting for this Bill, having in mind that additional legislation may be framed on this or other lines should the conciliatory and co-operative measure now submitted not prove to be satisfactory. To summarise the facts I have presented:

(1) The Government is assured of the satisfactory legal position regarding the Bill.

(2) The legislation aims to give a small amount of authority, amply controlled by the Minister, to deal with dust, smoke and noise nuisance, and it is submitted that it leaves the way open for the manufacturing interests to use all their own resources of specialised staff to remedy any defect in the manner in which they may consider to be the best under all circumstances.

(3) There is absolutely no question or danger of any factory being closed down.

(4) Investigations conducted by the Commissioner of Public Health over a period of 15 years or more do not allow of any proof that a health hazard does exist.

(5) The objections put forward by Dr. Hislop have been heavily weighted with the object of creating a major problem whereas only two or three major and many minor nuisances of a simple, reasonably remedial nature exist.

(6) The specialists quoted by the hon. member are available to the Minister should he consider it necessary

to call upon them when the initial stages of a problem have been investigated and presented to him.

(7) The power to be given to the Minister under the Bill will allow him to assess and direct action towards a particular nuisance which at the moment cannot be alleviated by any existing authority. Should all efforts by co-operation fail, or the time lag become unreasonable, the Minister may then draft a regulation and, subject to publication, objections, inquiry (redraft, if necessary, and further publication), appoint and obtain advice from a committee which would hear and consider objections on sworn evidence.

It is emphasised that such committee will consist of experts. Then subject only to the Minister's considered opinion in respect to his having regard to such related matters as he thinks fit, having regard in any case to such expenditure, such local conditions and such circumstances as are reasonably likely to be involved in the application of the regulation, the Minister may promulgate a regulation which is subject to being accepted by both Houses of Parliament. Action may then be taken by means of order or requisition with an enforceable aspect.

It is submitted that the Bill is a genuine attempt to do something to alleviate nuisances through the Minister and his officers who are closely acquainted with the details of manufacturing operations and therefore a safeguard will be effected against any loss of production or undue inconvenience whilst effecting a remedy of a nuisance created in factory premises.

That was the intention of those who framed the Bill. They had in mind continuity of production while at the same time alleviating major and minor nuisances with the assistance of those who have technical knowledge of the processes used by factories or plants and who presumably would be the ones who could suggest ways and means of alleviating those nuisances. So I submit that this is a reasonable proposition and I invite members to support the Bill.

Point of Order.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: I rise for an explanation. At what stage, Sir, would you rule that we can discuss the position of this Bill and the other one to be brought before us in the light of Standing Order No. 176? I would prefer that we reached some decision before the second reading is passed. Would that be in order?

The President: My contention is that it is competent for the House in Committee to make a decision along those lines, but the second reading must be carried or rejected.

Debate Resumed.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title and Citation:

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I desire to move under Standing Order No. 176, that consideration of this Bill be deferred until the other Bill on this subject has been dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can only move that progress be reported and leave be granted to sit again.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That is not within my province. It is for the Minister to decide. I therefore move—

That the Bill be deferred till a later stage of the sitting.

I make no secret of the fact that there is a good deal of feeling departmentally about this matter, and it has been made clear to me that there is a difference of opinion between the departments. We are going to be faced with this position, if it is passed, relating to one department, and another Bill is to be brought forward which will provide for the matter to be dealt with by another department. I know the feelings of the Commissioner of Public Health on this subject, and I know the general feeling of the department in relation to this continual whittling away of power from the Health Department as not being in the interests of the people concerned. In replying to the debate, the Minister said that most of these matters are of a minor character and can be dealt with. But attempts have been made for years to deal with the cement problem at Rivervale, and nothing has happened.

The Minister for Transport: We had no power under the Act.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I doubt whether the power exists now.

The Minister for Transport: This Bill gives us the power.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The only power would be to close an establishment. It seems extraordinary to me that the Minister should say that these matters can be handled satisfactorily by some inspector appointed under the Factories and Shops Act. The job of that department is to look after the conditions of workers within a factory. If the Act is read carefully, it will be seen that inspectors are trained in the matter of conditions of production within a factory, in so far as they affect the working conditions or the health or the convenience of workers within a factory. But they are not trained in the methods of production. We are

told now it is simple to solve this matter through the activities of one of these inspectors and technical officers from the factory. But that has been tried for years and has not worked.

It was said by the Minister that if we had an industrial area such as exists in Melbourne, the committee I suggested would be essential. But I do not want to see an area such as they have in Melbourne. There is not one single provision in this Bill that savours of prevention. The only way to tackle this measure properly is to see that this nuisance never occurs. I ask the Committee to defer consideration of the Bill because I know quite well that the Health Department has the matter in mind and has already begun to make inquiries. Even if we pass another measure which we may have to consider soon, that will put the power in the hands of local authorities, and they are not trained. Power should be in the hands of a technical committee on which all these avenues would be represented.

The CHAIRMAN: I have given the hon. member a good deal of liberty, but I think he had better confine his remarks to the deferment of the Bill instead of making a second reading speech.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am sorry, but I have been putting before members reasons for the deferment of this measure.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I must oppose the motion. Every one of the points raised was very effectively answered in my reply to the second reading debate. It acknowledged that hitherto there was no power in the Act to enable the Minister to proceed as he now desires. But everything the Minister wants to do will be made possible by the implementation of the Bill. As I see it, the measure will do the job, and it is a question of whether the administration should be in the hands of one department or another. If they co-operate, as I suggested they should, I do not think it matters whether the administration is in the hands of one department or the other. The Factories and Shops Department has access to technical knowledge of any kind it desires. It can obtain the opinion of the Health Department and technical officers of the industries concerned and it can consult the University and the Department of Industrial Development. I oppose the deferment of the Bill because I think the matter can be dealt with at the present time.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	17
Majority against	8

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. J. G. Hislop	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. C. Oliver	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTION—SUPERPHOSPHATE.

As to Equalisation Levy, Midland Railway Districts.

Debate resumed from the 2nd December on the following motion by Hon. A. R. Jones:—

That the Government give urgent consideration to the anomaly which exists in connection with the payment of an equalisation levy of from 4s. to 16s. 3d. per ton on superphosphate delivered to farmers served by the Midland railway and those served by the Geraldton super works.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [5.30]: Mr. Jones gave the background of the case fairly clearly, but as it is some little time since he addressed the House, it may be of value to recall the background of the equalisation fund and the substance of the suggestion now put forward. I think the proposition might have been more properly presented to the executive of the Farmers' Union, because the agreement to implement the equalisation fund was one into which the Government entered as an instrument of implementation. A number of interests were associated with the discussion but it was agreed that the recommendations of the executive of the Farmers' Union should be the meat and substance of the equalisation fund itself.

To explain how it came into being, we must remember that over the years the railways, because of their run-down condition, and the increasing population and development of the State were unable to carry all the traffic offering. This has meant that a great deal of traffic—particularly wheat and super—has had to be conveyed by road. The Government did take steps to build up the railways so that they could progressively deal with the traffic, but owing to orders not coming to hand, as was hoped, and more particularly

because of the metal trades strike, the policy of the railways to carry super, particularly this year, is far behind expectations. The Government felt, as early as last year, that it would have to modify or cancel the subsidy because of the growing shortage of funds. This year, in addition to the shortage of funds, owing to the effects of the metal trades strike, and the stoppage of the railways, which contributes substantially to our revenue, the Government was less than ever able to meet the demand.

The question then arose as to how best to regulate the impact of these conditions on farmers throughout the State. The farmers have to face the prospect, not only of a higher purchase price for super but of heavy road transport costs to the outlying areas. It was recognised that the railways could take some of the super and I am happy to say that at this stage they have taken considerably more than was anticipated, and we are hoping that progressively more will be taken. But it is too early yet to make anything like an accurate forecast of what the railways will haul.

We hope for the sake of the fund, and the railways too, that they will be able to haul a good deal more than even now seems possible, because the more the railways are able to carry, the less strain there will be on the fund. Possibly at some later stage there will be an opportunity of reviewing it but that time has not yet arrived. The equalisation fund was proposed and accepted provided that those up to 40 miles should not be in the fund at all, but should bear the cost of hauling their own super. From 40 miles onward there was a sliding scale to ease the impact of the strain on those who were long distances away, so that the burden would not be too heavy on them.

This principle has been accepted in a modified form by the farmers, and it is sound. If there were no fund, then obviously those who were fortunate enough to get their super by rail would have a big advantage over those who had to get their requirements by road. The various aspects of the fund, and its application were, however, designed to spread the burden, as far as possible, so that it would not fall too heavily on the shoulders of any one individual. I agree that there is quite an amount of logic in some of the points the hon. member made. He said that people living along the Midland line had to have their requirements hauled by rail under a local rating system and so had to pay more—not much, certainly, but still more—for the commodities they sent to their markets or ports.

Almost two years ago, when the rates of this company were being revised, I was responsible for deferring the increasing of the rate in order to test out the company's claim that it could operate under a local

rating system, my contention being that it should fall into line with the rates applicable to the W.A.G.R. The issue was finally taken before the Chief Justice, Sir John Dwyer, and resolved in the company's favour. But I think members will realise that I was trying to bring about a condition which I thought was common justice to those actually served.

The matter was discussed, and the representatives of the executive of the Farmers' Union said that this fund would, in all probability, operate for one season only because it was expected that by the beginning of next year the railways would be able to haul all, or practically all of the wheat and super which is now going by road. In that case there would be no necessity for any acquisition fund as the subsidy applied only to super which had to be carted by road at a higher cost, having in view the fact that it would operate for one season only, the executive felt it was only equitable to spread the burden over all those in what is called the controlled transport zone. They were quite prepared to take the responsibility for selling the idea, as it were, that was started by the executive as a whole. That, I believe, was confirmed at a later stage.

This being the case, we, the other members of the committee, were concerned with the question of implementing the scheme physically, the Treasury coming into the picture and being responsible for the finance, and, of course, the railways and the Transport Board doing their respective shares in the implementation of the scheme. Actually I was entrusted with the responsibility of trying to arrive at some solution, and I went to a fair amount of trouble, by calling a number of meetings, to iron out many of the difficulties that the scheme presented, as this particular extract from a report of Mr. Meadows, the welfare officer of the Farmers' Union, will show. He said—

Your representatives felt that if an equal cost plan was necessary at all, it should cover the entire distribution period to obviate one grower getting his super by rail at a very low freight compared to another grower who would have to pay the full road haulier's charge of 5½d. per ton mile from works to his farm. The representatives of the W.A.G.R. had previously made it quite clear that they could give no assurance that rail transport would be restricted to distances over 170 miles; in fact, they estimated only 60 per cent. of the super transported by rail would be for distances over 170 miles.

This information made it imperative that if equalisation was to have any merit, then it should be introduced at the opening of the season and not left until the New Year. It was with this fact in mind that we

joined the interested parties to place before Cabinet such objections to the proposed departmental plan.

In order to voice these objections, we were invited to Parliament House to meet the Deputy Premier and also the Minister for Agriculture. After listening to the views expressed, the Deputy Premier said he and his colleagues would give consideration to the points raised. No doubt superphosphate was causing the Government concern, for the next night we were invited again to Parliament House to meet the Minister for Transport whilst the House was sitting.

This conference was the most successful to date as we were with the Minister for two hours and he joined in the frank discussion very actively, asking innumerable questions, and the deputation left feeling that the proposals put forward would be placed before Cabinet.

Briefly put, the proposals submitted provided for an equalisation fee of 15s. per ton on all super transported, other than by farmers' own vehicles, and the Treasury to finance the scheme until sufficient money came in to recoup the expenditure, and for the Treasury to take up any losses that might ensue.

To clarify some points, the Minister called for another meeting on the Sunday so that a clear-cut proposal could be placed before Cabinet on the Monday following.

On the following Wednesday evening another meeting was convened of all interested bodies to meet the Minister and discuss an amended plan before it was released for publication. Subject to the appointment of a small committee and minor amendments which provided facilities for farmers to contract out of the scheme where they had or could arrange for local carriers to cart wool from farm to city and back-load the super at a lower price, the meeting endorsed the plan.

That is the portion which deals with the scheme as a whole and not particularly with the point raised by the hon. member. With regard to that point, I wish to quote an extract from the "Farmers' Weekly" of the 30th October this year. It states—

The question had been raised of the position of settlers on the Midland line who had been joined in the scheme for the surcharge when the Midland company claimed it could transport all the superphosphate which would be needed in the area served by its railway. When disabilities were suffered by settlers along the Midland line the union had

sought to have them corrected and endeavoured to have all farmers treated the same, Mr. Noakes said. If the surcharge was necessary, then it should be imposed on all superphosphate whether it was carried over the Government or Midland railways for the reason that at least some of the haulage in every case was made over the Government lines. Admittedly, this was only a small point when the general principles of this issue were considered.

Further on it states—

Mr. K. McDougall moved as an amendment the following motion carried the previous day at a meeting of the Wheat Section Executive: "That whilst we congratulate and endorse the action of the general president, we continue to press for the re-introduction of the subsidy previously paid by the Government on the road transport of superphosphate." He said that if this motion were carried the General Executive would be given something definite to work on.

Mr. F. J. Forrester seconded. The amendment was carried.

Further to that, members will probably know that, while some areas in the State this year have fared quite well, others have had an exceedingly lean time, and it so happens that the lean areas, so far as the season and light crops are concerned, are mostly on the long leads. If those people had to bear the cost of super, or if all parties did not contribute towards this fund, the cost to those people would be relatively high.

On the other hand, farmers along the Midland line, I am pleased to be able to say, were for the most part blessed with a good season. On broad lines, I think the majority of them would be quite willing to support the general principle of equalisation, and so help the less fortunate settlers who are having such a lean time. But, as I said in my opening remarks, the question of reviewing it should more properly be placed before the executive of the farmers' organisation itself as it was their recommendation and scheme which was, in principle, adopted by the Government. The Government came into the scheme mainly to assist in the matter of finance and to use its public utilities in effecting distribution of the super.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland—in reply) [6.5]: In replying to this debate I do not want to detract from the co-operative spirit which existed, and still exists, among members of the Farmers' Union. When that organisation, speaking for all its members, agreed that certain things should happen with regard to the charge which would be levied on growers for the delivery of superphosphate by road instead of rail, the idea of the scheme was that

people on the longer leads should not be so heavily penalised and those who were living close at hand should bear some of the cost. I think it is creditable that that spirit should have prevailed and it did prevail during the time that the Government told us it could not possibly find money to subsidise the cartage of superphosphate, as it had done in previous years.

The position changed somewhat when the Government announced that money had been made available by the Grants Commission to assist in overcoming difficulties caused by the metal trades strike. When that became known, I think the people for whom I make this appeal had some justification in saying, "Now that there is money available to the Government to help it make good the loss on the railways, we believe the onus should be on the Government to relieve people who have been helping in a friendly way to assist those farmers who are living further out." When moving the motion, I mentioned that the people for whom we appeal have had no previous benefit, yet approximately £800,000 was spent by the Government on a subsidy for the road haulage of superphosphate. Now that money is to be made available to the Government, I think these people should be given some relief.

I have heard it said that farmers who live in the area served by the Geraldton super works and the Midland Railway Coy. were against the scheme, but that is not correct. When they knew that the situation was desperate and that finance was not available, they were quite willing to co-operate, but now that money has been made available to the Government to overcome losses on the railways, I feel that the position has definitely changed. Surely these people are entitled to some benefit and they should be allowed freedom from this levy. It should be the responsibility of the Government to make good the subsidy required for those farmers who are served by road transport. I repeat, the people in the Midlands areas have received no benefit from money spent by the Government previously, and now that money has been made available to the Government, they should be relieved of their obligations.

Hon. G. Fraser: Is it a penalty?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes, every farmer is charged a levy unless he carts his own super from the works. It is an equalisation levy from 4s. rising to a 16s. 3d. maximum, starting from 40 miles out.

The Minister for Transport: It starts at 2s. 6d., but I think 4s. is the average in the Midland zone.

Hon. A. R. JONES: It is an equalisation levy to help people who live farther out. If this was not in existence, such people would have to pay heavy haulage costs.

Hon. E. M. Davies: How does this equalisation scheme operate?

Hon. A. R. JONES: On each ton of super delivered, the farmer is levied. All money collected is put into a general fund and ultimately that fund pays for the road haulage. To give an illustration, may I say that instead of the railways being able to cart super at a rate of £1 a ton, road hauliers are brought in and cart it at about £2 a ton. The idea is that farmers further out do not pay the full amount, and those living closer in have to pay more in proportion.

Hon. E. M. Davies: What is the prospect of the Midland Railway Coy. being able to handle its own traffic?

Hon. A. R. JONES: It has always been able to do so. Farmers living along that line have not received any benefit and they are expected to pay some of this levy, which varies from 4s. to 16s. 3d., depending on how far from the works the farmer lives.

Hon. L. C. Diver: But every farmer in the State is helping to provide bulk facilities.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I do not think that comes into the argument at all.

Hon. L. C. Diver: But it must be taken into consideration.

Hon. A. R. JONES: But it is quite divorced from this argument. I do not want members to think that I am putting up an argument against the people living further out, because I am in that position myself. But I want farmers who are living near the Midland line to receive some benefit now. That is why I want the House to agree to this motion and ask the Government to take over the responsibility for this levy.

Hon. G. Fraser: Where would the Government get the money if it did accept this responsibility?

Hon. A. R. JONES: The Government would find the money instead of the growers providing it. When this proposition was first accepted, the Government said that it did not have money to subsidise the cartage of super by road. Since then, the Grants Commission—and this has been published in the Press—has made available a sum of money to meet railway losses, and that is why I am making this appeal on behalf of the people in the Midland area. If I have not made myself clear, I will be prepared to answer any questions. I ask the House to agree to the motion.

Question put and passed; the motion agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading—Defeated.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: This is a very small Bill and in view of the fact that we have had a long discussion over the merits and demerits of this particular item earlier in the afternoon it is not my intention to be very long in introducing it. The Bill seeks to amend Section 182 of the Health Act, which says—

A nuisance shall be deemed to be created in any of the following cases:—

It then enumerates a number of them all of which I will not read, but I will mention a few. Among them is this one—

Where any factory, workroom, laundry, shop, office, warehouse, or other businessplace, or any portion thereof—

- (a) is so structurally defective, or is so dilapidated as to be unsafe or dangerous or injurious to the health of the inmates.

That is one condition under which a nuisance shall be deemed to be created. Another is—

- (d) is not so ventilated as to render harmless, as far as practicable, all gases, fumes, dust, or other impurities generated in the course of the work carried on therein.

Later the Act deals with other phases which are injurious to health and the paragraphs continue right down to paragraph (g). This Bill seeks to add another paragraph as follows:—

- (h) is not so equipped with efficient appliances as to carry off and render harmless, as far as practicable, all gases, fumes, dust and impurities generated therein, or as to prevent, as far as practicable, residents or occupiers of premises suffering inconvenience from such gases, fumes, dust or impurities.

I understand that at present the Act gives the health officers power so far as the inside of the factory is concerned, but they have no jurisdiction whatever respecting anything outside the factory. The Bill seeks to fulfil that want. The point has been raised during the course of the debate on an earlier Bill where somewhat similar provisions were covered.

I might mention that in the Factories and Shops Act and also in the Health Act there are similar provisions on other matters. A moment ago I read paragraph (d) of Subsection (7) of Section 182 of the Health Act which deals with lack of

ventilation and so on. We find almost the same provision in the Factories and Shops Act. So it appears that in the past it has been necessary for both the Health Act and the Factories and Shops Act to have somewhat similar provisions. We have been told that there are certain nuisances around the metropolitan area and that there is no provision either in the Factories and Shops Act or the Health Act to cover them.

There is an instance in my own electorate at North Fremantle, where because of stock-piling of rock phosphate, a nuisance has been created. This has become so bad that I have with me a petition signed by about 60 of the residents of Mosman Park asking that some action be taken. As I mentioned before, there is nothing in the Act that will permit of action to be taken. So it is necessary for this little measure to be introduced in order that that may operate.

Members know that down through the years there have been many complaints about the cement works at Rivervale. Some doubt has been raised as to whether that should be a health matter. I have a report here from the Commissioner of Public Health and I will read portion of it to show what the Commissioner of Health considers to be a nuisance and a health matter. He says—

So far as can be ascertained cement dust is not a dangerous dust. It is said to be inert because the silica contained in it is in combined form. It is therefore not a chemically harmful dust. Continuous exposure to high concentrations over many years could, however, have a mechanically irritating effect on the upper respiratory passages and probably cause frequent coughs, colds and the like.

Because of that, it is necessary that the Health Act be amended to enable a similar instance in connection with Mosman Park to be dealt with. We are also informed that during recent years a number of spot mills have been erected around the metropolitan area, and they are generally erected on vacant allotments in many cases in the midst of residential areas. In order to deal with a situation of that description, it is necessary for this amendment to the Health Act to be inserted. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Suburban) [7.38]: I am afraid I disagree with Mr. Fraser and his argument that it is necessary to amend the Health Act to deal with this nuisance. It is perfectly true that at the time when the petition about which he spoke was signed, there was no provision in any Act to deal with the nuisance. But an hour or two ago we amended the Factories and Shops Act and in that amendment we made provision

to enable the department controlling the Factories and Shops Act to deal with the nuisance which under this Bill the hon. member seeks to give power to the Health Department to do.

It seems to me to be wrong for two departments to vie with each other for the right to determine what is a nuisance and for the right to deal with it. I think the Bill we dealt with a short while ago covers the remedies and this Bill would only be redundant in giving similar powers to another department. For those reasons it is my intention to vote against the Bill.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [7.40]: To my way of thinking, the remarks of Mr. Dimmitt put the Minister in a spot. The reason I say that is that when the Bill to which Mr. Dimmitt referred was before the House and the Minister was making his reply, the Minister, in all sincerity, said that the two departments should co-operate. For that reason and the reasons outlined by Dr. Hislop, I think this Chamber will look foolish—

Hon. H. Hearn: Industry is not looking for dual control.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would like to answer that one, too. I said this would make the Chamber look foolish. The Factories and Shops Act and the Health Act are concerned and the Minister in his reply to the House believed that it would be possible for the two departments to work together. That being so, the House has a moral obligation to pass this Bill to amend the Health Act.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you want to see two sets of civil servants covering the same job?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That occurs frequently.

Hon. H. Hearn: But why multiply it?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I do not want to make an Address-in-reply speech, but I could in answer to Mr. Hearn's interjection. I can assure the hon. member that so far as the workers of this State are concerned, there are some employers that go to a lot of trouble to see that their workers operate under hygienic and healthy conditions; but I cannot say that of all of them.

Hon. H. Hearn: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It has a lot to do with the Bill. We have an industrial undertaking pending in my province which, I would say, is probably without parallel in the history of the State. That area will be covered with all kinds of factories—so we are told, and I hope it will eventuate. It is expected that there will be over 25,000 people in the Kwinana area. In the Spearwood and Hamilton Hill areas are some of

the finest market gardens in the State. We propose to build a cement works in the vicinity of those gardens. The market gardeners have already had a meeting and put their cases before me and other members of this House and of another place who represent that area. They expect us to do the right thing by them. As politicians, we expect the Government to run certain businesses to provide food for the State. In this House we have a Minister for Agriculture whose main ambition is to provide an extra pound of food wherever possible.

Hon. H. Hearn: What has this to do with the Bill?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: We are going to build a cement factory with a southerly and north-westerly aspect and with the wind blowing right across these market gardens. For that reason if for no other, I endorse Dr. Hislop's view that this is a matter not to be passed over lightly. It will have to be attended to by both departments, inside the factories and outside. Having passed the amendment to the Factories and Shops Act at the wish of the Minister, I feel that we have no alternative now but to approve of this measure.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [7.46]: I believe that ultimately this matter of dealing with nuisances will be recognised as one that requires scientific knowledge and probably also engineering knowledge. I am not worried over the question of whether this Bill becomes law or not because all that it will do will be to give power to the health officer of the local authority rather than to the Health Department. I believe that before another year has passed we shall appreciate the need for a different approach, and I feel certain that the Health Department will not take this matter lying down, but will carry on with its investigations. I shall support the second reading of the Bill because a provision along these lines should find a place in the Health Act.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sir Charles Latham—Central) [7.48]: I think the House has acted wisely in passing legislation to amend the Factories and Shops Act. I agree with Dr. Hislop that this is a matter that requires scientific knowledge as well as probably engineering knowledge. One would have to determine what constituted a nuisance as regards materials discharged into the air and lodging in backyards and in the homes of people, and it would be necessary to determine whether they were disadvantageous to human life. Chemicals may be injurious to health and they may also be beneficial.

We have set out to attempt something in a small way under the Factories and Shops Act and we should not convey the idea that there are alternate pieces of legislation that could be employed to effect

the same purpose. That would only confound the issue and confuse the people who have to operate under the law. If a complaint were made, a dispute would probably arise as to whether action should be taken under the Health Act or under the Factories and Shops Act and the lawyers would reap substantial benefits by giving advice.

I believe that in future quite a lot of the pesticides we are using for the destruction of weeds and insect life, etc., will have to be investigated in order to determine whether their use is affecting the productivity of the soil. We know that science has made available to us quite a lot of things that serve their purpose, but I doubt whether there has been enough research to determine what ill-effects might follow their use. A farmer told me that he had had his wheat crop sprayed and that he was afraid the spraying had done some harm to the soil. The treatment did not affect the wheat crop and it did destroy the mustard, but in the following year he got no return from the land. Of course that might have been due to seasonal conditions and not to the spraying, but that is a matter on which a determination is needed.

We shall need scientists to advise us on these matters. We have not the training that Dr. Hislop has received and we are asked to reach decisions on these questions without being qualified to do so. We shall probably have to pass legislation to define what is intended, and then provide the finance to permit the research worker to advise us as to what ought to be done. The amendment to the Factories and Shops Act should be sufficient to check nuisances for the time being.

In the city of London and also in Sydney, it is an offence to permit any smoke to emerge from a chimney stack and, after the first offence, substantial fines are being imposed. When I look at the East Perth power house, I wonder how much waste is being discharged into the air in the form of smoke. Not many years ago when I was Minister for Health, great difficulty was experienced at Wiluna by reason of the arsenical fumes being discharged from the mine stacks. Much vegetation was destroyed and many people suffered from a form of skin irritation. That difficulty was met by compelling the mining company to prevent the arsenic from being discharged into the air, and this led to a profitable use being made of it.

As a general rule we have been able to deal with such problems as they arose, though not as scientifically as we could if we had a laboratory and research staff. Let us not confound the issue by having two statutes dealing with the same subject. I do not want Mr. Fraser to think that I am against this proposal.

Hon. G. Fraser: It does not sound like it!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Had this Bill been introduced before the other one, I would have spoken similarly if I had thought the department was able to give effect to it. Under this measure, we would have to depend on health inspectors, and they would need to be more highly trained than they are at present. Quite a number of men in the Factories and Shops Department have qualifications, some of them University qualifications, and while they may not be well versed in these matters, they have the background that would enable them to absorb information. For the reasons given, I oppose the second reading.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Suburban) [7.54]: I do not think the Bill will achieve what the sponsor desires whereas the amendment to the Factories and Shops Act will do so. This measure merely provides for persons working in a factory. Section 182, Subsection (7), relates to any factory, workroom, laundry, shop, office, warehouse or other business place structurally defective, dilapidated, injurious to health, unclean, lacking sufficient supply of fresh air, ventilation, light, etc. To those matters the Bill proposes to add

- (h) is not so equipped with effective appliances as to carry off and render harmless, as far as is practicable, all gases, fumes, dust and impurities generated therein, or as to prevent, as far as practicable, residents or occupiers of premises suffering inconvenience or irritation from such gases, fumes, dust or impurities.

Thus the provision requires the prevention of these nuisances as far as practicable, not entirely. The factory-owner would merely have to do his utmost. There is no question of a prohibition, whereas the amendment we have made to the Factories and Shops Act is a prohibition. Under that amendment, inspectors may insist upon a nuisance being abated. I think it is fortunate for the public that we had already passed the other measure before this one was introduced. The Bill cannot have the desired effect and I consider it unnecessary. This Bill will apply to a resident or occupier of such premises, who would probably be the caretaker.

Hon. G. Fraser: We are not in the kindergarten.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I cannot see that the Bill will have any useful effect and therefore shall vote against the second reading.

HON. J. MURRAY (South-West) [7.58]: I had no intention of speaking on this measure until certain aspects were mentioned. I must oppose any further duplication of control of nuisances in fac-

tories. The anomaly that arises regarding spot mills that have been erected in the vicinity of the metropolitan area is the same in country districts, but under another Act provision is made for a workman's inspector and a Government-appointed inspector to ensure not only safe working but also the observance of health conditions in the sawmilling industry. If we are going to duplicate this control and include similar provision in the Health Act, what will be the position?

A sawmiller intending to start a sawmill in any municipal or road board area must first apply to the local authority to ensure that the mill is being erected on an approved area. Once the application is lodged, the local authority may impose any restrictions it thinks fit. Most of the health inspectors intended to police the measure now before us, are under the jurisdiction of the local authorities. Apart from the fact that they are appointed by the Health Department, they are employees of the road board. Therefore they would be consulted before the road board granted permission to a sawmiller to start operations. If at some future time a nuisance was created, restrictions could be imposed and the mill could even be closed down.

If we are going to extend this control from the Factories and Shops Department to the Health Department, I suggest that we should also extend it to the traffic authorities. My reason for saying so is that the only nuisance committed by the sawmill with which I was connected at Mt. Barker was that the smoke from the waste timber at certain periods of the year hung over the main Albany Highway and could, under some conditions, make traffic to and from Albany unsafe, but there is nothing in the Health Act or the Factories and Shops Act to define that as a nuisance. I oppose the Bill.

HON. G. FRASER (West—in reply) [8.1]: Apparently the Bill has not been well received and one of the reasons for the objection taken to it is that it is the second measure of its kind, but that is only because the Government placed it in that position. The measure has been on the notice paper since the 21st October, but the Minister in another place kept it well down on the list with the result that it could not be dealt with earlier. Those are lovely tactics to adopt when a private member introduces legislation. The Minister placed this Bill at the bottom of the notice paper and then introduced another measure. This Bill sought to amend the right Act and the Minister therefore could not bring down an entirely similar piece of legislation.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: The hon. member could have moved to have the item placed further up on the notice paper.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am speaking about the treatment accorded the measure in another place after it was introduced.

The Minister for Agriculture: You could have introduced it here.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am simply handling the measure for the member who introduced it in another place. What chance would I have had of having the item moved up from the bottom of the notice paper in this House? Much has been said about duplication, but plenty of duplications already exist.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do not include it in that bad principle.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is a necessary principle. What has been proposed in this instance is to insert words after the word "dangerous". I am not dealing with personal comfort but with the health of the people.

The Minister for Agriculture: Would that not involve their personal comfort?

Hon. G. FRASER: Not necessarily. A man could be perfectly healthy and still not comfortable. Both the Acts that have been discussed already contain similar provisions dealing with the same matter, but it is from the health point of view that we should deal with this question. The measure passed earlier today gave the factory inspector certain powers, but he has a tremendous district to look after. I do not think there are more than three factories and shops inspectors in the metropolitan area and I want these powers given to the health officers all over the State, yet members speak of duplication! There is a certain amount of duplication in most Acts.

Hon. E. M. Davies: It is better to have duplication than no co-ordination.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is so. No matter how great the nuisance is from the health point of view, health officers cannot at present deal with it. There are many men in the Health Department specially trained from the health point of view and their training is vastly different from that of the factories and shops inspectors. I do not want second-class men to deal with these problems.

Hon. L. A. Logan: What experience would a health officer have of smoke or dust?

Hon. G. FRASER: He would have plenty of experience. Whatever the fate of the Bill, I desire to register my emphatic protest against the manner in which the Government has treated the sponsor of this measure, which was introduced in another place on the 21st October and was not dealt with until yesterday.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Are you not reflecting on the conduct of another place?

Hon. G. FRASER: No. I am reflecting upon the conduct of the Government, and I am entitled to do that. It has taken ap-

proximately seven weeks to have this private Bill dealt with and it is time that the Government gave more consideration to business introduced by private members on behalf of the people of the State. By the use of the iron hand, the Government kept this Bill well down on the notice paper. Is it not remarkable that in this so-called House of review, we find members and even Ministers who have no dealings with the departments concerned, raising objection to the Bill even though the Minister in another place did not object to it? She had only to say the word to have it thrown out there.

Hon. H. Hearn: Are you referring to the cracking of the whips?

Hon. G. FRASER: I think it was the Minister in another place who said that the Bill could not do any harm if passed. I hope the House will agree to the second reading.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	13
				—
Majority against	3
				—

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Keenan	Hon. R. J. Boylen
	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. J. A. Dimmitt
Hon. L. A. Logan	(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. J. Cunningham
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. J. McI. Thomson

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

BILL—LOAN, £19,627,000.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [8.15] in moving the second reading said: As members are aware, this Bill is introduced towards the end of each session in order to give the Government the necessary authority to raise money for the purpose of carrying out the works detailed in the Loan Estimates and for the temporary financing of revenue deficits. The various items for which authority is required are set out in the schedule to the Bill, and the amount appearing against each item is based on the anticipated expenditure during the year, having regard to any unspent balances of previous authorisations. The general principle followed is that, after allowing for unspent balances, suf-

ficient new authority is provided to enable the works to be kept going for about six months after the end of the financial year, or to complete the work if completion is expected during that period.

Authority is provided under the Bill to temporarily finance the accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Revenue Fund, which, on the 30th September, 1952, was £1,839,830. This money is provided by the Commonwealth Bank on the security of Treasury Bills issued by the Commonwealth Government, and it is hoped that revenue collections later in the financial year will be sufficient to enable the Bills to be redeemed. The authority sought, namely, £4,000,000, may not be all required this year, but, on the other hand, the occurrence of deficits during the next two or three months may entail the issue of further Treasury Bills up to an amount approaching that figure, and the authority should be sufficient to meet all eventualities. During the year 1951-52, the Public Debt was increased by £15,101,765, and at the 30th June last stood at £138,288,531. Of this amount, £10,049,000 was provided by the Commonwealth under a guarantee given to the State Premiers at the meeting of the Loan Council held in August, 1951, that the Commonwealth would underwrite the loan programmes to the extent that the amount obtained from the market by means of public flotations fell short of the approved programmes.

Under the guarantee, the Commonwealth provided a total of £160,000,000, which sum was handed to the National Debt Commission, and the Commission, in turn, invested the amount in Commonwealth securities at 2 per cent. with a currency of three years. From Commonwealth loans raised on the market, the State received £3,943,000, of which £2,898,320 carried interest at 3½ per cent. and £1,044,680 at 2 per cent.

Other loan proceeds were £2,073,000 from the Commonwealth Savings Bank, and £28,920 from investment of trust funds under the control of the Treasury. The money that came from the savings bank represents 70 per cent. of the increase in depositors' balances, which is available to the State under the Savings Bank Transfer Agreement. The total amount received from this source is now £10,500,000, on which the interest rate is at present 3½ per cent.

Redemptions of the Public Debt during the year amounted to £992,000. Accretions to the fund during the current year will amount to approximately £1,400,000, and as there was a cash balance of £323,000 carried forward from last year, there will be about £1,750,000 available for redemption purposes this year. There has been some misunderstanding in the past as to why it is necessary that the Loan Bill

should be passed by both Houses of Parliament before the Loan Estimates are approved by another place.

In order that members may be in no doubt I propose to explain the position. The Loan Bill is an integral part of the Loan Estimates and the two should be introduced to Parliament concurrently. It is important that the Bill should be passed by both Houses before the Estimates are dealt with because each item in the schedule to the Bill appears in the statement accompanying the Estimates. If the order is reversed and the Estimates passed before the Bill, then, if the Bill should be amended as did occur on at least one occasion, the problem arises of how to alter Estimates that have been approved by Parliament.

Furthermore, the Loan Estimates, are estimates of expenditure from the General Loan Fund, and as that fund consists of money borrowed under the authority of Loan Acts, it would be "putting the cart before the horse" to approve of expenditure from the fund before authorising the borrowing of money to create the fund.

The Loan Bill does not bear the same relationship to the Loan Estimates as the Appropriation Bill does to the Revenue Estimates. The Appropriation Bill appropriates the General Loan Fund in exactly the same manner as it does the Consolidated Revenue Fund, while the Loan Bill is to the Loan Estimates what a Bill imposing taxation or otherwise increasing revenue is to the Revenue Estimates. In the one case the Loan Bill and in the other, the taxing Bill must be passed before the respective funds can be appropriated. It will therefore be apparent to the House that the Loan Estimates cannot be approved by another place until such time as this House passes the Loan Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [8.20]: There is one item in the schedule to which I desire to draw attention and that is the one referring to the provision of £2,500,000 for public buildings. I presume there are not details in regard to that item because such buildings will include schools, hospitals and many similar structures. However, I hope the Government will give attention to what are known as public utility buildings and the erection of them on the block east of Government House. We have there an area of 8½ acres, but for years past all Governments have been obliged to cut down on public buildings of a general nature.

Parliament House is one of them. Plans for this House were drawn many years ago but the present building is as far as we have got. Always is there pressure

for immediate building to be done by the Government and the time will never be reached for the erection of these utility buildings if it continues in this manner. I hope the Government will have sufficient courage, despite the criticism levelled at it, to make a start in the erection of a building to house members of the Public Service.

Some of our employees are working under disgraceful conditions; conditions which would not be permitted in private industry. Clerks are jammed up in offices and working at horrible old tables which are scarred and scored and, altogether, they are working under conditions which would not be tolerated by a factories and shops inspector if they existed in a private organisation. Governments, somehow, keep on putting off the erection of these necessary buildings, perhaps through pressure or because of criticism, and the time has arrived in my opinion, when a percentage of all Loan funds should be set aside and plans prepared for new public buildings.

Our Government departments are scattered throughout the metropolitan area. The cost of administration must be many thousands of pounds greater than it need be if modern buildings were erected. So I hope the Minister, at a Cabinet meeting, will voice my opinion of the obligation that rests upon the Government to at least commence these necessary buildings. There is a tremendous lag in this type of building and it will take years and years for plans to be prepared and a start made with a programme. If we do not start now, I do not know when a start will be made.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [8.25]: I was pleased to see in the schedule to the Bill, under Item No. 20, the amount of £475,000 to be provided for country areas water supply, including North-West districts. It is gratifying to know that that item does appear, but I hope the Government is aware that money will be needed in the Kimberleys to help rehabilitate the area when the present serious drought abates. There has been little or no relief as a result of rain in the Kimberleys except by way of an isolated thunderstorm, and stock losses total as much as 40 per cent. in some cases. At this time of the year in the North calves are being born and the cows are leaving them, with the result that the calves are dying in thousands.

The latest report I have received is that most of the waterholes are dry and many stations have lost as much as 50 per cent. of their stock. Most serious of all, in some cases the stations are losing their horses and I do not know from where they will obtain replacements. Something will have to be done. It is the first drought the Kimberleys have suffered in

50 years, and it will affect the meat position in the metropolitan area for some time to come. I therefore hope the Government will see its way clear to take some action to effect relief.

I hope, too, that the Government has made provision in the Loan Estimates for the purchase of the "Dorrigo" and the "Dulverton" belonging to the Commonwealth Shipping Line, which, I understand, is to be sold. Even if the Government does purchase these two ships, as things are at present in the North, we will still not have sufficient ships. In the past the position was that we could not get our goods up to the North, and there was little produce to take out. But today the position is reversed. We are bringing in many thousands of tons of goods and there are piles of produce waiting on the jetties to be removed for shipment to other parts, but there are no ships to transport the cargo.

Therefore, I hope the Government will do something about that problem. There has been much discussion about the main road from Northampton to Carnarvon. Members representing the North Province have asked repeatedly in the House that some provision be made to bituminise that road. I do not say that all the work can be done immediately, but if the Government could give us an assurance that it will make a start and continue to do further sections each year, we would finally get somewhere. However, as it is, we get no satisfaction and no real answer. I trust that the Government will take action on the matters I have raised.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [8.28]: I cannot let this opportunity pass without making some reference to the very small amount of £25,000 that is to be provided for the development of agriculture. In looking through the list contained in the schedule to this Bill, we can see that millions of pounds will be spent in various ways for many purposes. But for agriculture, upon which our livelihood depends, we have provided the small amount of £25,000. We all know that if the State is to progress we must produce more food. I know, of course, that that is not all the money that will be spent on agriculture during the whole year; I understand that the total expenditure will be something in the vicinity of £500,000.

As the Minister for Agriculture has stated that somebody else will have the opportunity of holding his portfolio in the next few weeks or months, I wonder if that is the reason for his making the remarks we have heard during the last few days. It simply appals me to think that in an agricultural State like Western Australia so little money is available for the primary industries upon which we all so much depend. I trust that Ministers in this House will raise Cain when the Estimates are next being prepared in order

to see that a more satisfactory amount is provided for the development of agriculture. There are millions of acres in this State that could be developed on sound lines. It is only reasonable that before the Government asks people to settle on the land, it should take steps to prove the worth of the country and to secure information as to what development could be successfully undertaken in the district.

Those who are prepared to go on the land should have information as to what production can be obtained from the soil. I hope the Ministers here will take steps along those lines and secure more money for the development of agriculture. I am fully aware that upwards of £500,000 will be spent in matters affecting agriculture. There is one phase, however, to which greater attention should be devoted by the Government. I refer to the problem of soil conservation. Little erosion has taken place in the rural areas, but quite sufficient to make us aware of the serious position that could easily arise.

I do not intend to voice any criticism against the Bill. I am aware that the present Minister for Agriculture has gone out of his way to implement legislation and provide regulations that will help to foster agricultural interests. I know he has not sufficient funds to enable him to deal with the schemes he has in hand on a proper basis. I content myself with protesting against the provision on the Estimates. Mr. Craig appealed to the Government to go ahead with the construction of the administrative block on the site that has been available for years.

For the moment I forget on which side of the House he sat when we agreed to make provision for that magnificent temporary building in Malcolm-st. If he approved of that, I do not think he had any right to speak as he did this evening. In all probability, the amount of £75,000 which was set aside for the temporary building will be expanded to £100,000 before it is completed. To my mind that was a wicked waste of money. I implore the Government not to go ahead with any suggested construction of a huge administrative block involving the expenditure of £1,000,000 or more when so much money is required for the rural areas and the promotion of primary production.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [8.34]: I would like some information regarding the schedule. I draw attention to item No. 26 in the Schedule to the Bill, which reads—

Advances to State Housing Commission for re-establishment of persons dispossessed of their homes owing to resumption of land for public purposes and for temporary housing of evicted tenants, £75,000.

If the provision of that money is for the purpose of recouping people who have been dispossessed of their homes and for the

provision of other accommodation for them, I would like to know if the amount also provides for compensation to be paid to people who have been dispossessed of their homes. The item covers provision for the temporary housing of evicted families. Is the system of erecting buildings for the temporary housing of evictees to continue?

To my knowledge, arrangements have been made with some local authorities to permit of a certain type of house being erected as temporary dwellings. Does the amount of £75,000 cover that phase as well? The amount provided is very small if it is to be utilised for those particular purposes. There is another item in that part of the schedule—No. 29—which reads—

State Housing Commission—capital,
£500,000.

I want to know something about the two items I have quoted. I understand that some of the temporary houses that are to be built, are to be constructed under the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act and are for sale. If that is so, it appears to me that very few of these temporary houses will be erected.

On the other hand, we have been informed by the State Housing Commission that owing to lack of loan funds it is not proposed to enter into any further contracts for the erection of houses for the people. At the same time, if the homes that are to be erected are to be brought under the Workers' Homes Act, we should be informed accordingly. It appears to me that the amount provided is quite niggardly. As against the items I have quoted, I note that £1,200,000 has been set aside for the purpose of housing in the Kwinana area. One wonders where the money is to come from, seeing that we have been informed that no funds are available for the provision of homes for the people.

While I have not raised any objection in Parliament nor yet in another sphere with which I am associated, to the building of temporary accommodation, I do not know that the local authorities are prepared to allow the construction of that particular type of dwelling in perpetuity. I say that, although I realise that people must have somewhere to live. The housing of the people is a national matter and should receive serious consideration at the hands of all Governments. If we are to pursue the immigration policy that has operated for some time under which we are bringing thousands of people into the country, we must assuredly make provision for them to live somewhere. Some of those who are arriving are supposed to be displaced persons. They do not appear to have been displaced without cash, because they can afford to pay exorbitant prices for even old buildings, thereby causing the eviction of our

own people who have lived in those dwellings for considerable periods. As a result, we see widows who have reared families and have done their duty by the State being forced to live in rooms in the evening of their lives.

I appeal to the Minister to explain to me how much money will be available to the State Housing Commission beyond what is mentioned in the schedule. When we find that only £75,000 is available for the Commission and on the other hand, over £1,000,000 can be set aside for the Kwinana project, I become concerned about the situation. The housing problem is by no means easing up. If we are to continue with the immigration policy, it will be increasingly difficult. I know it is the desire to populate Australia and we must do so if we are to retain the country, particularly within the British Commonwealth of Nations. We shall not be doing the right thing if we bring out thousands of people who, when they arrive here, will find there is nowhere for them to live.

This is a very important matter. One of the factors that make for contentment is security with regard to the ordinary comforts of home life, hospitalisation and so on. Only when those considerations are provided can we build up a happy community. If people have nowhere to live, they become disgruntled. They develop into a type of citizen that we do not desire and that through no fault of their own, because they feel they have been let down by the State. How many of these temporary houses does the Government intend to build? Is it expected that the local authorities will continue in perpetuity to allow the current type of building to be erected?

HON J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.42]: It is my very great regret that I cannot find in the schedule to the Loan Bill a sum of money for the purpose of providing loud speakers in this Chamber. During the session quite a number of members have regarded their speeches as strictly confidential to themselves and their neighbours. Loud speakers are necessary to enable those who have normal hearing to be able to follow what is said in the Chamber over the conversations among individuals which are so necessary and vital, particularly when they proceed alongside the member who happens to be speaking. Even at times I have been unable to hear the voice of the President, and I trust that some day we shall have sufficient money provided on the Estimates to admit of the installation of loud speakers.

Hon. J. A. Dimmit: Some loud speakers have been elected to this Chamber.

Hon J. G. HISLOP: Quite so. I have also concluded a year of most strenuous service as a member of the Library Com-

mittee. I have held this onerous post for another session of Parliament without the opportunity of having to attend a meeting of that august body, or even having been invited to attend one! I regard this signal honour afforded me as something I have grown to merit because of my continued absence from meetings of the Library Committee. I suggest to the Minister as this library is as vital to Parliament as is one associated with any other institution, when next session he is appointing someone in my place to this committee, some regulation be framed covering the conduct of the committee, and the members of it.

I suggest that he should provide for regular meetings to be held. It is extraordinary that the Library Committee operates in a way that no other library committee of which I am aware carries on its business. We simply receive a list of the books that have been purchased, and not one member of the Library Committee, so far as I am aware, has ever looked at a book to see whether it merits purchase. I do not know any other library committee that could behave in that way. I suggest that before books are purchased they should be laid on the table of some room for members of the committee to peruse with a view to deciding whether or not they should be bought. Unless we adopt some method of caring for our library in this way, I cannot see that it will fill its rightful place in Parliament.

There is one other feature of the year's activities that I wish to criticise. During the debate on the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill, I refrained from criticising the Workers' Compensation Board. I stated that during its 3½ years term of office its relationship with the insurers and the workers had been very amicable and that litigation had been considerably less than in past years. But I think that this board has regarded itself purely as a board that settles claims for compensation. That should not be so. It was charged with a duty. Parliament gave it power to investigate and carry out research into the causes of accidents in industry and even into treatment of injuries.

Last year I asked what activities had taken place in that connection and I received a wordy reply, which stated, in so many words, that precisely nothing had been done. If I had asked the same question this year, I would have received a similar reply, that "precisely nothing has been done." With all the money accumulated by insurance companies within the last year, this board has signally failed to take its place in either preventing or conducting research into accidents in industry. It would be wrong to regard the Workers' Compensation Board as being purely one that settles claims. It has a bigger function than that if it is to play its full part in community life.

I sincerely trust that within the next year my words will be taken into consideration by the board and that a start will be made with research. There is an ample field for it. We in the profession know of what occurs and of certain action that could be taken in regard to accidents in industry. The amount of money that would be spent in this way would be handsomely repaid. Just as our traffic conditions have been altered by keen interest shown by the police, so I feel certain research into the causes of accidents in industry would eventually lead to a lessening of the number.

My congratulations are extended to those who have been invited to be present at the New South Wales meeting of the Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. They will carry with them our good wishes. At the same time, I am filled with certain regret. I think considerably more interest should be taken by this Parliament in that very vital organisation. It is something which can act as a pure basis of education for members, can break down State and parochial ideas of government, and can make members aware of the developments that are occurring in the various States. For the two or three men from this Parliament visiting, in conjunction with members from other States, one of the States of the Commonwealth and being taken at the expense of the Government of that State to inspect the new developments, the experience will be an eye-opener.

But I feel that this should never be allowed to become political but that all shades of thought should be equally educated and there should be an opportunity for all members, of whatever party, to be chosen for such visits to the other States. I trust the time will come when we shall have the honour of inviting men from the Eastern States to visit us so that we may show them the vast distances that have to be covered by our governmental concerns and to indicate to them the ambitions we have for our State.

When our members go to the Eastern States, I trust they will realise that there was a plan at the back of the minds of those who were at the first meeting, which was that these gatherings should be held regularly, that they should be educational and that they should attempt to realise that up to date this State has been slow in accepting the conditions which were laid down at the original meeting in Hobart, and which have been accepted by every other State Government. The amount called for is very small indeed when the return to Parliament generally is considered.

I would issue a warning that unless we here and members of Parliament in other States become nation-minded, we will lose

our State Governments. It was distressing to read the hints in reports of the Canadian meeting that our State delegations were looked upon as almost separate bodies from our Commonwealth delegation. The representatives of the States at the meeting of the Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association should insist on representation of the Commonwealth Parliament. We might even attempt to make it an Australasian branch by bringing in the New Zealand Government, which was so anxious to attend the first meeting at Hobart.

Although I was a member of the first delegation, I do not state what I am about to say purely on the basis that I hope some day to represent this Parliament abroad. I say it because I really keenly feel that there should be no bar to the best men possible going to Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meetings outside Australia; and the fact that a man has attended an Australian branch meeting should be regarded not as a bar but as a step educating him for, and leading him to, the position of representing us abroad. The education so gained at one of those meetings must fit a man to represent us in those great and tremendous meetings of the Parliamentary Association that are held in the various Commonwealth and British Parliaments.

I would like to repeat what I said in the early stages of this session, during the Address-in-reply debate, that the time is ripe for the introduction into this Parliament of some form of committee control of some of its activities. I was interested to read an advance notice of a book by a man named Keeton entitled, "The Passing of Parliament." I understand this book will be in Australia shortly. It was written by a man who has watched with dismay what he considers to be the passing of Parliament in Great Britain. In the preface to his book he uses the words that "the day of Cabinet dictatorship and bureaucracy is at hand." We have this year passed a number of Bills—I think about 80—and almost all of them have given power to civil servants the various departments to issue regulations in countless numbers. Yet there is no committee that will, in the interests of Parliament and the people, scrutinise those regulations as they are issued.

It is not possible for one man to take a vital interest in regulations laid on the Table of the House. But the appointment of a committee to look into the regulations as they are promulgated would be a very sound means of retaining the power of Parliament. I will not repeat my speech on the Address-in-reply. The Minister was kind enough to ask me to prepare a statement on the matter, but unfortunately he forgot that I had given him

all my notes when I finished my speech, so all the details are in his hands. I do trust that the matter will be discussed by the Government before the next session of Parliament, not on party lines but, if necessary, with assistance of representatives of the other parties, in order that we here may not see the passing of Parliament. I support the measure.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.58]: Having read the Bill, I realise it might be said that I should be happy about the amount allocated to my province.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Are you not?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: While such is the case, and while, as the saying is, "needs must when the devil drives," and everything must be bound up in Kwinana, there are one or two items in the schedule that call for some consideration. I have totalled the sums of money required for Kwinana, also for the railway, the building of homes, and resumption of land, I find they amount to £2,750,000. I suggest that if all members had that amount being spent in their districts, they would feel happy. Despite the fact that a great number of houses are to be built, it may be news to members to know that the Rockingham Road Board is the local authority mainly concerned with the new area, and I venture to say that the time is not far distant when that board will be known as the Rockingham Municipal Council.

The Fremantle Road Board fringes on the north-east end of the site, and it will also expand as a result of the development there. But according to the town planning maps of the area, no site has been allocated for a hospital. The road board is concerned about this, because it will have to carry a big burden in regard to health in respect to sanitation of the new area. If it has to provide the obsolete pan system, it will be up against an expenditure of approximately £1,500. What is more, the pans just cannot be purchased.

For this reason, I am stating the case for the health committee of the Rockingham Road Board. It is looking for co-ordination from the Government departments that will be functioning in the area in the future. The Rockingham and Fremantle Road Boards have been only faintly notified of what is going on. As a result, a special meeting of the Rockingham Road Board was held some two or three weeks ago, to attend which Mr. Lawrence, the member for South Fremantle, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Davies and I were invited. The sole purpose of the meeting was to place before us, as the members for the district, the disabilities under which the board is working. It is getting no assistance from the various departments that are functioning there.

I have, therefore, taken the opportunity tonight to place the matter before the Government departments through the Minister for Transport. The Rockingham Road Board is a virile body and is prepared to play its part in the development of this phenomenal area. Within a radius of 14 or 15 miles from the beach in this district, there are seven or eight small schools. The children are brought in by cars and other means. There are three bus-loads of children that leave Rockingham each day for the Fremantle Boys' High School and the Princess May High School. The number of teachers in the Rockingham area would not have to be added to if one central school were built there.

The Education Department, under Dr. Robertson, has, I know, big plans for schools in the metropolitan area, but while we build for the future let us not forget to look after those who are here at present. We should see that Rockingham is not left out of the picture. Within 10 years, in my opinion, Rockingham will be a municipality as big as Fremantle. The position of the people whose land has been resumed will need attention. As yet they have had no notification beyond knowing that their blocks have been resumed. They do not know what payments they will get, or when they are likely to receive them. Perhaps they will have to wait for the Loan Estimates to be passed.

Taking the area of the new road through Spearwood, there is some land in 50- and 60-acre blocks owned by various people who were farmers there, and who would like to subdivide these areas into building blocks. The Town Planning Commission has ruled that they cannot cut up their blocks into less than five-acre blocks. To show how absurd the policy is I refer to one block in particular which is a quarter of a mile from the Naval Base Hotel.

It is on the main Rockingham Highway and also fronts the Hope Valley-rd. going to Mandogalup, and is serviced by electricity, telephone, school-bus and a good bus service. The owner realises that he will have to put roads through, and is prepared to do so, but then an officer of the Town Planning Commission was approached he said, "Who wants to live there?" This happened only five months ago, and yet we know that some 20,000 to 25,000 people will be living out there. An appeal will have to be made to the Minister for Local Government in this regard.

I whole-heartedly support everything the Commissioner of Police has done in connection with the traffic raids, and I hope he will not give up in two or three weeks, because it is only by continuing this strong action that we shall break down

the enormous accident rate in the metropolitan area. I disagree with a member in another place who said that the traffic police should be in civvies and not uniform. The police are appointed to prevent crime, not to condone it. As far back as 1932 the Transport Workers' Union in this State prevailed upon the then Commissioner of Police to put the speed cops into uniform, because the union considered there were always breaches of the law being made by people when driving along the roads, but that the driver pulled up when he saw a policeman in uniform. I hope the Commissioner will not put his traffic police into civvies.

Turning to another subject, I trust the native question is not going to die a natural death like some matters that are introduced into Parliament. "The West Australian" has made a valiant effort on behalf of these people in the last two or three months. We had a magnificent meeting in the Perth Town Hall at which a pious resolution was carried. We still get an odd letter in the newspapers about it. I hope "The West Australian" and others who have tackled this question will not give up their fight.

When I came into this House a few months ago, I had the honour of being welcomed by each member who stood up to speak on the Address-in-reply. I take this opportunity of reciprocating their good wishes, and I also extend my best thanks to the President, to you, Mr. Deputy President and also to the officers of the House for the happy way they have tried to help me learn this business of Parliament. Whilst I may not have been as bright as some might have expected, at least I have been sincere.

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.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

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

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendment No. 1 made by the Council and had agreed to No. 2 subject to a further amendment now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

No. 2. New Clause—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 6 as follows:—

6. Paragraph (d) of the proviso to clause one of the First Schedule to the principal Act is amended by deleting all words after the word "time" in line three and substituting the words, "provided that the charges allowed shall not be less than the fees currently charged for a public hospital bed and shall not exceed the fees currently charged for a ward bed in a private hospital if such fees are in excess of those charged for public hospital beds. Hospital charges shall include fees for theatre services and drugs and dressings other than those granted under the Pharmaceutical Benefits Act. Hospital fees under this section shall be subject to any contributions made under the Hospital Benefits Act."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment to the Council's amendment is—

That the Council's amendment be amended by deleting the proposed new clause and inserting the following new clause in lieu:—

6. Paragraph (d) of the proviso to Clause 1 of the First Schedule is repealed and re-enacted as follows:—

(d) (i) In this paragraph—

"area" means the area within an imaginary circle having a radius of 15 miles from the General Post Office at Perth;

"public hospital" means a public hospital administered under the Hospitals Act, 1927.

(ii) The hospital charges mentioned in paragraph (c) of this proviso for the treatment and maintenance of the worker—

in a public hospital within the area;

in a public hospital outside the area;

in a private hospital;

shall in addition to any operating theatre fees be at the respective rates determined by the board as the equivalent of the general rate chargeable for treatment of cases other than workers' compensation cases in—

a public ward bed in a public hospital within the area;

a public ward bed in a public hospital outside the area;;
a ward bed in a private hospital.

(iii) The board is authorised from time to time to determine the rates and operating theatre fees mentioned in sub-paragraph (ii) of this paragraph and a determination so made shall have effect on publication of the determination in the Gazette.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I move—

That the amendment, as amended, be agreed to.

Hon. H. HEARN: I support the Minister and I think that this is a satisfactory solution to the discussions held in this Chamber.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am prepared to accept the Assembly's amendment but I realise that the words "and drugs and dressings other than those granted under the Pharmaceutical Benefits Act" have been omitted. The drugs and dressings necessary for the treatment of a patient can cost a considerable sum and if they are not covered in the hospital charges, we may find a man in the position of having to meet a bill when he leaves the hospital. If a man were admitted to a private hospital ward bed, the cost of an injection of morphia would be added to his other costs. I do not think the cost of drugs and dressings would come within ordinary hospital fees and I would like the Minister to express an opinion on it. To my mind, it would be better to insert the words that have been left out.

Hon. G. FRASER: I was going to raise the same point because I think it is an oversight. We agree that wherever possible the ordinary expenses of hospital accommodation shall be met by the Workers' Compensation Board, and if we inserted these other words I am sure the Assembly would agree to it. While I do not intend to oppose this amendment, I am a little disappointed because we laid down a minimum and a maximum charge and where an injury necessitated a worker having to go into a one-bed room, the wording of our amendment made it possible for the expenses to be covered. There was a provision in the old Act which allowed a margin of £50 at the discretion of the board, but that no longer appears. The board will be able to prescribe only the fees that are set out in the amendment.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: That is why I think drugs and dressings should be covered.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, I think so, too, but I intend to support the Minister's motion.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: It seems to me that under subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (d) hospital charges might cover drugs and dressings. I believe that view was taken in another place, so it would appear they have considered that item.

Hon. G. FRASER: Having mentioned operating fees there might be some difficulty.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Paragraph (c) of the proviso to paragraph (c) of Clause 1 of the First Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act provides—

In addition to the compensation payable under this clause there shall be payable a sum equal to the reasonable expenses incurred in respect of medicines, medical or surgical requisites and the medical or surgical attendance (including first aid and ambulance or other service to carry the worker to a hospital or other place for treatment, hospital charges for treatment and maintenance not exceeding as hereinafter prescribed in paragraph (d), and also including treatment by specialists when their services are found necessary)

Hon. G. FRASER: It says—"not exceeding as hereinafter prescribed in paragraph (d)." This is paragraph (d).

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I think the main purpose is to specify that charges generally shall be those charged in a public hospital or for beds in a private hospital and to rule out the possibility of a patient requiring a special private ward for his own use.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like to point out that paragraph (d) says, "Cases in the public ward bed in a public hospital". That might confine it to a hospital charge and not extras. It specially mentions the word "bed". I move an amendment—

That the words "and drugs and dressings" be inserted after the words "theatre fees" wherever they occur.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I would like some consideration to be given to this. Perhaps Dr. Hislop could explain it better than I can. Paragraph (c) says: "in addition to the compensation payable under this clause, there shall be payable a sum equal to the reasonable expenses incurred in respect of medicines, medical or surgical requisites, etc." Surely that should include drugs and dressings?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am quite agreeable if the alteration will not bar hospital charges for treatment and maintenance covering the position.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It is quite safe. Paragraph (c) distinguishes all these matters with commas and semicolons in between them and the expenses do cover

medicines as an entity, medical or surgical requisites as an entity and the medical or surgical attendance as an entity, and then comes the reference to hospital charges for treatment and maintenance. It is only hospital charges that are referred to in the paragraph (d) we are now discussing. I think the whole position is well covered.

Hon. G. FRASER: In view of Dr. Hislop's explanation, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment to the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

Sitting suspended from 9.40 p.m. to 2 a.m.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [2.1 a.m.] in moving the second reading said: As members know, this Bill is to appropriate the moneys required for the services of the year in accordance with the Estimates of expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan Fund. In addition to the amount covered by the two Supply Bills, which have already been passed this session, namely £15,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £7,000,000 from the General Loan Fund, and £1,000,000 from the Public Account for Advance to Treasurer, further supply is granted by this Bill up to the total amounts requiring appropriation as shown in Schedule "A".

The total expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund is estimated to be £38,241,142, but as £6,706,847 is already covered by the special appropriations in the respective Acts, which provide for the expenditure, the amount to be appropriated now is £31,534,295, and a summary of the proposed expenditure is set out in Schedule "B". Schedule "C" summarises the estimated expenditure from the General Loan Fund, totalling £16,596,920, while Schedule "D" sets out in detail the purposes for which the amount granted from the Public Account for Advance to Treasurer may be used. In addition to expenditure for the current year, the Bill appropriates the amounts spent during the previous year in excess of the Estimates both of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan Fund, and details of these excesses are shown against the respective votes in Schedules "E" and "F".

Section 41 of the Forests Act, 1918-31, requires that a scheme of expenditure from the Reforestation Fund shall be submitted annually to, and shall be subject to the approval of, Parliament. The scheme of expenditure for the year 1952-53, which is summarised in Schedule "G", has been laid on the Table of the House, and Clause 4 of this Bill gives the necessary approval. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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.

Read a third time and passed.

COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Now we have completed the work of the session, I think we are all something like schoolboys in the sense that we look forward to the termination of our labours each year. That is not to say that we have not enjoyed in some measure the proceedings that have characterised the session that is just ending, but rather that, when we have done our job, we look forward with a certain amount of eagerness to the time when we can lay down our task and take what we believe is a well earned rest.

I would like, in conformity with the tradition that has grown up and with absolute sincerity, to express to you, Sir, my own appreciation of the courtesy that has always been extended by you to me and to members during the session, and I feel I am speaking for the whole House when I say that to you. I do not propose to go into details regarding individuals and I will leave that to our able colleague, the Chairman of Committees. I think it can be taken for granted by all those who have assisted in the services to the Council that we do very much appreciate what each and everyone has done.

On the whole, I think it has been an enjoyable and, I should say, a very profitable session. There have been notable contributions to the debates in the Chamber, and I would say, as one who has participated in comparatively few sessions in the House, that there seems to have grown up greater confidence in individual members in expressing their views, and they have on many occasions given us something well worth while to think about. That applies in particular, I would say, to the newer members of this assemblage.

I take this opportunity again, on my own behalf and I feel sure on behalf of the whole of the members, to extend to you, Mr. President, greetings for the coming Christmas season. I would say to members generally that I do wish each and every one of them an enjoyable Christmas-tide and the best of all good things during the coming year. I sincerely trust that we shall all meet again and that all members of the House and the staff will continue the same happy relationships that we have experienced during the current session.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I join with the Minister in charge of the House in extending to you, Mr. President, my felicitations and to say to you how grateful we are to you for the courtesy you have always extended to members, your firmness in decision and your generous tolerance. May I compliment the Minister for Transport on the way he has conducted the proceedings in the House. As Leader of the House he has done an excellent job and has been able to secure for most of his Bills a successful passage through this Chamber.

May we also compliment Sir Charles Latham, as the No. 2 Minister in this Chamber, on the work he has done. I particularly wish to express my thanks to the Deputy Chairmen of Committees who have always stepped into the breach when called upon and have performed their respective tasks in an entirely satisfactory manner. I also express thanks to the Clerks at the Tables, Mr. Sparks and Mr. Roberts, and also to Mr. Browne, the Clerk of Records, all of whom have carried out their duties in the way we would wish.

We must not overlook our thanks to the "Hansard" staff, who have made good speeches of some that were not so good in the course of reporting our proceedings. We thank them very much for the work they have carried out so capably. I know members would like me to express their appreciation to the chief of the "Hansard" staff regarding the efforts of those under his control. To Tom Court, who looks after matters at the front door, we express thanks for the courteous manner in which he has always carried out his duties.

To the Controller and his staff we also express our appreciation of their very able efforts in looking after us. I conclude with extending my very best wishes to each and all for the coming year and hope that their Christmas will be a bright and happy one.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like to contribute a speech that will be popular in that it will be very brief. In addition to those who have already been mentioned, I desire to express our appreciation of the efforts of the staff who have looked after the inner man during the session and also to the messenger boys who have helped

in the smooth working of the House. The colleagues of my party I thank for their assistance and co-operation and I thank other members for the manner in which they have received us on many occasions. May I wish all members the compliments of the season and hope that if they are race-minded at all, they will pay a winning bets tax often during the festive season!

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I wish to add my comments to what has been said. As this has been my first session in this Parliament, I want to thank everyone who has helped me so willingly and so ably. I particularly want to thank the officials of this House for what they have done to help me and you, Sir, for your tolerance, and also the Ministers and all members. I shall at all times do my best in this House, but the day I am looking forward to is the day when loud speakers will be installed so that I can speak over them and really let members know what I want! I wish all a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: As one of the younger members of this Chamber I would like to convey to you, Sir, to the members of the House and to all the staff my thanks and appreciation and seasonal greetings. It is indeed an experience to come here and be treated so kindly and with the greatest consideration. I very much appreciate it. Since coming here I have made friendships that I shall cherish for the rest of my days. I thank one and all.

The PRESIDENT: In exchanging seasonal greetings we are continuing a tradition that has been established in connection with this House and recording the fact that the high standard of this Chamber has been fully maintained in recent years. All who have been mentioned have contributed to the maintenance of that standard and I trust that the decorum which has graced our proceedings will always be observed. I am sure it will be, while members have regard for what has been entrusted to them. We are passing through what must be regarded as a particular phase in world history. My contention is that our problems can be solved only by that spirit of tolerance and understanding and sympathy that goes so far towards making those problems amenable to human intelligence and divine guidance.

I think we should express appreciation of the way in which the officers of the House have carried out their duties. During the session, and especially towards the end of it, they are under a continual strain. Every Act that goes on the statute book must be carefully examined for those inevitable mistakes and discrepancies which are characteristic of human weakness. The way in which they have carried out their duties during strenuous

times is a tribute to their faithfulness. Reference was made to Mr. Burton and his staff and I think that they have surpassed themselves in attending to our needs this year. We should not let the occasion pass without referring not only to the work of the "Hansard" staff, but also to that of the Press. Although we always consider the Press does not give nearly the amount of space to our discussions that we think should be provided in the interests of the public, they have made available to us such space as they have been able to afford.

We look forward with hope to the year that is to come. I think the world is gradually coming back to a condition of sanity. We hope that during the year the suffering which so many people have endured will be lessened as they settle down to production and realise that man's salvation rests on his own efforts rather than on indulging in all sorts of wild dreams. We trust that the dreams of a contented community will become a reality and that Western Australia, which perhaps has a brighter future than it has had for many years, will go forward to fulfil its destiny. I thank members one and all and wish them the very best for Christmas time and a happy and prosperous New Year.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT
(Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland): I move—

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

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 2.36 a.m. (Saturday).