

*Point of Order*

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I point out, Mr. President, that we have a Standing Order which prevents us from commencing new business after 11 o'clock at night, and it is now a minute or two after that time.

The PRESIDENT: That is so.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.4 p.m.*

CONTENTS—*continued*

	Page
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Acts Amendment (Superannuation and Pensions) Bill : 1r. ....	1950
City of Fremantle (Frea Literary Institute) Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1961
Com. ; report ....	1962
Country High School Hostels Authority Bill—	
Conference of Managers : Suspension of sitting ....	1959
Conference managers' report ....	1961
Council's further message ....	1961
Death Penalty Abolition Bill : 2r. ....	1950
Pawnbrokers Act Amendment Bill : 2r. ....	1959
Property in Bottles Bill : 2r. ....	1962
	1975

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### DRAINAGE AT RIVERTON

#### *Commencement of Scheme*

1. Mr. O'NEIL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:
  - (1) Is it anticipated that a commencement will be made on a comprehensive drainage scheme for the Riverton area of the Canning Road Board during this financial year?
  - (2) If so, what is the extent of the proposals?
  - (3) If not, can any firm estimate be given of the likely commencement date?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) "No.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).
- (3) A firm estimate cannot be given, but each year all contemplated works receive consideration in the light of available funds.

2. *This question was postponed.*

### WATER BORES

#### *Details of Tenders for Drilling*

3. Mr. O'NEIL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:
 

Would he give details of the most recently accepted tenders for drilling of—

  - (a) 5-inch or 6-inch bores;
  - (b) 8-inch bores?

Mr. WILD replied:

Tenders are not called for drilling only. I would like to add that this question is not very clear, and if the honourable member amplified it, we could endeavour to give him the information he is seeking.

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 19th October, 1960

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Albany High School : Technical annexe and development of schoolgrounds ....	1947
Builders' Registration Board : Alteration of constitution ....	1947
Drainage at Riverton : Commencement of scheme ....	1946
Gascoyne River : Dam sites ....	1947
Geraldton High School : Additional classrooms ....	1947
Greenmount and Boya : Transport facilities ....	1948
Greenmount-Helena Valley : Transport facilities ....	1948
Housing of Natives : Narrogin training project ....	1947
Standard Gauge : Kalgoorlie to Perth—	
Construction and repair work at Midland Junction ....	1948
Control ....	1948
Effect of narrow-gauge lines ....	1948
Route ....	1948
Water Bores : Details of tenders for drilling	1946

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

Migration Interstate : Departures from and arrivals in Western Australia ....	1950
R. & I. Bank "Death" Beacon—	
Comments on value ....	1948
Discontinuance ....	1950

## MOTION—

Wool Industry : Inquiry by Select Committee ....	1963
--	------

**HOUSING OF NATIVES***Narrogin Training Project*

4. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has he received favourable reports on the experimental native housing training project at Narrogin?
- (2) Has the first "graduating" tenant been granted a Housing Commission home?
- (3) Would he provide two additional houses in the experiment to cater for selected native families too large for the existing small type of training house, and who are, therefore, excluded from the scheme although their need is greater?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The commission was only the constructing authority for this project, and the houses were handed over to the Narrogin District Native Welfare Council for letting. Favourable reports on standards have been received through the Department of Native Welfare regarding three families, one of which has since left the district.
- (2) Offers of accommodation have been made to three of the tenants. Two declined, and the third is in occupation of a Housing Commission home.
- (3) The Minister for Housing will confer with the Minister for Native Welfare; and if further houses are required, the commission is prepared to act as the constructing authority.

**GERALDTON HIGH SCHOOL***Additional Classrooms*

5. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) When will tenders be called for the building of additional classrooms urgently needed at the Geraldton High School?
- (2) How many additional classrooms will be built this year at the high school?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Tenders close on the 18th November.
- (2) Two classrooms and one woodwork room will be completed in the 1960-61 financial year.

**ALBANY HIGH SCHOOL***Technical Annexes and Development of Schoolgrounds*

6. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many rooms of the technical annexe at the Albany High School will be ready for use by 1961?

- (2) What progress has been made with regard to the removal of house on Lots 2-3 to Lot 279, and the consequent development of school-grounds?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Tenders will be invited for this work in February, 1961.
- (2) Consideration is being given to the availability and delineation of the alternative site.

**BUILDERS' REGISTRATION BOARD***Alteration of Constitution*

7. Mr. O'NEIL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has there been a meeting of the Builders' Registration Board since the dissolution of the Builders' Guild?
- (2) Was the Builders' Guild represented at that meeting?
- (3) Is it intended to amend the Builders' Registration Act altering the constitution of the Builders' Registration Board because of the dissolution of the guild?
- (4) If so, will any other builders' organisation be represented on the board?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) The Builders' Guild has not been dissolved. It is still a legal entity.
- (2) The Builders' Guild has been represented at recent meetings of the Builders' Registration Board.
- (3) and (4) Answered by No. (1).

**GASCOYNE RIVER***Dam Sites*

8. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it correct that one or more prospective dam sites have been located on the Gascoyne River or its tributaries, and that further investigations are being carried out before a final decision is made?
- (2) If so, will he advise the House—
  - (a) the number;
  - (b) the locations of the sites?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Several prospective dam sites have been looked at, and preliminary details only have been taken on three possible sites, which are as follows:—

On the Gascoyne River near Kennedy Range, approximately 100 miles upstream from Carnarvon.

On the Gascoyne River at Chalby Chalby, approximately 70 miles upstream from Gascoyne Junction.

On the Lyons River, adjacent to Lyons River homestead.

No further investigations are in hand, or are proposed until the report of the consultants—Messrs. Scott and Furphy—has been received, unless requested by them.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

9. *This question was postponed.*

#### **STANDARD GAUGE: KALGOORLIE TO PERTH**

##### *Route*

10. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Will the proposed 4 ft. 8½ in. standard gauge line between Kalgoorlie and Perth follow the same course as the present 3 ft. 6 in. gauge?
- (2) If not, what would be the alternative route?

##### *Effect on Narrow Gauge Lines*

- (3) When constructed, what part will the present 3 ft. 6 in. gauge and its branches play in the State's transport system?

##### *Control*

- (4) Will the new line be under the control of the Commonwealth or State Commissioner of Railways?

##### *Construction and Repair Work at Midland Junction*

- (5) What amount of the new construction of rolling stock would be manufactured in the Midland Junction Workshops, and what amount of repairs would take place there?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Until a final decision is made on the question of standardisation and up-to-date detailed surveys are available, a positive answer cannot be given to these questions.

Such investigations as have been made have been of an exploratory nature based on a reconnaissance survey, and possible locations can be accepted as tentative only.

- (3) It is not considered desirable to make any pronouncement on this matter until a lot more investigation has been made regarding the effect of standardisation.
- (4) The State Commissioner of Railways.
- (5) At this stage it is impracticable to answer this question.

#### **GREENMOUNT AND BOYA**

##### *Transport Facilities*

11. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

As the M.T.T. buses were withdrawn from the Koongamia route on the establishment of the Koon-gamia rail service, will he give instructions for a Railways Department bus to service Greenmount and adjacent areas, or alternatively, have the present rail service extended to Greenmount and Boya?

Mr. COURT replied:

No. Railway road service buses are not designed for operation on suburban passenger services.

Requests for extension of the present rail service have already been considered and the extension has been found impracticable.

#### **GREENMOUNT-HELENA VALLEY**

##### *Transport Facilities*

12. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Transport:

As the M.T.T. buses were withdrawn from the Koongamia route on the establishment of the rail service, will he confer with the Minister for Railways, with a view to railway buses servicing the Greenmount-Helena Valley areas?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The Chairman of the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust has been conferring with the Commissioner of Railways on this matter; but since the railway passenger service was extended to Koon-gamia, there does not appear to be sufficient patronage remaining to warrant a bus service.

#### **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

##### **R. & I. BANK "DEATH" BEACON**

##### *Comments on Value*

1. Mr. BOVELL:

The member for Canning, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Leederville asked questions regarding the beacon on the new Rural and Industries Bank building. I said that I would get written information from the Commissioner of Police, the Road Safety Council, and the Commissioner of the Rural and Industries Bank. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read these opinions. The one I am about to quote is from Mr. O'Brien, Commissioner of Police, and is as follows:—

I refer to the objection raised to the denoting of fatal traffic accidents by blue lights on the

above beacon, and I can only repeat my personal view that there seems little difference in this method of bringing such tragedies to public notice than by any other of the means of dissemination, such as press, radio, posters and so on.

It is quite different from the former method of painting a sign on the roadway at the actual scene of the fatal accident, which was rather gruesome and undesirable and remained for some time as an upsetting reminder to friends and relatives.

The blue beacon is not so specific but indicates only that a fatal road accident has occurred within the previous 24 hours somewhere within our million square miles of territory.

Whether or not the beacon will have any minimising effect on the tragic road toll (we have 27 more deaths this year to the equivalent date last year), it is impossible to foretell, but it will surely cause many road users to reflect on the problem and may, in the ultimate, have some good effect.

(Sgd.) J. M. O'Brien,  
Commissioner of Police.

17th October, 1960.

The next comment is by Mr. R. G. Clark, Executive Director of the National Safety Council of Western Australia. It is as follows:—

The National Safety Council of Western Australia supported with some considerable enthusiasm the suggestion that a warning beacon indicating that the toll of the road was mounting should be placed on the new Rural and Industries Bank in Barrack Street.

It was considered that because of Western Australia's record in the constantly mounting number of road deaths in Australia, an additional warning to road users would serve a very useful purpose. The fact that over 142 persons are killed, or injured to the point of needing hospital attention each day on Australian roads fully justifies any warning device.

Road toll barometers are to be found in many cities throughout the world and thousands of them have far less claim to aesthetic appeal and dignity than the obelisk which surmounts the Rural and Industries Bank. In

most cases the day to day warning signs of road deaths feature the green and red lights, together with the slogan—"Keep the green light burning". Very frequently these daily barometers of road deaths feature the progressive death toll for the year and, in some cases, the number of days which have been road fatality free.

While such warning devices to stimulate awareness of the great need of care in the use of the road are a very common feature in American cities, they are to be found in England and quite a number of places in Australia. Indeed, the Perth Junior Chamber of Commerce made a feature of a road toll barometer some years ago in Perth. The sign was discontinued owing to the cost of maintaining daily supervision in respect of changes. It was sponsored by one of the leading oil companies and was favourably commented upon by many people as a salutary warning to careless road users. One such device at Deepwater Point, New Jersey, U.S.A. is in the form of a chronometer which shows on a dial face 12 feet in diameter the number of safe seconds, safe minutes and safe hours which have passed since the last accident.

It is recognised that extreme "horror" propaganda is not a good thing but an ostrich-like attitude to the appalling number of road accidents breeds a dangerous complacency. The public spirited action of the Commissioners of the Rural and Industries Bank in providing the warning beacon is to be commended. It is a dignified warning which might well be a directly contributing factor in the reduction of the toll of the road in Western Australia.

19th October, 1960.

Mr. G. H. Chessell (Chairman of Commissioners of the Rural and Industries Bank) said that—

In erecting the beacon the commissioners' only thought was to provide a service to the community. If the beacon were responsible for saving just one life a year the commissioners would have considered it a success.

The beacon was in no way intended to be a "death light" but rather a reminder to road users that careless driving could cause death.

The commissioners of the bank took into consideration the form the light should take and the use to which it could be put and these aspects were fully discussed with many responsible bodies and departments.

It was finally decided that if the light could be used to make people more aware of our horrible road toll and bring about safer driving habits and more courtesy, it would be a worthwhile contribution to Western Australia's road safety campaign.

However, various opinions had already been voiced about the efficacy of the beacon in this regard, but as the project was so enthusiastically supported by both the Police Department and the National Safety Council, the bank was reluctant to put the beacon to any other use unless it was sure that was what the public really wanted.  
19th October, 1960.

#### *Discontinuance*

2. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Lands:

In view of the opinions which he has just read, will he tell us the reason why the beacon has now been turned off?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I was unaware that the beacon had been turned off. It may have been turned off because of some structural matters concerning the building of the bank; I do not know and I have not been advised by the commissioners of the bank. I shall, however, certainly have inquiries made.

#### **MIGRATION INTERSTATE**

##### *Departures from and Arrivals in Western Australia*

3. Mr. ANDREW asked the Minister for Immigration:

Yesterday when I asked the Minister a question concerning the number of people who had left Western Australia for other States, and had come to Western Australia from other States, he did not give me an answer, although previously similar questions have been answered in this House. I ask him now whether the following figures are correct:—

Excess of departures for the Eastern States over arrivals in Western Australia—

1956	.....	4,730
1957	.....	2,344
1958	.....	2,454
1959	.....	3,383

For the March  
quarter of this  
year ..... 3,234

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I am not in a position either to confirm or deny the figures that the honourable member has just quoted. As I said in reply to his question yesterday, it is not the responsibility of the State Department of Immigration to keep these statistics, and therefore I have no official information to impart.

4. Mr. ANDREW asked the Minister for Immigration:

Would the Minister say that the *Quarterly Statistical Abstract* published by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics would have the correct figures?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I have no doubt that the figures are correct; but it is a Commonwealth matter, in respect of which the honourable member has full information, because he has just indicated that he has taken the figures from the *Quarterly Statistical Abstract*.

#### **ACTS AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION AND FAMILY BENEFITS) BILL**

##### *First Reading*

On motion by Mr. Brand (Premier), Bill introduced, and read a first time.

#### **DEATH PENALTY ABOLITION BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 28th September.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [4.50]: Some very interesting speeches have been delivered by members on both sides of the House on this Bill. The approach by every member who has spoken so far has been analytical and earnest. I would hope, and would be confident, that all speeches yet to be made would measure up to the same high standard.

The purpose of the Bill is to abolish the imposition of capital punishment in Western Australia. It is true that capital punishment has been imposed in various countries of the world for a great number of years—I suppose, since the beginning of time in those countries where men first lived.

In earlier days, even in England, capital punishment was imposed for offences which would not, in these times, be described as serious crimes. For instance, the offence of picking pockets was punishable by death, and the death sentence was

imposed and carried out in England in earlier years upon people who had been found guilty of having indulged in the practice of picking pockets.

In those days hangings were carried out in public. It has been said by authorities who have investigated the subject that whenever a hanging was being carried out in public—and this would include the hanging of a pickpocket for having stolen money—the pickpockets who were still alive and active carried out their practice at the public hanging and became considerably richer, from a monetary point of view, than before the hanging commenced.

Sheep stealing was also an offence which carried a capital punishment sentence if, in the opinion of the presiding judge or magistrate, the circumstances were considered such as to justify the imposition of that penalty.

If, in fact, capital punishment had been a deterrent, the picking of pockets and sheep stealing would have practically disappeared with the passing of time as men were being hanged when found guilty of picking pockets or stealing sheep. However, that trend did not develop, but the other trend did. More and more people came to realise that the imposition of capital punishment for those types of offences was out of all reason and inexcusable in the highest degree; and, as a result, capital punishment was declared to be a form of punishment which could no longer be imposed upon persons found guilty of either type of offence.

It is true, however, that capital punishment has survived as the punishment which is imposed in several countries, including England and Australia, when a person has been found guilty of murder. The main argument put forward in justification of it is that it is a deterrent. In other words, it is contended that the imposition of capital punishment and the hanging of a person found guilty of murder does deter other persons who might be inclined to indulge in murder from so doing. I will have a few more words to say about that later on.

It is also contended by some people that as murder is the major crime which any person can commit against another, capital or major crime should be punished by a capital or major punishment: that is, death by hanging in British countries, and death in the electric chair in the United States of America and perhaps in some other countries.

It has also been said, and is still said, that anyone who criticises or condemns capital punishment shows much more sympathy for the murderer than he shows for the relatives of the murderer's victims. I am unable to see the logic of that claim. Most people, if not all, who oppose capital

punishment, do so on principle. The question of sympathy for the murderer or the relatives of his victim does not enter into the situation in that setting.

However, let us look briefly at that situation. I think every person who would be opposed, on principle, to capital punishment would have as much sympathy for the relatives of the victim as would anyone who is in favour of retaining capital punishment and of continuing to impose it. I do not think there would be any difference in the outlook of each group in regard to the sympathy they would feel and express towards the relatives of the victim.

In this area of discussion we have also to remember that the murderer upon whom capital punishment is imposed, has relatives. He could have a mother and father, both still living; he could have brothers and sisters; he could have a wife. If anyone cared to try to make a logical assessment of the need of sympathy for each of those groups of relatives, he might be inclined to favour, on balance, the relatives of the person upon whom capital punishment has been imposed.

I say that because the relatives of the person who has been hung have not only lost a near relative; but they have, in addition, had imposed upon them a blot, a stigma, and a disgrace as a result of the person who had been hanged having committed the awful crime which he did commit, and who had his life taken in the brutal way which is used in this country to impose capital punishment.

Those relatives have to continue living in the community with that disgrace upon them. Although most people in the community would not look down upon them, or try to hurt them, injure them, or insult them because of what happened—in the happening of which they played no part and held no responsibility—yet there are some in every community who would make the place of those relatives in the community much harder than it should be.

If members are to look at the sympathy angle they will have to look at the complete picture and keep before their minds the situation of each group of relatives—the group who are related to the victim, and the group who are related to the murderer.

Mr. Lewis: Would it make any difference in their attitude whether the person was hanged or was imprisoned for life?

Mr. HAWKE: I think it would make a very great difference. After all, imprisonment for life is indeed a severe punishment. The fact that the person who is imprisoned for life has committed a murder certainly puts a stain and a strain upon his relatives; but at least he is still alive. It is true that whilst there is life there is hope.

Instances have been known in every country of the world, I suppose, where a person found guilty of murder—sometimes hanged and sometimes not—was later on found to be not guilty. If hanging were to be abolished, the relatives of the person found guilty and sentenced would be much better in their relationship to other people in the community if their relative was still alive, even though incarcerated in prison for a very long term or for life.

On that point, we have in Western Australia at least one man who had been found guilty of murder; and who, because of his youth at the time the crime was committed, was given a life sentence of imprisonment with hard labour. However, with the passing of the years and the wonderful conduct which he consistently displayed in prison, he was released. As far as I know, he is a very good and a very worthwhile citizen today.

He was given an opportunity to redeem himself and he made the most of the opportunity—not that he ever had any hope of being released and being a free man again. The effort which he made brought its reward after a considerable number of years, and today he is a free man in this community, on equal terms with every one of us and probably as good a citizen as any one of us.

The argument that the imposition of capital punishment is a deterrent is one I have never been able to follow. I quite agree that one can neither prove nor disprove the claim. If those who believe it is a deterrent were really logical in their belief, they would be constantly urging that the sentence of capital punishment should be made a great public occasion, and that there should be all the publicity in the world in regard to the imposition of capital punishment.

Surely if some penalty is to be a deterrent, the more publicity that is given to the imposition of the punishment the greater will be its chance of becoming a deterrent. We know from practical experience that almost the whole of the proceedings in carrying out capital punishment are surrounded with secrecy. The smallest possible number of people are given an opportunity to witness the carrying out of capital punishment; and the smallest possible amount of publicity is given.

So those authorities which agree to this extreme sentence being carried out and which justify their decision on the ground that the imposition of the penalty is a deterrent, do not really believe in what they say at all; because they do everything in their power to restrict the proceedings to the narrowest possible confines, to restrict the publicity to the smallest possible amount, and to reduce the number of persons who are to witness the imposition of the punishment to as few as possible.

We can take it for granted that the imposition of capital punishment is not a deterrent at all, because those who make this claim to justify the carrying out of the death sentence do everything possible to reduce the knowledge of what is being done, and to keep it down to almost nothing in the publicity which is given. For my own part as an individual, I agree that if an authority does decide to carry out the capital punishment sentence, it should be so restricted in every possible way.

I am inclined to think that publicity is restricted, that the number of persons who are to witness the carrying out of the sentence is limited, and that everything else is restricted into the smallest possible area because those who have the responsibility of deciding that the sentence shall, in fact, be carried out, are, to some extent, conscience-stricken in regard to the actual performance and the carrying out of the sentence.

My own impression is that the imposition of capital punishment is not a deterrent at all. I cannot imagine that when a person in cold blood premeditates, plans and carries out a murder, there is any question of the extent of the punishment he may receive; and that in deciding whether he shall, or shall not carry out his intention he is likely to be turned aside by the knowledge that, should he be found out and found guilty, he would be hanged. Neither can I imagine that a person who commits a murder in "hot" blood has any time to think about or to consider the extent of the punishment which may be imposed upon him should he be found out and found guilty.

I sometimes wonder whether we think seriously enough about the difference between the balance of the human mind and the human emotions, and their unbalance. I doubt very much whether any of us thinks seriously enough about that situation. This seems to me to be tremendously important in trying to face up to the Bill before us.

I think the margin between the balance of the human mind and the balance of human passions and the balance of human emotions, and their unbalance, is extremely fine. I suppose every one of us at some time or other has had one or more experience when the strain of mental balance, emotions, or passion has been so heavy as to cause us, either almost or completely, to lose control for a moment, or perhaps for more than a moment.

I remember reading in the morning newspaper only a few weeks ago where one workmate attacked another workmate with a hammer in a workshop over in Leederville. This happened in the morning, soon after the two men had started work. I have no knowledge of the background to the occurrence, but presumably ill-will had

developed between them either that morning or perhaps over a period of time previously.

I would refuse to believe that the person who used the hammer on his workmate had ever thought of capital punishment being imposed upon him as a punishment if he had killed his mate and was found out and found guilty. Yet the use of the hammer by this particular person could have easily killed his workmate, because clearly the thing must have been done in a moment of considerable hostility or of passion.

So, in our anxiety as individuals to condemn the person who commits the capital offence; and in our anxiety to rush him to the gallows when he is found out and found guilty, we should, I think, pause a moment—we would do well to pause a moment—to consider the basic impulses in man, the unbalance of which at any particular moment, or hour, or day has been responsible in the past, and will be responsible in the future for murder being committed.

I think no-one would be so unwise as to think that murder will vanish from the earth next year or next century; just as I should say no-one would be foolish enough to think sheep stealing would disappear from the earth next year or in the next 50 years; or think that all crimes and offences which are committed will disappear from the face of the earth. These offences take place, and these crimes are committed because man is man.

We, because we are in Parliament, and because we are public men, might be inclined to feel self-righteous. We might think and we might even say we would never commit murder—and I hope none of us ever would—that we would never steal sheep; that we would never pick a pocket; that we would never break and enter a shop or an office; that we would never do anything against the law. In saying these things we might be expressing prophecies which are well based and which would be proven by the passing of time to have been thoroughly justified in our own individual lives.

We have to remember that we are fortunate persons in the community. Certainly members of Parliament, and especially Ministers of the Crown, are subject to pressures which sometimes cause them, at least privately, to get hot under the collar; to become hostile; and to say things under their breath, if not outwardly, which relieve their feelings and make them become reasonably calm and sane again. However, we are not living the lives of other people in the community. We are not in the unfortunate position of many men and of many women.

It was my good fortune, or otherwise, to have been Minister for Child Welfare for several years altogether in this State; and in that position one learns, to some extent, how the other half lives—how the unfortunate half lives—and one obtains a far

better appreciation of the mental strain, of the mental pressures, and of the emotional strains and pressures which are upon some men and some women in this community constantly—not for a day or a week, but week after week, and year after year.

If there is one thing more than another for which some women in this country deserve credit it would be for the way those women stick to their husbands through thick and thin despite what those husbands do to their wives and to their children—not by way of the imposition of physical or brute-force punishment, but by the terrific unending strains and pressures which they put upon the minds and the emotions of their wives and also of their children. So I would hope we would not be self-righteous in judging the situation. I would hope that we would indeed be very human in looking at the whole situation.

For my own part I find nothing which supports the imposition of capital punishment. I find nothing which would justify the State in taking the life of one of its citizens. It has been claimed that where a person takes the life of another, his life should be taken. I do not see the sense of that at all. I do not think there is any sense or reason in it—it is just sheer vengeance.

It does not do the murdered person any good. It does not do the relatives any good. It does not do the community any good. And when we consider that capital punishment is carried out in Western Australia in the brutal manner which is used here, then the situation from my point of view is made worse.

Not that I would favour, in any circumstances, the imposition of capital punishment, no matter how brutally refined the method of carrying out the punishment might be. After all is said and done, it is not so much the method of carrying out capital punishment as the act of carrying it out—the act of the State, certainly on behalf of the citizens of the State as a whole, in cold blood having organised and carried out the taking of the life of a human being.

So I support this Bill. I hope the Bill will be carried at the second reading stage this session, even if it is carried on the understanding that the Committee stage will not be taken until next session. In this regard, the member for Subiaco indicated he was opposed to capital punishment except in relation to treason and piracy. He also went on to say that he might vote for the second reading of this Bill if some other members on his side of the House would do the same. Presumably, in the event of the second reading being carried, it would be the intention of the member for Subiaco to amend the Bill in Committee in order that the right to impose capital punishment should be retained to cover cases of treason and piracy.



I express the hope again that the second reading of this Bill will be carried. Naturally, I have not had any discussion with the member for East Perth, whose Bill it is, as to whether he would agree, in the event of the second reading being carried, to hold the Committee stages over until next session. All members in the Chamber know why no discussion with the member for East Perth has been possible on that basis since he took ill some three or four weeks ago.

However, I would be inclined to think the member for East Perth—and possibly all members on this side of the House—would agree that capital punishment might still be retained in relation to treason and piracy. That would certainly be a tremendous step forward as compared with the present law and the present situation. There is a point, too, that in cases of treason, the Commonwealth law would almost certainly operate above the State law. As I understand the situation, legally treason is a crime against a law of the Commonwealth of Australia and not against a State law.

As far as piracy is concerned, I should think that is a dead crime these days. I have never heard of a case since I do not know how far back. In view of that situation, it seems to me that there is a majority of members in this House at this time who would vote to abolish capital punishment except in regard to treason and piracy. There might be a majority who would vote for the abolition of capital punishment in spite of those crimes, and therefore to abolish capital punishment totally in Western Australia.

I hope that as many members on each side of the House as possible will take part in this debate, because I think that with the onward march of time and the further development of the human mind, there is a greater understanding and appreciation of the value of human life, no matter whose life it is; and this fact makes it certain that capital punishment will be abolished, if not this year, then in the not very distant future—certainly in this century—in all British countries.

In proof of that, I express again the fact that capital punishment, a great many years ago, was imposed for almost trivial offences. In those days it was imposed for offences which could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be described as crimes because human life was cheap—and that applied to most human lives. As we learn from early history of the many deportations of people from the older countries of the world to Australia, not only was human life cheap in those times, but human liberty was almost non-existent in the sense which we understand it and know it today.

I hope that Western Australia will not be the last area of any British country to make the decision to abolish capital

punishment. Therefore, I hope that if we are not in a position this session to obtain a majority for the complete abolition of capital punishment, or for its almost complete abolition, we will approve in principle the second reading stage of this Bill and, by agreement, hold over the Committee stage until next session.

**MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.34]:** I deem it a great privilege to participate in this debate. In my opinion, the Bill before the House is the most important one to come before Parliament during my short career in this House. It is a Bill which touches not economics but human life; and I repeat that I deem it a very great privilege, and a responsibility that has been placed upon me as the representative of the people of Kalgoorlie, to speak upon a measure of this nature. It behoves all of us to analyse the contents of such a Bill in a detailed and objective manner. For myself, I personally accept the challenge, and I intend to do just that.

I have before me a copy of a petition that was circulated, I believe, to all members of this Assembly some weeks ago when this Bill was first introduced. I would like to read the preamble to this petition for the benefit of those members who have not a copy before them at the present time. It reads—

**A PETITION TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY IN RELATION TO THE ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT:**

Recognising the desirability of removing from the Statute Book of Western Australia the provision for capital punishment, and understanding that there is before the present session of Parliament a private member's Bill designed to secure that end, we, the undersigned citizens from varied departments of public life, urge that you, as a duly elected representative of the people of Western Australia, treat the Bill as a non-party measure. We could hope that you might feel yourself able to personally support the measure.

I would like to emphasise the words, "We the undersigned citizens from varied departments of public life urge that you, as a duly elected representative of the people of Western Australia" . . . I speak in that vein, as only one of 50 members in this Assembly.

The signatories to this petition give us a glimpse of some of the leading members of our community. They are certainly leading citizens, and their occupations and callings could well be termed varied. The pride of place on the petition is given to a previous member of this Assembly, namely, Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver; and includes that grand Western Australian gentleman, Professor Walter Murdoch;

and Profesor Beasley, Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Western Australia. Rather than read out all of the names, since most members have received a copy of the petition, I will simply mention, in fairness to all of these people, that they were moved by an attitude of moral awareness and moral urgency to lend their names to this petition, because the Bill, as I mentioned, is one of paramount importance.

It is true that the Government of the day is responsible for the discharging of the law, whenever such law is broken or offended. The purpose of this Bill is not to interfere with that principle, but merely to amend the law in order to give it, in modern jargon, a shot in the arm; to imbue it with a status that is in keeping with modern-day thought, and modern trend, throughout the world.

On many occasions during this debate we have heard references to the early history of capital punishment in our Mother Country, England. I do not intend to traverse that same ground; but I would mention the fact that prior to 1830—that is, in the beginning of the 19th century—a political theory swept England, the result of which was, in the field of legislation, the greatest reform since the time of King Edward I. In other words, following the death of Edward I there were hundreds of years during which time there was very little change in legislation in England until the early 19th century.

Due to the efforts of a great reformer by the name of Jeremy Bentham, a political theory swept England under the term Utilitarianism. The essence of this theory was to ask whether any given institution served a useful purpose. If it did, it should be retained; if it did not, it should be dispensed with and replaced by something more useful and serviceable.

The effect of this theory on English law was completely shattering. There were various statutes—I mention those of only two years: 1832 and 1833—which completely changed the complexion of English law, particularly in the field of real property, and the criminal law of England, as a result of this theory of utilitarianism. In other words, when the theory was applied to certain archaic institutions as to whether they served a useful purpose, the answer was most definitely in the negative.

As a result, there was a great change in the field of criminal law. In those days, prior to this burst of legislation, fears were held when it was suggested that the death penalty should be removed from those who menaced a person's home by breaking and entering. Fears were held that a person's property would no longer be safe; that the maxim that an Englishman's home is his castle would be shattered and violated. Those fears were expressed most volubly in both Houses of Parliament in England,

as elsewhere throughout the community. But time has shown that they were greatly overrated and exaggerated.

Criminal law, from the point of view of reform, is indebted in no small measure to the person who gave his name to the Police Force—namely, Robert Peel, who established the first regular police force in London; and, later on, in the country districts of England.

History reveals that the only sound reason why there was such a multiplicity of crimes carrying the penalty of capital punishment in England in those times was the lack of an adequate police force—or any police force at all. People therefore took it upon themselves, as a form of defence against those who violated property, to apply the death penalty to certain crimes that were committed.

Following the establishment of a reliable, organised, and efficient police force, emphasis on those crimes was lessened; and great reforms have taken place in England ever since, the most recent reform being, of course, the abolition of the death penalty in certain cases. This is certainly a long way ahead of what was in vogue in England in 1833, and a long way ahead of the position in Western Australia.

In some respects, in other fields, we have been proud to boast in the past that what Western Australia thinks today, the rest of the British Commonwealth will think tomorrow. We had better think about that one a little more in the field of criminal law and capital punishment.

Coming to more modern times, when we cast our eyes back a little we find that with the advent of the motorcar there were accidents on the highways, and many cases of deaths resulted from the negligent driving of vehicles. These matters, of course, were referred to juries; and it is common knowledge that in many cases juries were hesitant to declare a verdict of guilty, knowing that in such cases the law could be satisfied only with the death penalty. The result of this is that today there is a differentiation which is often applied in cases of negligent driving, and the penalty is less than death. I ask, when we consider that the net result is still death, is the difference more of degree or kind?

Mr. Watts: There has not been a death penalty for manslaughter for a tremendous number of years.

Mr. EVANS: I quite agree with the Attorney-General.

Mr. Watts: That is because of the alternative the jury has now for manslaughter, in regard to running-down cases.

Mr. EVANS: I am sure the Attorney-General will not contradict me when I reiterate that one of the reasons for the differentiation, and the adoption of manslaughter as a classification for these

offences, was the reluctance of juries to convict when it was common knowledge that such crimes would carry the death penalty.

Another point is that it has been argued that in all criminal law the value of punishment as a deterrent is most important—the value of a certain punishment is to deter the incidence of that particular crime. This is no less true in the field of the death penalty, particularly for murder. However, if we are to be truly Gilbertian, and follow the maxim of Gilbert and Sullivan, and “make the punishment fit the crime,” we will find ourselves in some queer circumstances, particularly when we apply it to another crime which in Western Australia carries the death penalty—I refer to piracy. If a person is pirated, what punishment is meted out to him? Is he reprimanded?

Furthermore, if the death penalty is regarded as being an effective deterrent to the incidence of murder, I ask the question also posed by the Leader of the Opposition: Why is it that proceedings following the sentence of death—the execution—are always cloaked in secrecy and carried out furtively? If the deterrent value is of such importance, why is it that the Government of the day, or any day, has not capitalised on the value, and gained the true value that it no doubt believes applies in the deterring effect of the death penalty?

I do not intend to touch very much on the humanitarian point of view or to give a spate of quotations. I content myself with repeating one of the major commandments which, of course are the background of our belief in a God above—I refer to the commandment which says, “Thou shalt not kill.” This commandment was given with no qualifications; it applies to each and every one of us and it does not have any diminishing effect in accord with any office we might hold. The commandment is quite clear and unequivocal—“Thou shalt not kill.”

Furthermore, the interpretation of that commandment is justified or vindicated by another statement from the New Testament: “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s; and to God the things that are God’s.” It is quite clear that the intention was that both the State and each human being were given certain responsibilities which they were bound to honour in their own particular field.

Each individual was commanded to render unto Caesar the things that were Caesar’s; but there was still the reservation that he was commanded to render to God, and only to God, the things that were God’s. This interpretation does not vary one of the ten commandments—“Thou shalt not kill.” And to my mind it applies both to individuals and to Governments.

The Attorney-General will realise the importance of the year 1907 in the criminal law of England. In that year a court of criminal appeal was established in England. Before that time there was no such thing as a court of criminal appeal. Prior to the establishment of the court there was a most famous case concerning a man by the name of Adolph Beck. He was tried, found guilty, and convicted of a capital offence; but later it was found that he was entirely innocent. On that occasion the unfortunate accused person had no right of appeal, because there was no such court in operation.

I mention the incident to prove that in modern times—that was in 1907—there was an example of where a miscarriage of justice could have operated, to such an extent that the authorities were moved to institute a court of criminal appeal. But English-speaking peoples today are even more enlightened, because in England now the death penalty has been abolished in many cases.

Before concluding, I would like to quote from an extract from *The Observer*, of Sydney, a periodical available in the reading room of Parliament House. This issue is dated the 8th August, 1959, and the article has a very gory title. It was directed to an incident which occurred in another State—namely, South Australia—and referred to the Stuart case. The title of the article is “Politics in the Hanging State,” and I mention that with reservation. It was written by an Adelaide correspondent and I will content myself with this brief extract from the article—

Extrapolating figures from the U.K. Royal Commission on Capital Punishment of 1949 and from the Australian Encyclopaedia, it seems that South Australia is in the habit of executing 42 per cent. of its convicted murderers. Western Australia follows a good way behind with an execution rate of 35 per cent. New Zealand has overall during the course of the century averaged a 24 per cent. execution rate. Tasmania’s small figures reveal a rate of 20 per cent. The average rate for Victoria and New South Wales over selected periods would be about 4 per cent, and 2 per cent., respectively, while Queensland has been without capital punishment long enough not to count statistically.

I would be most shocked—but in reality I am most grateful about it—if this article had been written about Western Australia; but it was written about one of the other States. The rate of execution for murder in South Australia is 42 per cent. of convicted murderers. I am grateful to know that such an article was not written about the rate in Western Australia.

Mr. Watts: For the last 36 years our figures show an execution rate of 14 per cent for convicted murderers.

Mr. EVANS: Those figures were taken from *The Observer*—

Mr. Watts: I think you said they were for the last century; and that, of course, might be right.

Mr. EVANS: I come to another point. Why was it ever written into our Criminal Code that there should be a distinction between wilful murder and murder if the punishment for both is to be the same? It is an interesting point.

Queensland, whose criminal law is very similar to our own, in that it has a Criminal Code, still retains the distinction of wilful murder and murder; and for both the penalty is the same. But it is not the death penalty. Queensland has seen fit to remove the death penalty, and I have not been convinced that since the abolition of the death penalty in Queensland there has been an increase in the incidence of murder or any other capital offence in that State.

In the year 1960 we in Western Australia pride ourselves on living in an enlightened age. Tomorrow afternoon I intend to congratulate the Government on the introduction of the new summary relief Act for married persons. In dealing with that Bill my praise will not be lavish enough, or my approbation loud enough, in congratulating the Government for carrying on the work instituted by the member for Eyre. The Government is to be congratulated on introducing the measure, because we are living in an enlightened age; but I trust that the Government will continue to look at other legislation in the same light.

I conclude by saying that in 1960 we in Western Australia are fortunate to have the heritage which has been handed down to us, and we should be able to pay our debt to the past by putting the future in debt to us.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [6.0]: I would like to make a declaration as to where I stand in this matter of capital punishment; though I am sure no-one has ever doubted exactly where I have stood for many years, because I have not made one recommendation that a person should hang. I do not believe in homicide; I do not believe in revenge or retaliation; but I do believe that a murderer should be severely punished.

I do not wish to be misunderstood in this matter. I feel that if somebody deliberately commits a murder—and it would depend on the circumstances—he should be committed to life imprisonment with hard labour. As I have said, I do not believe in hanging. It is a legal instrument, but it is not moral.

It matters not what a man may do. Very often we find a man committing a crime on the spur of the moment, or in the heat of an argument. Perhaps he has been badly treated, and this prompts him to commit the crime. I could quote three instances of men in Western Australia who have been granted relief from their sentence and who, as a result, have been completely reformed; and are now highly respected by all those with whom they come in contact. That proves very clearly to me that a person is capable of being reformed. Parliament is at the head of affairs, and should make every endeavour to legislate to reform people, and do everything possible to make that a reality.

A number of people have been proven innocent after they have been hanged. I know of three such cases. There is, of course, no redress for such people; but we must consider the terrible effect a situation of this kind will have on the person's relatives—his mother, his wife, and his family. I have not gone into this matter very thoroughly. For instance, I do not propose to go back to Pharaoh, or to Socrates, or to Plato, who carried on the great work of Socrates, in order to indicate what transpired in the world many hundreds of years ago, before the coming of Christ.

I do feel, however, that everyone should give this matter careful consideration, and we should all declare ourselves, and say where we stand in regard to capital punishment. My opinion is that mercy is a great corrective. We all know that some people will never be reformed, because of their mental unbalance. Some of these may have become prejudiced, and in consequence they find it difficult to clear their systems of such sentiments.

I feel that we should let humanity prevail wherever possible. We say that we are merciful, and that we want to be fair, but to continue to impose the death penalty will be to act contrary to all the tenets of mercy. It will mean we are being revengeful instead of doing our best to reform the individuals concerned.

It has been my experience that on many occasions people have committed murder as a result of drinking intoxicating liquor. It is possible they have laboured under the influence of liquor for a long time, and have become depressed and despondent. Their only outlet appears to have been suicide or murder.

It is well known that in many of the murder trials the offenders have been convicted and hanged on circumstantial evidence. They have not been found guilty because they have been seen committing the offence; they have not been found guilty because they admitted to the offence; they have been found guilty as the result of circumstantial evidence; and,

after the death penalty has been imposed, on many occasions, it has been found they have been wrongly hanged.

As I have said, a man has no redress once he has been hanged, but our thoughts must go to his relatives, and his immediate family; we must consider their feelings and the torture that must be inflicted on them as a result of such a hanging.

I think it will be agreed that the hangman himself commits murder in carrying out the job for which he is paid. We do not tolerate murder being committed, but yet we are prepared to pay a hangman to carry out a murder—the murder of a man who has been found guilty of murder.

After having listened to the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Kalgoorlie, who have given this matter a great deal of consideration, I feel there should be a better understanding on this question of capital punishment. As has been pointed out, people were hanged in early times for trivial offences. Very often they were hanged for poaching, and taking a hare from a rich man's property; they were hanged for stealing a loaf of bread to provide for their starving families; they were also hanged for stealing sheep.

I admit we have got beyond that stage, but I see no reason why a person should be hanged at all. When a murderer commits his crime he does not think of the consequences; nor has he any thought of capital punishment. To my way of thinking, capital punishment is not a deterrent. I feel that most people can be reformed, brought back into society, and be looked up to, as it were, by those with whom they come in contact.

If Christianity means anything—and I think it does—who is to be given the dispensation and theological license to do what is forbidden by the canons of the church? I will not dwell on this matter. I read the very fine speech delivered by Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver in this House; and although I do not entirely agree with everything she said, it must be admitted that she put up a very good case. Anybody who reads her speech must agree that is so. The member for East Perth did a considerable amount of research into this matter, and he placed before this House a great deal of valuable information.

I would like to repeat that our aim should be reform. That was the attitude I adopted when I was Minister for Justice in this State. Wherever I saw the possibility of reforming a man, or a woman, I thought to myself, "That person has made a mistake. We have all made mistakes; and he should be treated mercifully". I am sure members will agree that we have all made mistakes; and although none of us has committed murder, I am sure there have been many occasions on which we could have quite easily done just that.

I am sure there is no doubt as to the integrity of any one of us; but we could at times have made some mistake or other, and suffered the consequences. My experience has been that with the exception of very few, who are mentally unbalanced, for the most part people are capable of being reformed.

After considerable research in Fremantle, at Barton's Mill, and also at Pardelup, a report would be made to me that a certain person was capable of reform; and on every occasion that Mr. MacKillop and Mr. Waterer advised me along those lines, their advice was correct. I know of three such persons, one of whom is in the north-west of this State, and another in the south-west. I am not sure where the third person is at the moment. They were given their freedom by a Labor Government, and none of them has offended again.

There is only one case known to me of a man abusing the merciful treatment meted out to him. I do not mind mentioning his name. We all know that "Squizzzy" Taylor was given his freedom in Western Australia. He had a very bad record, and he did commit another murder in Victoria, where he was eventually hanged. That is the only case of which I know. His release was a mistake, but we all make mistakes. But I do honestly feel that if we are able to reclaim a person, and make him an accepted member of society, it is a job well done.

I hope every member of this Chamber will make a declaration as to where he stands on capital punishment. We are all subject to our opinion. As I have already said, I do not believe in capital punishment as a deterrent; I feel that if a person is to be punished and is to be sent to Fremantle or some other place, he should in time be given his liberty. We should have a thorough understanding of this matter.

I do not think it is necessary to go back 500 or 600 years. We should look at the position that obtains today. Revenge and retaliation are not the answer, and nothing will convince me to the contrary. It is my opinion that, in the majority of cases, it is possible to reform a criminal.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Beeloo) [6.10]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division called for.

#### *Remarks During Division*

**Mr. Tonkin:** This is the first time that this has been done in my experience in this House.

**Mr. Watts:** What is that?

**Mr. Tonkin:** The Government opposing the adjournment of private members' business. That is the first time it has been done during my experience in this House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You didn't even ask for it.

Mr. Jamieson: Why don't you close up for a while?

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

### *Division Resumed*

**Division taken with the following result:**

**Ayes—22.**

Mr. Andrew  
Mr. Bickerton  
Mr. Brady  
Mr. Curran  
Mr. Evans  
Mr. Fletcher  
Mr. Hall  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. Heal  
Mr. J. Hegney  
Mr. Jamieson

Mr. Kelly  
Mr. Moir  
Mr. Norton  
Mr. Nulsen  
Mr. Oldfield  
Mr. Rhatigan  
Mr. Rowberry  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Toms  
Mr. Tonkin  
Mr. May

(Teller.)

**Noes—25.**

Mr. Bovell  
Mr. Brand  
Mr. Burt  
Mr. Cornell  
Mr. Court  
Mr. Craig  
Mr. Crommelin  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Guthrie  
Dr. Henn  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Lewis  
Mr. Mann

Mr. W. A. Manning  
Sir Ross McLarty  
Mr. Nelder  
Mr. Nimmo  
Mr. O'Connor  
Mr. O'Neill  
Mr. Owen  
Mr. Perkins  
Mr. Roberts  
Mr. Watts  
Mr. Wild  
Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

**Majority against—3.**

**Motion thus negatived.**

(Continued below.)

## **COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS AUTHORITY BILL**

*Conference of Managers: Suspension of  
Sitting*

**THE SPEAKER:** As the conference of managers on the Country High School Hostels Authority Bill will take place in the Committee room of the Legislative Council at 7 p.m., I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

*Sitting suspended from 6.19 to 9.50 p.m.*

## **DEATH PENALTY ABOLITION BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Beeloo) [9.50]: I desire first of all to protest most vehemently against the action of the Government in refusing an adjournment of this debate. After all, there have been three speakers on this occasion, and it is a private member's Bill. Never before have I known an adjournment to be refused in connection with private members' business. I am sure that it will have repercussions at a later date and that the Government will regret its action, because there is no feasible reason that the adjournment should have been refused.

There is quite an amount of private members' business on the notice paper, and surely all of it should be entitled to be dealt with before the Government closes down on private members' preference. If there had been a *bona fide* reason, the refusal might not have been so objectionable, but on this occasion there was no legitimate reason for the request not being granted.

As will be appreciated, some hours have been lost today, and that could have been avoided, because the House could have been proceeding with other matters during the conference. Standing Orders were altered to enable just that.

There is one matter in connection with this Bill which appeals to me, although it has not been overstressed in the course of the debate. I am referring to the fact that I have never known a public outcry to be made when a death sentence has been commuted by the Government to life imprisonment. On the other hand, there was a considerable outcry from people and organisations at the time of the three hangings which I can remember—those of Rowles, Tapci, and Thomas. Those who made that outcry feel that hanging should not take place in this supposedly enlightened age. Of course, I am not denying that there were some unsavoury features about each of those crimes.

I well remember the Rowles hanging. I was in about the third standard at school and even though we were so young, we keenly discussed the matter on the day of the hanging. It was rather a wet, dreary day, and I will always remember the occasion. I mention that to indicate that that was the first time I obtained a reflection of public opinion in connection with hanging. Even the schoolchildren in that era were concerned about it.

We can all recall rather vividly, of course, the activity associated with the hanging of Tapci; and, in recent times, of Thomas. On each occasion there was much activity on the part of people in this so-called Christian-spirited community, particularly relating to Thomas's hanging. I feel that is a strong example of why hanging should be abolished as a punishment in this State.

After all, it was stated early by Thomas that he had committed the crime because he wanted to be hanged. If ever a person was pandered to, surely it must have been Thomas, because his desire was met. That was no punishment at all. A fitting punishment would have been to confine him where he could not do any more damage, but where he could regret and repent his action for a considerable time, considering the fact that he was a young man. It was really a form of suicide on Thomas's part, and I believe that those who were associated with the hanging were partners in that suicide, and thereby have contravened the law of human ethics.

The subject of capital punishment is a simple one and should not be involved in legal argument. It is just a matter of whether we agree with it or disagree with it. I believe that there are some who could conscientiously say that they do believe in the retention of capital punishment, but they would be very few in number.

The true test is to ask a person who states he is in favour of it whether, if such were the punishment, he would be prepared to present himself at the trap-door, place the noose over the person's head, and pull the lever, thus sending the condemned man into oblivion. I ask members whether any of them would be prepared to do that.

From the tenor of the interjection of the member for Claremont earlier in this debate it would appear that he might be one who would be prepared to go that far. I do not know, but we must remember that he is a person who is rather quick in temper. We have had examples of that in this House when he has flared up and, for some reason or other, has brushed a book at someone.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr. CROMMELIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the remarks of the member for Beeloo when he states that anything I have said suggests that I would be prepared to hang a man.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking for the remarks to be withdrawn?

Mr. CROMMELIN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Claremont has asked that the member for Beeloo withdraw the reference he made about him in connection with hanging a person.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr. JAMIESON: I withdraw the remark. I did not actually say that. I said that because of the tenor of his remarks, he might be one who would be associated with a hanging. However, I am glad to have his assurance that he would not be associated with it. That narrows the field down considerably, and illustrates that there would be very few prepared to carry out this particular side of the punishment; and I feel all members should take notice of that fact. There are very few, if any, who would be prepared to take this action. Nevertheless, we have in the community somewhere people who are prepared to do so.

The member for Pilbara delivered a rather eloquent address on this matter, concerning the relevant qualifications and the style of a person who would accept the position of hangman. I do not know where these people are to be found. I understand that on the most recent occasion the man engaged was an accountancy man from Adelaide who is rather closely associated

with a member of the Ministry through a firm with which he is connected. I understand, also, that the fee was very small.

It appears that a man who would take on the job of treating human lives so lightly, without any attractive fee, would be a person who had no mercy in his make-up. How such a person could accept a job like this at a low fee, I do not know. Perhaps some members associated with the Cabinet would be prepared to act when Sir Thomas Playford requires a hangman in South Australia; but I doubt very much whether any of them would.

I fail to see why the Government should import a person who appears to be a business associate of some members of the Government of this State. That is all I know about the hangman at this juncture. But I feel that if it is right that we should terminate life, we should know more of the calibre of the people who are prepared to act as executioners.

It appears to me that it is somewhat alarming to have such people in our community; particularly if they are also associated with legitimate business proceedings. One wonders how the families of such persons would view their actions in taking the lives of other people.

If the present set-up is to be continued at least one variation should be adopted so that instead of civil servants being compelled to witness hangings, members of the Government who make the decision to hang a man shall bear witness to the carrying out of the law. If Government members did that, no doubt they would be carrying out their duties to the fullest extent.

I feel there are not many, if any, who are prepared to go the whole hog and do a job that they would not expect their dog to do. There is an old saying: Never ask your dog to do something which you are not prepared to do yourself; that is, if one is able to do it. Physically, everyone in this Chamber is quite capable of carrying out the functions of a hangman. But as I have already said, I doubt whether members would go so far as to do that; and if they would not, then they do not believe in capital punishment, because there must be some doubt in their minds as to whether it is ethical to terminate a life.

It seems that if the death penalty is to be retained it could be carried out by means that have been proved more humane than the present ones in the civilised world. But I do not agree that the death penalty should be retained. Surely the penalty could be carried out without having to hire people to come here to do the job; and therein lies the main section of my argument: that no person in the community should be free to profit in either a small or a large way; or to satisfy his sadistic tendencies, if the fee is not large, by doing whatever is necessary to hang a person.

Another aspect raises its head here: that people are not very often required to do this job, because very few hangings take place. Earlier this afternoon we were told the percentages of hangings in the different States in the past few years. South Australia is in the habit of executing 42 per cent.; Western Australia, 35 per cent.; New Zealand, about 24 per cent.; Tasmania, about 24 per cent.; Victoria, 4 per cent.; and New South Wales, 2 per cent. Queensland has been without capital punishment for so long that it does not count statistically in this regard.

There are not many jobs for executioners. Therefore, when a person who has been doing these jobs passes on, where can the Government expect to get someone else of the same calibre? A difficulty will arise. Or are we to tolerate some kind of amateur executioner who has no knowledge of his work except through reading books? After all, practical experience in hanging is, I imagine, a vital factor if the executioner is to complete his job as quickly and as humanely as possible. If he had done only one hanging in his life he would be liable to strike difficulties and hitches which could cause considerable suffering to the person being put out of the way.

I hope the Government of the day, and its supporters, will be enlightened enough, in view of what the member for Claremont said in his point of order, to do what the Leader of the Opposition has requested; namely, to give the Bill a second reading at this session and let us think further about it and deal with the Committee stage at some subsequent meeting of the House.

That would, perhaps, be the best way to deal with the measure at this juncture as no doubt many members are turning over in their minds the question of just what hanging achieves. I feel it achieves very little. It only panders to those who have a suicidal tendency and a desire to die violently; and a desire, as their last fling, to make themselves a headline subject—which they certainly do.

Should a death sentence be commuted, a small paragraph usually appears in the *Daily News* to the effect that the Executive Council has commuted the death sentence to life imprisonment. But when a hanging is to take place, we find that for weeks beforehand there is Press publicity; radio publicity; and, on this last occasion, television publicity. The community is fed with all this propaganda, and their minds become completely mixed on the issue. Some of the publicity is sickening and nauseating.

In the main I suggest that for the well-being of the community at large—some people could not care less about this matter—it is desirable to do away with the condition that creates such a situation.

I well remember doing a little gardening in front of my house just before Thomas was hanged, and I heard the

woman across the road and the chap next door discussing what was to happen the next day. Later on I heard a similar discussion on the footpath. Surely this is not the sort of topic that should be fed into the minds of the people in this day and age.

Nobody in this Chamber has clearly indicated that he would be prepared to administer the death penalty. Therefore, morally, all members are bound to give the Bill a second reading.

On motion by Mr. Norton, debate adjourned.

## COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS AUTHORITY BILL

### *Conference Managers' Report*

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Minister for Education) [10.10]: I have to report that the managers on the Bill have met and have agreed as follows in regard to the amendments made by the Legislative Council:—

Amendment No. 1—Reject.

Amendment No. 2—Reject.

Amendment No. 3—Accept.

Amendment No. 4—Accept, but amend by striking out the word "remote" in line four of the amendment.

Amendment No. 5—Reject.

Amendment No. 6—Accept, but add the following words thereto:—"where transport is not provided or is not caused to be provided by the Minister for the purpose of transporting those students so enrolled in high schools or primary schools."

Amendment No. 7—Reject.

I move—

That the report be adopted.

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

### *Council's Further Message*

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

## CITY OF FREMANTLE (FREE LITERARY INSTITUTE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 28th September.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport) [10.12]: The Bill is purely a machinery measure; it merely sets out to correct an anomaly. For that reason I see no cause to oppose its passage. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.



*In Committee*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## PAWNBROKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

**MR. OLDFIELD** (Mt. Lawley) [10.16]:  
I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Briefly, the purpose of this Bill is to achieve two objects. Firstly, it is designed to insert in the principal Act a provision whereby the maximum rate of interest to be charged by a pawnbroker shall be prescribed; and, secondly, to include a provision to grant the police authority which they do not have today.

The principal Act in this State has not been amended for many years, and similar legislation in other States has also remained unaltered for a great length of time. In Queensland, for example, the Act has not been amended since the State was constituted, and the legislation governing pawnbrokers was adopted from New South Wales.

In drafting the Bill, guidance was obtained from the provisions in the Victorian Act, which was completely rewritten and re-enacted in 1958. The clause prescribing the maximum rate of interest to be charged by pawnbrokers was copied from the Victorian Act, which was introduced in 1958, with the exception of the actual rate of interest prescribed.

It is difficult for anyone to decide what rate of interest shall be charged by pawnbrokers when they lend money on pledged goods. Therefore, in providing, in this Bill, for an amount of 3d. for every 10s. loaned per month this rate has been set with a view to at least having some rate in the measure in order to establish what maximum rate of interest is desirable.

In the Committee stage, some member may suggest that a higher rate of interest should be set, and another may suggest that the amount prescribed in the Bill is too high. For the information of members, the rates of interest charged by pawnbrokers in other States are as follows:—

New South Wales—1½d. per 2s 6d. per month.

That rate, incidentally, was set in 1950. Continuing—

Victoria—1d. per 2s. per month.

Tasmania—On amounts under £1, ½d. per 1s. per 14 days. On amounts exceeding £1, 1d. per 1s. per month.

New Zealand—On amounts up to £1, 2d. per 2s. 6d. per month. On amounts exceeding £1, the interest rate is 50 per cent.

In Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland, no maximum interest rate is provided.

**Mr. W. A. Manning:** Did you say, earlier, that the rate of interest here was 3d. for every 10s.?

**Mr. OLDFIELD:** There is no maximum rate of interest provided in this State at present.

**Mr. W. A. Manning:** I mean, in this Bill.

**Mr. OLDFIELD:** The rate provided in the Bill is 3d. for every 10s. and for any outstanding fraction of 10s. so lent for one month and seven days from the date the goods are pawned, or for any shorter period during which the articles remain in pawn. Actually, it is interest at a rate not exceeding 3d. for every 10s. and for any outstanding fraction of 10s. for the period I have already mentioned.

Further, if the article pledged remains in pawn beyond one month and seven days, then thereafter, for each period of one month—including an unexpired month—that rate of interest shall be charged. That provision has been taken from the Victorian Act.

The question may be asked: Why has not a maximum rate of interest been provided in this legislation long before? Why have we waited so long? Obviously it is an Act that is easily overlooked, because members do not have much to do with it, and it is only occasionally that its provisions are brought to the notice of the members of this House. I might mention that an interest rate of 90 per cent. is being charged by pawnbrokers generally, in the City of Perth.

Members do not need much imagination to realise what an interest rate of 90 per cent. can mean to a person who is forced to approach a pawnbroker for money which he may require urgently. It often happens that people pledge articles with pawnbrokers and never bother to redeem them, because the interest rate charged is too high. On an article worth, say, £20, a pawnbroker may lend £3 or £4; and, if it is a keepsake, the person making the pledge may eventually redeem it.

However, in some cases, people pledge jewellery, watches, and similar articles, which are possibly worth anything from £100 to £150; and on those articles the pawnbroker may lend £10 or £15. The mere fact of having to find the amount of interest quarterly and having to repay in one bite the total amount borrowed, creates a position where the borrower finds it impossible ever to get square and redeem the goods he has pledged.

I think it is desirable to have some maximum rate of interest provided in this legislation so that people who are forced to approach a pawnbroker for financial accommodation will at least know the maximum rate of interest they can be charged. Therefore, in accordance with

the provisions in the Victorian Act, I have included a clause in this Bill making it mandatory on every pawnbroker to display a notice printed in large letters showing the maximum rate of interest to be charged by him, and that such notice shall be placed in a conspicuous part of his shop or place of business.

A further provision states that the maximum rate of interest shall also be printed on the pawnbroker's ticket, according to the schedule which appears on the last page of the Bill.

The second major provision in the Bill seeks to give the police authority which they do not now possess; that is, the right to enter any pawnbroker's premises during reasonable hours of daylight to examine the books and the pledges when searching for stolen goods. For some strange reason this authority has never been given to the police under this legislation, although under the Secondhand Dealers Act the police have the authority to enter the premises of a dealer to examine his books and the articles purchased by him. However, it must be borne in mind that there is a distinction between a second-hand dealer and a pawnbroker, and that each operates under a different Act.

It must be understood that the police have some difficulty, at times, in searching for stolen goods, because they do not have authority to enter the premises of a pawnbroker to examine his books and the articles he has received on pledge; and quite often a pawnbroker is unco-operative, especially if he has in his possession goods that are suspected of being stolen and which have been pledged by known criminals.

Some members may not know that the practice of secondhand dealers purchasing goods from known criminals does occur in this State. A case in question occurred quite recently which involved a friend of mine. He had his motorcar stolen, and on the back seat of the vehicle he had left a new gabardine raincoat worth about £20. The person who stole the car sold the raincoat to a secondhand dealer in the city for £1.

To begin with, the amount paid by the secondhand dealer was suspect—that is, only £1 for a coat worth about £20. The criminal was subsequently arrested and he pleaded guilty to the charge, but the original owner of the coat had to reimburse the secondhand dealer the £1 he had paid, before he could recover his coat. In other words, he had to buy it back. Strangely enough, the secondhand dealer admitted to the police that he knew that the man from whom he had purchased the coat was a known criminal.

Surely it does not require much imagination to realise what would happen with a pawnbroker who, under the Act, is entitled to lock his goods and books away and refuse the police access to them unless they have a warrant sworn before two justices, to search his premises.

It is not a simple matter for the police to obtain such a warrant. Firstly, they have to establish that they suspect the pawnbroker has stolen goods on his premises before the justices of the peace will issue the warrant. If they cannot establish that fact before the justices, they do not obtain the search warrant. Therefore the police are hampered in their search for stolen property in pawnbrokers' premises.

A further provision in the Bill is designed to increase the penalty to be imposed on any pawnbroker who commits a breach of this Act from a £20 to a £50 fine. The object of this clause is to bring the penalty into line with present-day values. No doubt, £20 was a considerable sum in 1888 when this Act was first placed on the statute book. Today that is rather a small amount, I consider that an increase of the penalty to £50 is justified, especially when the penalties applicable to the breach of any of the provisions contained in this measure come under the general penalty.

I commend the Bill to the House, with the assurance that the interest rates set out in the Bill have been included purely as suggestions. They have been inserted to enable the House to establish the principle that a maximum interest rate should be included in the Act. During the Committee stage of the Bill, members will be able to have their say on this question, and put forward suggestions as to whether the interest rates should be raised or decreased.

In the interests of justice and in the interests of assisting the police to recover stolen property, the Bill should be passed. The police should be given the power which the Parliament of South Australia gave to the Police Force in that State in 1950.

I might add, in conclusion, that so far South Australia is the only State which has seen fit to give this power to the Police Force. That was done by a special amendment to the Act, and it was the only amendment in the Bill to amend the Act in that State in 1950. It was done because in South Australia it was found necessary to give the police that power. The time is fast approaching when the other States of Australia will have to give the same power to their Police Forces.

On motion by Mr. Perkins (Minister for Police), debate adjourned.

## WOOL INDUSTRY

### *Inquiry by Select Committee*

Debate resumed from the 12th October on the following motion by Mr. Kelly:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into—

- (a) all factors which make up the cost of production of wool, including unseen or moiety charges, with a view to arriving at an accurate cost of production covering all phases of the industry;

- (b) the present auction marketing system, which is causing a divided outlook among primary producers, and allegedly allowing "pie buying" and other unsatisfactory features to defeat stability within the industry;
- (c) other suggested selling systems such as the Addis method;
- (d) reasons for the uncertain outlook of the wool market, and the threatened instability of wool producers, especially small producers, who find themselves unable to budget for operational requirements;
- (e) practicability of recommending to the Commonwealth Government the adoption of a wool stabilisation scheme on similar lines to the Wheat Stabilisation Scheme.

to which Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture) had moved the following amendment:—

Delete after the word "that" in the first line, the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into," with a view to substituting the following:—

this House requests the Premier to ask the Commonwealth Government to include in the terms of reference of the committee it proposes to set up to inquire into present woollselling systems, terms covering the following:

and with a view subsequently to moving the following further amendments:—

Delete paragraph (b) and insert instead the following words:—

(b) Better methods of promoting the use of wool and encouraging the demand for wool.

Delete the following words from paragraph (c), namely, "such as the Addis method."

Delete the following words from paragraph (e), namely, "to the Commonwealth Government."

**MR. SEWELL** (Geraldton—on amendment) [10.32]: I oppose the amendment. The Minister would have been better advised to leave the motion as it was, because it would have achieved a better result. The Minister is attempting to delete the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into" with a view to inserting other words mentioned in the amendment. With that exception, the motion is practically the same as when it was introduced.

I cannot see how a request of this House to the Commonwealth Government will bring quicker action. Being a representative of a country district, and realising the importance of the wool industry

not only to this State but also to the Commonwealth, I agree that we have been riding on the sheep's back for a number of years. There is no doubt of that, and the saying has become rather worn. Any action which we as a Parliament can take to assist the wool industry should be taken.

Many aspects of the wool industry have to be inquired into. If the motion were passed, the wool producers of this State would be well served—better than if the amendment were carried. The proposed committee to inquire into the wool industry would, no doubt, consist of persons who were thoroughly familiar with the industry. The committee would be able to take evidence from people with a wide knowledge of the industry, as to the best methods to be adopted.

Paragraph (a) of the motion refers to the cost of production, and paragraph (b) refers to the present auction marketing system, which has been so widely criticised throughout Australia. Under that paragraph the primary producers in this State would have the opportunity of saying under which method they prefer their wool to be disposed of.

Paragraph (d) is most important. It states—

reasons for the uncertain outlook of the wool market, and the threatened instability of wool producers, especially small producers, who find themselves unable to budget for operational requirements;

I might mention the threatened take-over of the clothing industry by the manufacturers of synthetic fibres and the like. In the very near future we will have to face this problem in Australia. The interests behind the manufacture of synthetics have many millions of pounds or dollars backing. They will spare no effort to ensure that their products are placed on the market to the detriment of the wool producers.

Paragraph (e) of the motion states—

practicability of recommending to the Commonwealth Government the adoption of a Wool Stabilisation Scheme on similar lines to the Wheat Stabilisation Scheme.

The matter referred to in this paragraph will be the cause of much argument and debate in Australia. The committee proposed in the motion would have a better opportunity to discover what the wool producers desire than would be the case under the method proposed in the amendment.

In the best interests of the State and the Commonwealth the motion should be agreed to without amendment. In any case, some action will have to be taken at an early date to set up a committee of inquiry to find out how the wool industry in this country is faring. I oppose the amendment, because in my view the motion will fill the needs of the wool industry.

**Mr. HALL** (Albany—on amendment) [10.38]: In supporting the motion I do so with a feeling that the mover is endeavouring to bring to the notice of the Government a problem which the Minister for Agriculture should have introduced early in the piece. The wool industry is so important to this State and to Australia that the consideration of this problem in the wool industry should have received top priority in this House.

**Mr. Nalder**: The matter has already been discussed by the Agricultural Council meeting held recently.

**Mr HALL**: That has not taken place here. The action taken by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn was a forthright one, to bring the matter before Parliament. If we go through the farmers' journals we will find this controversy has been referred to frequently, and letter after letter has been published setting forth various schemes for the disposal of our wool. They all strive to find the right answer to the problem.

In his motion, the member for Merredin-Yilgarn aims to cover all factors which go to make up the cost of wool production, including unseen or moiety charges, with a view to arriving at an accurate cost of production covering all phases of the industry. Unlike the previous speaker, I shall endeavour to cover the individual paragraphs of the motion.

Paragraph (a) refers to all factors which make up the cost of production of wool. To achieve this will mean greater research into the development of pastures, into the right type of pasture at the right cost. By putting the correct nutriments into the pasture we will gain a better type of fleece from the sheep, and thus achieve a better presentation of the article on the auction floor.

I refer to the auction floor because I believe that all these suggested schemes for the disposal of wool and the incorporation of the best ideas in them could be worked through the auction floor system. It means that wool would be displayed properly and not half-camouflaged like some articles in shop windows. Without doubt, wool has to be presented in the best light, and there is no better light than the modern wool stores being built today where the brokers exhibit wool for a very moderate charge, in some cases. I shall touch upon this point later on.

We have to get down to the problem of pasture development, and the many costs involved in wool production. I refer to an item in *The Farmers' Weekly* of the 13th October, 1960, which makes reference to a recent publication by the Bureau of Agriculture and Economics. It reads—

A recent publication by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics referred to a 13-year study of three properties in the South-East of South Australia.

The properties were within a few miles of one another and were selected for their uniformity of size, pasture development, type of country and management efficiency. The survey showed that the return to the wool-grower in the 1955-56 season worked out at £10 7s. 5d. per acre. However, in the 1958-59 season the return had dropped to £6 19s. 7d. per acre. At the same time there was an increase of costs from £5 14s. an acre to £5 18s. 6d. The survey showed that the net income per sheep for 1958-59 was 8s. 1d.

Those figures refer to research into this matter, and it took many hours to arrive at them. That is one point covered in the motion. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn is aiming to tackle the basic problems to which I have just referred.

The inquiry proposed in the motion could not have any detrimental effect on the wool industry. It would enable the tackling of the problem of pasture development, the cost of establishing that pasture, and the improvement of the fleece of the sheep as a result of better pasture development. The inquiry would include investigations into the nutriments required to be put into the soil, and the nutriments which are obtained from the soil by suitable pastures and getting those nutriments into the carcass of the sheep, and the results of the nutriments on the wool.

We will have to get down to the basis of producing wool economically; and, further, on the economic side we will have to get down to the basis of a higher yield. To do that will require very deep research.

Touching on the other points contained in the motion, we find that the wool industry is getting a very raw deal. No doubt we all consider that to be the case. If I were a wool producer I would feel that to be so. The prices obtained for wool, and their unhealthy fluctuations, must be discouraging to wool producers.

We have to face up to the other obstacle affecting the wool industry; that is, competition from synthetics. We are all aware that, in the past few years, the manufacturers have been introducing into their goods a higher percentage of synthetic fibres, which may be essential from a selling point of view, but not always essential to the durability of the material—as some of the organisations, such as the Consumers' Protection Society and the Bureau of Standards in London have found out. They have been able to prove that wool, with a 20 per cent. content of synthetic fibres, is the best-wearing and most durable material.

We are now back to something reasonable. There is a greater amount of wool used in our fibres. We are getting the cloths down in weight where they are more attractive in the hotter countries; and they contain insulating fibres against the cold.

We are now getting somewhere in that field. It is very heartening to find that in many cases the ratio is 80 per cent to 20 per cent, while in others it is 75 per cent to 25 per cent. However, the 80 to 20 per cent ratio would make a good cloth.

As I said before, many of these cloths are being tested for durability, particularly children's clothes. This is being done because women insist on value; and the societies about which I have spoken are giving them protection. Perhaps this Government, in its wisdom, could consider the introduction of legislation on similar lines to that in the United Kingdom for the protection of the consumer, and set up a bureau of standards. If that were done, we would be getting somewhere.

Regarding fertilisers and the different types of wool, I wish to quote from an article dealing with research. I do not know from what paper the article was taken, but it appears under the heading "Bigger Grant for Research", and reads as follows:—

"The Agriculture Department is another field in which a rapid rise in expenditure has been well justified," said the Premier (Mr. Brand) discussing the Budget introduced to the State Parliament recently.

I compliment the Premier on that statement. To continue—

"The Department now costs us more than £1,000,000 a year and its officers in country centres have increased from 46 ten years ago to more than 150 today."

He said; "The tremendous strides made by research, which have greatly increased the production per acre, make it essential that the man on the land should be enabled to know the latest developments in his field".

I agree most wholeheartedly with that article. It would appear that the research is on similar lines to that in South Australia, which I mentioned previously. Perhaps more finance will have to be made available for research. However, I think the Government can be commended on what the department is doing with regard to research.

On the manufacturing side, which I have already touched on briefly, I find that many of our faults and high costs can be blamed on machinery which has become obsolete over a period of years. Throughout Australia, electronics are being introduced for the manufacture of worsted and woollens; so much so that the woollen mills are spending in the vicinity of £70,000. I wish to quote from *The West Australian* of the 1st October under the heading "W.A. Woollen Mills Order More Plant"—

Although the mills completed a programme of expansion in 1958-59, the directors of W.A. Worsted and Woollen Mills Ltd. now find it necessary to

place orders for the latest types of modern textile equipment because of further increased trade.

Increased trade is one side of the question but the cost of manufacturing is another. I know there are certain types of machinery in that mill which are obsolete; and, in common with other mills in Australia, an attempt is being made to do away with it and obtain modern machinery. With the present obsolete machinery there must be increased charges. There is also the cost of overtime—I do not say this to the detriment of the workers—in order to cope with orders.

These costs are added to the price structure all along the line. No matter what type of goods are manufactured, these costs have to be loaded on, with the result that people question what it costs to manufacture the goods.

Many mistakes occur in manufacture through the use of obsolete machinery, with the result that cloth is damaged. It is necessary to re-process this cloth, and naturally the cost has to be loaded on to the price of the goods. Therefore, it can be seen that the elimination of obsolete machinery is most essential, particularly if we are going to compete for overseas trade.

I believe Australian wool production is gaining; and it will be necessary for us to manufacture on an internal structure which will enable us to export economically to countries outside Australia. It will be necessary for us to produce faster, and with a higher productivity. If that is done, we will be able to export our wool in competition with the cheap labour markets overseas which are not very far from Australia.

I have here an article from *The West Australian* of the 18th October under the heading "Yarra Falls Turnover Rises £1m." I do not know why they are growling about £1,000,000. They seem to have a disgruntled attitude about the whole thing. The article is as follows:—

Turnover of Yarra Falls Ltd. and associated spinners and weavers in the year to June 30, 1960, totalled £5,733,016, which was about £1,000,000 up on 1958-59.

The directors say that the textile trade experienced a difficult year and these conditions continued.

Basic wage and marginal rate increases caused a substantial rise in the cost structure, but owing to severe competition in the home market it was not possible to recover higher costs by increasing prices and these had to be absorbed.

That firm made a profit of £1,000,000, yet it complained in regard to basic-wage increases and marginal increases. I wonder if its machinery is as efficient as it might be?

I have another article from *The West Australian* under the heading "Farm Warning: Use the Land You Have"; and this article sounds a note of warning. It reads as follows:—

The end of land development by bulldozer was in sight and W.A. farmers must give some thought to secondary development, Rural and Industries Bank official F. Collett said yesterday in Perth.

I will not read the whole of this article, but another portion says—

In addition, there were about 5,750,000 acres in lesser rainfall zones which might be brought into use as technical skill improved.

"Assuming that all this 9,000,000 acres is suitable for settlement, we do not have a lot of land left to make new farms," he said.

The warning in that article is that we are reaching the end of our reserves in land for settlement.

The next point in the motion concerns the system of pie buying. For many years we have been suspicious of pie buying. I think it was proved in the Colbourne Research that pie buying works to the detriment of wool sales. Although it might have suited the requirements of different buyers in different areas, I think it might have had a villainous effect. I do not favour it myself, but sometimes these things look worse on the surface than they probably are.

The late Ben Chifley made a statement that the back-door trading in wool was costing Australia many millions of pounds. He was referring to trading through the European countries. I do not know how we are going to get over that one. It goes on all the time; and I think it would be beneficial to a nation like Japan. Japan buys wool from many countries and manufactures it into cloth with American machinery. That country manufactures this cloth at reduced costs because labour is exploited. We are not in a position to say what another country will do with its wool after it has bought it. Japan does that with the support of American dollars. That sort of thing would have an effect on the price of wool in the country.

I would say that today Japan is in financial difficulties because of a restriction of finance. She cannot obtain the wool in the way she would like to. However, that nation has a bargaining point—it can insist on barter trade with regard to imports and exports. If Japan resists buying our wool, it has that bargaining point.

Private buying has been mentioned on many occasions. I would say that private buying has affected the Albany wool market to the extent of approximately 30,000

to 40,000 bales which were bought privately and brought to the metropolitan area. When wool is bought privately the producer believes he is receiving an equitable price for the wool he sells. In most cases it is a reasonable price. These private buyers do not stop at one point; they buy the bales, the crutchings, and the other pieces that go with it.

The men who do this are highly qualified and they spend many hours on reclassification of the wool, with the result that they gain quite a considerable number of pence in the lb. If the farmer put his wool into a recognised sale, the reclassification would be as high as 46 to 50 or 55 to 56; and the crutchings and pieces would be processed by a scouring works which would construct a first-class blend.

Most of these scouring firms have a set overseas clientele who take this wool at a set rate. The scouring works are able to do that because they buy at a reduced rate. The result is that they produce something lucrative for themselves and satisfying to the customer; but the farmer has lost.

I would like to quote from the *Official Year Book of Western Australia, 1957*, under the heading, "Wool." It reads as follows:—

This is mainly exported in the grease although substantial quantities of scoured wool are also shipped. The export trade in both types of wool fluctuated fairly widely between 1938-39 and 1945-46 when 108.2 million lb. of greasy wool (valued at £8.57 million) and 11.7 million lb. of scoured wool (£1.39 million) were sent abroad, principally to the United Kingdom and to the United States of America. Although the total quantity involved (just under 120 million lb.), comprised the largest annual wool export yet reached by this State, it should be remembered that some clearance of war-accumulated stocks helped to produce an abnormally high figure in relation to the wool clip.

Post-war exports continued at high levels, but did not again pass the £100,000,000 mark until 1949-1950. Under the influence of increasing demands for Australian wool by the United States of America, and several other countries which had returned to the market after many years—viz. France, Belgium, Germany, Italy and Poland—and by the United Kingdom, prices rose sharply after 1946-47. They reached the unprecedented figure of 143.43 pence per lb. for greasy wool as the average f.o.b. value for 1950-51. Then followed a substantial fall, with prices for the next three years ranging from 75 to 85 pence.

The following summary gives the average annual f.o.b. values during 1938-39 and five recent years:—

Greasy Wool:		Pence
1939	....	10.65
1950	....	57.65
1951	....	143.43
1952	....	75.17
1953	....	80.58
1954	....	85.02
Scoured Wool:		
1939	....	15.62
1950	....	74.46
1951	....	174.40
1952	....	109.81
1953	....	108.19
1954	....	109.89

Even allowing for scouring costs, it is possible to assume that farmers have made some profit. There is such a big margin of profit.

Mr. Lewis: Ten lb. of greasy wool would not make 10 lb. of scoured wool.

Mr. HALL: That is open to argument. If the weather is of the right humidity the conditioning of the wool takes place and, the producer gains quite considerably. I would say that in a climate similar to that of my district one would gain 3½ lb. to 4 lb. on a bale.

Mr. Lewis: You cannot tell me that 10 lb. of greasy wool produces 10 lb. of scoured wool.

Mr. HALL: I am referring to the pieces and bits that are exported. I am saying the wool has to be blended and then shipped to a client overseas. The client knows at what price he is buying it. I am saying that the farmer is not getting a lucrative return for his bits and pieces. Normally, the scouring firm gains on by-products as well as on wool. It is necessary to gauge the effect on prices.

No-one can dispute the fact that today's hire-purchase system affects wool prices all over the world. Also, with the increase in world disturbances, the demand is diminishing. The economic situation must upset the general trading balance, and must have repercussions on the wool-producing industry, not only in this State but throughout the Commonwealth.

A very big percentage of capital is channelled into the hire-purchase system. Clothing is affected. Sometimes one can get a suit manufactured for about £20. However, it is possible for me to take my own cloth to a tailor, and to have a suit made which would cost me £25. I cannot see why there should be that amount of difference between the prices charged by two tailors; and I think that aspect should be inquired into.

I feel that the motion of the member for Merredin-Yilgarn will be of advantage to the industry. I think that an inquiry by a Select Committee would bring the two different organisations together. If we can extract the good out of those ideas and get down to the fundamentals of pastoral development, I think something will be achieved.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin—on amendment) [11.7]: As the representative of one of the best wool-growing districts of this State—the district that produced the best fleece and the best sheep at the last Royal Show—I feel I should have something to say on this subject, as well as advertising the district.

The member for Albany suggests the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into a number of things. I feel that such a committee would take a very long time to inquire into all of the points raised in this motion. If the many aspects of the industry covered by the member for Albany are any indication of the matters to be inquired into, it would probably be about 10 years before the committee brought down its report; and the price of wool would have materially altered. The member for Albany covered a lot of ground in presenting his point of view. A Select Committee would have a terrific job to carry out an inquiry into some of the aspects mentioned, particularly paragraph (a).

I feel that no purpose would be served in having a State inquiry on these particular matters. The production and price of wool are material factors at the present time. They are no doubt affected by present adverse marketing methods. These matters cannot be dealt with on a State basis.

The marketing of wool affects the Commonwealth as a whole, and unless all States are incorporated in one scheme, and in one method of marketing, any scheme decided upon in Western Australia would be quite futile. Once a satisfactory conclusion had been reached, we in Western Australia would have to set about convincing the other States. To my mind, that would be most difficult.

Wool producers of Western Australia have indicated that they would support a scheme for the marketing of wool. They did so some years ago, but wool producers of other States were opposed to the scheme. The same thing would happen again. I feel that the whole matter should be inquired into on a Federal basis. The answer lies in the amendment moved by the Minister for Agriculture and, from a practical standpoint, any inquiry should be on that basis to achieve results.

To have this matter inquired into on a Federal basis is likely to bring those results. In addition, the Federal Government has already moved to set up an inquiry, and the suggestion of the Minister is that we should indicate to that authority some of the points which would make a useful inquiry of it.

I do not intend to elaborate on the point, because I think what is wanted is perfectly obvious, and that is already being done by the Federal Government. We hope that the outcome of the inquiry will be such that it will enable us to find the right

markets for our wool, and that the price derived from those sales will benefit the whole of Australia—not only the woolgrowing industry but also the whole of the economy of the Commonwealth.

**MR. LEWIS** (Moore—on amendment) [11.11]: As a representative of a district which cannot claim recently to have produced the best sheep, or the best individual wool clip—that is the best sheep or the best individual fleece—but nevertheless as one who represents a district which produces all good sheep, might I say that I oppose the motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, and I am not altogether enamoured of the amendment moved by the Minister for Agriculture.

I do not like the motion because it proposes to deal with this important matter—a very important matter not only to the economy of the woolgrowers of Western Australia but also to the economy of the Australian nation—on a State basis. This is something which affects the woolgrowers not only in Western Australia but in all the other States also. I believe it is much too broad a subject to be dealt with on an individual State basis. In my view it must be dealt with on a national basis.

I am not enamoured of that part of the motion, or indeed of that part of the amendment which deals with the inquiry, or proposed inquiry, into the cost of production; because I do not think that endeavouring to arrive at the cost of production of wool will get us anywhere in the long run. It will be a very expensive job and, in the final analysis, I think it can be only a rough sort of guess because there are so many factors that enter into the cost of producing wool. For instance, I heard the member for Eyre say somewhere in the corridor that the research farm at Esperance this year has been able to produce four sheep to the acre, which is a remarkably high production per acre.

When we compare that with other districts that are probably battling to produce one sheep to the acre, and in some districts less than that by far—and in between a wide range of soil and climatic conditions—we realise what a difficult job it would be to arrive at what could be called the average cost of producing wool per lb. in Australia. I think we should leave that individual aspect of it to the individual grower. Either he will go to the wall or he will not; either he is prospering or he is not. I think any inquiry into the cost of producing wool will not get us very far. We will find that those growers who can produce below the calculated cost of production for wool will be doing very well indeed, and those who cannot will not be doing so well.

I do not think an inquiry into the cost of producing wool would get us anywhere at all, but I am all for that part of the

motion and the amendment which seeks to promote the use of wool. I think much has been done along those lines over the years. Up to a year or two ago I was personally very disappointed at the results achieved by the Australian Wool Bureau; but in the last year or two it has accelerated its efforts in that direction and I believe, if we take the exhibition at the Royal Show this year as any criterion, the bureau is doing a lot to produce more suitable cloths and so on from wool, and in the design of dresses, suits, and so on.

But we are still up against the great problem of price and availability. Many of the retail stores today do not stock the woollen goods that we are asked to buy, and encourage other people to buy; and often, when those goods are produced for sale, the price is beyond the reach of most people. Therefore I am in sympathy with many of the remarks of the member for Albany. I think that is one of the problems that should be tackled.

However, I believe that the fundamental problem of the wool situation is that of marketing. I think if we could solve the situation of marketing, and if we could find out what was wrong from the marketing angle, the individual woolgrower could look after his own cost of production. I know various schemes have been advanced over the years from the reserve price scheme, which was introduced many years ago, in 1951. I believe it was then we had what was called the Post-J.O. wool plan under which it was proposed to set up a reserve price. It was not necessarily based on the cost of production, but it was based on a reserve price for wool, under which if any wool was not sold off at auction the reserve price would be paid by the scheme and the grower would be paid accordingly. Of course, if a grower puts a reserve price on his wool at the moment he has to carry the financial burden if he fails to sell it by auction. I know that that reserve price scheme failed to receive the support of growers throughout Australia.

A motion was moved in the Senate recently by Senator Wade. I am not taking a political slant on this matter because I do not even know the party to which he belongs. However, he moved his motion in four parts, the first of which reads—

- (1) Whether the wool industry and the Australian economy generally are being endangered by the downward trend in wool prices.

I do not think it needs any inquiry into that aspect; every agriculturist could answer that. The second part reads—

- (2) Whether an expanded sales promotion campaign would have a steadying effect on the market.



I think that is obvious, too. It would have a steadying effect on the market and I think that question is fairly easily answered. Then we come to the crux of the situation—marketing—and the third part reads—

- (3) Whether a more vigorous research programme into credit facilities and production problems would materially assist the industry.

I think production problems are important; and, among other things, they are wrapped up with agricultural research. Here may I interpolate that I believe the various agricultural departments have done and are continuing to do a great deal in promoting the growth of better pastures, animal husbandry, and so on, in order to cushion, which it has done to a large extent, the falling price for wool. The last part of that motion reads—

- (4) Whether a competent independent body should be set up to inquire into all the aspects of wool marketing.

I believe that is really the most important one of all. Without delaying the House any longer, it is my contention that if the Federal committee of inquiry is set up to do just that the rest of the problems will be easily dealt with by the grower. He knows more how to deal with those aspects than any Parliament of this State or even the Commonwealth.

**MR. MANN** (Avon Valley—on amendment) [11.20]: I want to say a few words on both the motion and the amendment and to point out that I have no time for either. I am a farmer and I learned the hard way. The main principle in regard to wool production is the cost factor. During the prosperity years the woolgrower had to carry a prosperity loading rate and no attempt has been made to lift it.

The producers' costs have been increased by the rising prices of superphosphate, shipping charges, and also by the occasional waterside strikes which delay the shipments of goods from overseas; and these delays increase the farmers' costs once again, because the cost of the delay is loaded on to the price of the goods and implements purchased by the producers.

**Mr. Jamieson:** We have not had many waterside strikes in this State.

**Mr. MANN:** Western Australia does not count.

**Mr. Jamieson:** It does as far as your experience is concerned.

**Mr. MANN:** In what way?

**Mr. Jamieson:** In the way of costs.

**Mr. MANN:** Apparently I have a lot to learn yet. However, getting back to the question of farming generally and of wool production in particular, the producers have had their prosperous years and they have also experienced those times when

prices have fallen below the cost of production. I know that I, as a farmer, and woolgrowers generally, will never agree to any measure controlling the method of selling our wool.

Various attempts were made after the first world war to stabilise wool production and further attempts were made recently. Despite the fact that there was £25,000,000 in the scheme, the wool producers decided that that money should be distributed among themselves.

There is a fear that wool production will become the biggest taxing measure in this country.

**Mr. Jamieson:** So it should be.

**Mr. MANN:** Very well. First of all, we should take steps to lower our cost of production; and, secondly, we should boost our wool sales. The only way we can achieve that is by the ordinary method of having wool sales by auction. No-one has yet made a success of any of these hairbrained schemes to sell wool by any other method. When it comes to a question of handling millions of pounds and possibly a stockpile of millions of bales of wool, where do we stand?

Another feature is that we must improve our sales campaign if we are to have a better outlook for the wool industry. For many years the woolgrowers have been subjected to a levy on their wool production for publicity purposes but, in my opinion, it has been a tremendous waste of millions of pounds in the hands of completely incapable publicity men.

One of the first steps which should be taken is to produce a lighter fabric to compete against synthetics, as was mentioned by the member for Albany.

How many people, in the whole of Australia, ever go into a shop and ask for a woollen article? Today, a would-be purchaser never asks for a woollen article but buys one manufactured of synthetics. Further, when we come to the question of trying to lower our cost of processing wool, we cannot hold a candle to Japan and several other countries of the world that handle wool.

Unless we can bring our costs down, those engaged in primary production in this country will be faced with some very dark days. In fact, the welfare of the whole of Australia is at stake. We cannot allow our costs of production to continue to soar. So far as wages are concerned, we are living in the best country in the world.

Farmers in this country, at the present time, do not experience as many setbacks as pastoralists because the majority of farmers are engaged in mixed farming. Wool producers who are engaged solely on the production of wool can be destroyed completely if the present trend continues. Whether those producers will be destroyed

will depend on circumstances, especially the scarcity of labour; because, today, men will not face the rigours of the outback. If the producers are destroyed, it will be a dark day for this State.

The motion moved by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn is a pious one. It is only a kite-flying motion. It is purely party-political propaganda. If I were the Minister I would throw it back into his teeth instead of discussing it and proposing amendments. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn spoke for an hour and a half on wool; but, in fact, it was purely party-political propaganda.

Mr. J. Hegney: The motion was on wool, wasn't it?

Mr. MANN: It was to pull the wool over the Government's eyes. If the honourable member, by his motion, had produced some suggestions whereby we could reduce our cost of production it might have been of some worth; but what has the honourable member brought forth? He has been responsible for this House spending hours debating his motion, which has been a complete waste of time. I do not know how the problem can be solved, and I do not think anyone else does, either. It may be possible to obtain a university man to solve the problem, but that remains to be seen.

We are increasing our production and we are learning better methods of sheep husbandry; and as we increase our returns, so the cost of production increases. This must come to a stop eventually because we are living in a fool's paradise.

This motion is a pious bit of material and I would scrap the whole of it. I can see no hope for the future of the industry. We have to realise that the primary producer of this country is an individualist. He does not belong to any union and he will not support any union. Even in politics the primary producers are divided into two parties.

If prices continue to be depressed the farmer will, eventually, be forced to cut his costs tremendously and one of his greatest cost items today is superphosphate. However, if he reduces his top-dressing, his wool clips and his crops will be reduced accordingly. He will be forced to reduce his flocks and that reduction will mean a great blow to Australia, because once the country experiences such a setback it is very hard to make a recovery.

However, I consider that the farmers today can stand a bit of a knock. I can remember, a few years ago, when all primary producers were stone, motherless broke, and we could not have withstood any great setback; but we can take it today.

So far as we are concerned, we will plug along without any pious hopes. Australia must realise what is going to happen to the whole industry generally. The debate

has been worth listening to, but I think the member for Merredin-Yilgarn will find that the farmers of this State, when they go to bed after reading the *Hansard* report of the debate on this motion, will shrug their shoulders and say, "That is the usual piffle we hear from Parliament."

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn—on amendment) [11.30]: If nothing else, the debate has produced a rather remarkable outlook for the representatives of some of the best wool-producing districts of the State—at least according to their own indications. It seems strange, also, that a motion of this kind could have had the effect of bringing out of moth balls the member for Avon Valley.

I will deal with the Minister's comments last. To revert for a moment to the member for Avon Valley. His utterances tonight are all the more difficult to understand when I say that in the corridor he told me that what I had said was good stuff. Accordingly, it is a little difficult to reconcile such a sentiment with his speech tonight.

Of the three members who have spoken, the first said that a Select Committee would take a very long time to reach a conclusion. It undoubtedly would take a fair time to get down to all the factors in the wool industry that are crying out for examination. The honourable member who expressed this opinion went on to say that an inquiry in Western Australia would be futile. I can tell him that the various branches of the Farmers' Union would not be at one with him there. It appears to me that the members who represent the areas where a considerable amount of our wool is produced are out of touch; otherwise I would not have had the sheaf of telegrams and letters I received saying how wholeheartedly the producers of this State are behind an inquiry. They have asked that there should be no wavering on the question of the appointment of a Select Committee.

I said I was not over-enamoured of a Select Committee, but that I did want to see something done which would be an improvement on the position obtaining at the present time. I said there had been over 200 references by way of newspaper articles over the last 18 months, particularly in Western Australia, in connection with wool affairs generally, which indicated that an inquiry, or some move, was very much overdue. The longer we procrastinate in this matter the further we will find ourselves in this period of recession, in so far as it relates to wool.

The member for Narrogin was prepared to agree that the Minister's amendment was the answer to the whole of our problems. His immediate neighbour, however, the member for Moore, followed him and said he was opposed to the motion. He said he did not want it to become a

political issue; and further said that he did not know the fellow in Adelaide or Melbourne or his political viewpoint. I think it was well established in the Press, over the air, and in this Chamber, what the party designation was of the senator who raised the matter. So there is no excuse for the member for Moore not knowing his party designation.

The member for Moore said that while he opposed the motion, he was not enamoured of the amendment at all. He did not like the Minister's amendment which, he said, would get us nowhere; and he had no liking for the motion.

The honourable member referred to the cost of production, and said how difficult it was to get down to a basis of cost of production. We heard that said 15 or 16 years ago when the matter of wheat stabilisation costs was being examined, and when the whole industry underwent an exhaustive inquiry which lasted a very long time. As a matter of fact, even the survey which is being conducted now by the Federal Government—and has been conducted since 1951-52—is not a survey connected with wool. It has had a lot of information with reference to the wool industry and wool producing generally, but it wholly and solely has been a survey dealing with the cost of production of wheat. That has been its sole purpose. The information it gleaned in the interim as it related to wool was obtained because of the fact that in the course of its activities it touched on these matters. But there is no doubt that it was explicitly appointed to inquire into wheat costs.

The member for Moore said there are too many factors involved, and that it is too difficult to assess the cost of wool per lb. He added that an inquiry would not get us very far. When the question of endeavouring to secure wheat stabilisation was mooted I remember the controversy that raged around the subject. There were a tremendous number of wheat-growers who were satisfied we could never establish the cost of production, because of the great disparity that existed between the wheat producing areas. That is a very real objection up to a point. But we found it was possible to get down to a basis of cost of production on wheat, and from that source estimate its stability.

I do not know one per cent. of the farmers of Western Australia who would scrap the wheat stabilisation scheme and revert to the days when the old order existed. Accordingly it is ridiculous for the member for Moore to talk about its being too difficult to arrive at a basis whereby we can establish a true cost of production.

Mr. Mann: The wheat farmer kept the whole of Western Australia on cheap flour.

Mr. KELLY: I know he certainly did supply the pig industry and the poultry industry for a very long time with a cheap

grade of wheat. I think he is still doing so. I know that the wheat farmer assisted very materially to keep these industries going over a long period of years. I am sure no-one will deny that. But over the years the wheat farmer has had a number of ups and downs; and during the period when our wheat was at its lowest, hundreds of farmers walked out of the industry. Again, in the early 1940's, we found that wheat became a very much neglected side of our primary production, due to the fact that wool had begun to take the ascendancy.

From then on many farmers ceased producing wheat, and the amount of wheat sown for production diminished greatly. But when the wool position began to level out from the high peak it reached in 1942-43, and again in 1950-51, and when the small producer who had been in a position to make a reasonable living during the period when wool was at its peak found that credit began to recede in the market, he decided it was wise to distribute his eggs into more than one basket. He then began to level out his income by producing some wheat, and also by moving into the production of other grains.

Mr. Lewis: We had to have a stabilised price, because the Australian consumer expects his wheat at cost of production.

Mr. KELLY: That was not the reason, and the member for Moore knows it as well as I do. We all know that apart from the question of the home consumption price of wheat, the greatest factor was that of export. That was where we were getting it.

Mr. Lewis: The export price was above our Australian price.

Mr. KELLY: It was slightly above, and it is so at the present time.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. KELLY: The international wheat agreement levelled out overseas costs. There is no doubt that that is where the cost of wheat levelled out. Had it not been for stabilisation, we would have been floundering in this State from the grain production point of view, apart from wheat.

Mr. Lewis: You must agree that the cost of production of wheat is only based on the average.

Mr. KELLY: I know that stabilisation of wheat has made Western Australia. The wheat farmers have been given some security which they did not have previously. The position of the wheat industry in former years was on all fours with the position in which the wool industry will get into. It could happen—as it happened in the period when wheat was fetching 1s. 5d. to 1s. 7d. per bushel—to wool. There would then be a clamour for the stabilisation of wool, because stabilisation would be the natural haven which the producers would

seek. I am asking this House to do something before that point is reached. If it is reached there will be no return.

The member for Avon Valley said he had no confidence in either the motion or the amendment. He rambled on in various ways, and said finally that any interference with the marketing system of wool will destroy that industry.

Mr. Mann: You are a typical parish pump preacher.

Mr. KELLY: The honourable member got right away from his little nest where he raises a few sheep in his mixed farming proposition. He derives much of his income from the raising of pigs and from other sources. Of course he is not dependent on wool as much as other farmers, particularly those in the dry areas where wool has been the only source of income for a period of years, although more recently they have gone back into the production of some grain. Such farmers are much worse off now than are other types of farmers.

The member for Avon Valley got away from the point of his own district and from the knowledge he has of that area. He made the statement that any interference with the marketing system of wool will destroy a great industry.

Mr. Mann: That is your interpretation.

Mr. KELLY: I wrote down the statements as the honourable member made them. I cannot agree that the wool industry will be destroyed by another system. In my remarks I was particularly careful to refer to the reaction of the chief pastoral gentleman in the State—Mr. Lee-Steere. I quoted his remarks specifically, because over a long period Mr. Lee-Steere objected to any change in the system of marketing of wool. He maintained it was not possible to have a change in the marketing system which would benefit the pastoral industry. Now Mr. Lee-Steere has altered his views. He did so after a tour which lasted a number of weeks, covering 5,000 miles. I reiterate that the comments of Mr. Lee-Steere carry a great deal of weight, so far as I am concerned, when he speaks as the voice for the pastoral industry which he has represented for a long period of years.

I do not want to delay the House, because I have already put forward my views when moving the motion. I would not have said anything on the amendment, had the three members not intruded into the debate at this juncture. Those three members have a different outlook on the wool industry, yet they represent the same type of electors. Is it any wonder that over the last 1½ to two years the industry has been referred to in many quarters as being divided in its outlook.

The Minister created an impression that he was labouring rather badly when he spoke to the motion. He relied mainly on

reading a great deal of matter which appeared in the Western Australian *Hansard*, the Federal *Hansard*, and other publications. From what he said very little of importance has emerged. It is surprising to find the Minister adopting an attitude like that, because his electorate is the centre of a very important woolgrowing district of this State. I would have thought that he would be very pleased to find that a proposal for the appointment of a committee into all aspects which go to make up the cost of wool production had been put forward.

I summarise what the Minister had to say by stating that he put forward a tongue-in-the-cheek type of suggestion when he moved the amendment to the motion. Primarily and chiefly the amendment sought to delete the portion of the motion proposing the appointment of a Select Committee. Where will his amendment get us? The Minister based his reasons on two points. The first was that the survey by the Commonwealth Government was continuing. There is no argument about that. I know the survey has been going on for a long time, but nothing so far has emerged from it. The second point was that the Minister for Primary Industry might appoint a committee. We have been hearing about the possibility of the appointment of a committee by the Commonwealth Government for a long time, but up to the present none has been appointed.

I would remind the Minister that this survey has been going on since 1951 or 1952. The Commonwealth has had all the answers since that time, but it has not done a thing in regard to the position in which wool is placed. It did not even take any activity on the promotion plan for the sale of wool that was put into effect by some sections of the industry. It was a promotion plan organised by the industry itself, and the Commonwealth Government gave the plan its blessing as well as some capital. Since the adoption of the plan, the Commonwealth has assisted to some extent.

From the gathering of information over a period of eight or nine years nothing has resulted. I want to drum into the ears of members in this House that it is useless to have a file of documents if we do not take some action to bring the matter to a climax. Let us do something rather than stand around and grizzle about the various aspects, while achieving nothing in the ultimate.

Much of the matter dealt with by the survey which has been going on for so long is outmoded at the present time. The information on the wool industry gained as a result of the survey over eight or nine years has very little value today. Some of the fundamental points may not have altered very much, but there has been a great change in the industry in

many of its aspects. The costs and conditions of the industry have greatly altered, and money values have depreciated many-fold in that period.

I think we could even get back to saying that we almost had the pound value at that time. Whilst not wanting to make a political matter of it, I have heard a lot of talk about putting value back into the pound. However, the further we go the further is the value of the pound depressed, whether it be in Western Australia or in any other part of the Commonwealth. Granting the claim that the survey is capable of supplying the answers, none of this information has been put to any effect; and the only reply the Minister for Primary Production could give me when I put the case on behalf of this State in November, 1958, was that the information was there for anybody to see.

I am not wanting to see information. I want to know that some activity has been undertaken to apply this information usefully in order to do something for the industry. The Federal Government might appoint a committee. We have been told that several times, and the Minister is prepared to accept this rather nebulous approach to the problem by being contented—to use the words of the member for Avon—with a pious wish. They were words which I intended to use with reference to the utterances of the Minister and the altered wording. However, the member for Avon even went further and made the whole meaning of the motion appear to be in the “pious wish” category.

I do not think we should be prepared to water down a motion that is designed to do something of a tangible nature. We want positive action. Procrastination will not get us further afield than the state this industry has been in over the last few years. From my point of view the amendments are neither forthright nor convincing, whereas the original motion had that intention and would have served that purpose. For this House to ask the Premier to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth and ask it to refer the matters we have discussed to a committee it might later appoint is not the type of proposition we want. I cannot understand the Minister falling for something of that kind. We still have no guarantee that this committee will be appointed.

This is just a delaying action that is going to achieve nothing. I can assure the Minister and other members on that side of the House that this matter is foremost in the minds of farmers of Western Australia, particularly those who are represented by branches of the Farmers' Union. I have discussed these matters on many occasions with farmers and I know their sentiments. They have been thinking along the lines of the motion for a period of time; and I finally came to the

conclusion that if any activity was to take place it was necessary for a motion to be introduced into this House.

I know the Government has sufficient numbers to vote against the original motion, and that the amendment will be carried. However, I think I have expressed my feelings in regard to the matter. I would say this to the Minister: If something tangible is not done soon, this will not be the last of the motion, because there will be a further movement which will highlight to a greater extent than on this occasion the actual position which the wool industry is facing at the present time.

As I said earlier, it would not be policy, nor would it achieve anything, if I voted against the amendment. I realise I am in a cleft stick in regard to the sentiments I have expressed. I hope that something more forthright will be done. I leave the motion as it is at present.

**Amendment put and passed.**

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [11.54]: I move an amendment—

That the following words be substituted for the words deleted:—

This House requests the Premier to ask the Commonwealth Government to include in the terms of reference of the committee it proposes to set up to inquire into present wool-selling systems, terms covering the following:

**Amendment put and passed.**

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [11.56]: I move the following further amendments:—

Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following:—

(b) Better methods of promoting the use of wool and encouraging the demand for wool.

Delete from paragraph (c) the words “such as the Addis method.”

**Amendments put and passed.**

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [11.58]: I move an amendment—

Delete from paragraph (e) the words “to the Commonwealth Government.”

**MR. KELLY** (Merredin-Yilgarn—on amendment) [11.59]: I think the word “recommending” in the final paragraph does not read very sensibly. The clause as amended would read:—

Practicability of recommending the adoption of a wool stabilisation scheme on similar lines to the Wheat Stabilisation Scheme.

I do not think that shows the true intention of the House. The word "recommending" should be deleted from the paragraph because this motion is going to be conveyed to the Commonwealth Government by the Premier. I think the paragraph should read, "The practicability of the adoption of a wool stabilisation scheme on similar lines to the Wheat Stabilisation Scheme."

The SPEAKER: If the Minister would agree to withdraw his amendment it may be possible to achieve the end the honourable member desires. I do not know whether the Minister is prepared to withdraw his amendment.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [12.1 a.m.]: I am doubtful whether the suggestion made by the honourable member is of much advantage. The motion still reads sense to me. It would read "Practicability of recommending the adoption of the wool stabilisation scheme on similar lines to the wheat stabilisation scheme."

The SPEAKER: The word "the" is not included.

Mr. NALDER: Yes, it is.

The SPEAKER: Yes; the Minister is right. The Minister is not prepared to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. NALDER: It is only splitting straws.

THE SPEAKER: The Minister does not want to withdraw it?

Mr. NALDER: No.

The SPEAKER: We will have to put the motion as originally moved to delete the words "to the Commonwealth Government."

Amendment put and passed.

Motion, as amended, put and passed.

## PROPERTY IN BOTTLES BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [12.3 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Premier and the Government for giving me this opportunity of introducing the Bill, particularly at this late hour. It may be that many members are not interested in bottles at this time of night.

Mr. Hawke: Not empty ones.

Mr. FLETCHER: Some might be interested and need the stimulants contained in them.

Mr. Brand: How about getting cracking on the Bill?

Mr. FLETCHER: The main purpose of this measure is to overcome difficulties which have arisen in relation to the collection of bottles by licensed collectors, and the unfair advantage which is given to a developing monopoly, to the disadvantage of small bottle yards which have been in business in the metropolitan area for many years. It is an attempt to give fair and impartial trading rights to all who deal in bottles.

Bottles might seem quite an innocent and simple article, but there is £1,000,000 per year involved in this industry. Unfortunately a situation has developed where one company is receiving a disproportionate share of that money; and that is causing growing concern and dissatisfaction among dealers and collectors.

The previous member for Leederville made an attempt to rectify the situation, but the Bill he introduced lapsed through effluxion of time. I trust that the present member for Leederville will assist in ensuring that this Bill does not meet with a similar fate.

Mr. Perkins: Your Bill is not the same as his, though.

Mr. FLETCHER: It has a similar purpose.

Mr. Perkins: It is a lot different.

Mr. FLETCHER: Many metropolitan members of the Government will find bottle yards in their districts, and I ask them for their support on this issue. I hope to be able to outline the injustice that is rampant at the moment in respect to this humble article. In the Bill is a provision, as the title suggests, to confer a title to bottles in certain cases on persons who purchase the contents of the bottles.

Another clause in the Bill states that "bottles" includes a bottle branded or marked with a name, trade mark, or other distinguishing mark, as well as a bottle not so branded or marked. Reference is made to a contract which I have here and to which I will refer later, and a provision is contained in the Bill dealing with this contract. There is also one which back-dates the Bill for this reason. Members will realise that sales before the commencement of this Act will be affected by the Bill. In the absence of this provision it could well be that difficulties would arise; for example, if a marine dealer tried to establish at what date any particular bottle passed into the possession of any householder.

A further provision is that dealing with bottles, the contents of which are consumed on the premises where the sale takes place.

Mr. Lewis: Is that going to increase any prices?

Mr. FLETCHER: I will attempt to explain that point later.

At I stated earlier, a similar Bill was originally introduced into this House by the previous member for Leederville. Approximately 12 months ago, on my entry into Parliament, I received a deputation from suburban bottle yards and collectors at Fremantle and Midland Junction, and throughout the metropolitan area generally. They asked me to do something about this matter. A few weeks ago they came here again. The deputation consisted of bottle-yard proprietors, collectors, trade union officials; and some members of Parliament from opposite were good enough to be present also. Together with myself, the member for South Fremantle, the member for North Perth, the member for Leederville, the member for Guildford-Midland and others, as parliamentary representatives of these people, heard their grievances as to the unsatisfactory situation which is developing to the detriment of those I have mentioned, and to the detriment of the public in general.

The deputation pointed out that owners of branded bottles had formed themselves into an association, and this association had appointed Hayes Bros. of Fremantle and Morley Park to be its sole agents. The association, by various means, and some intimidation, had endeavoured to persuade licensed dealers and collectors to sign an agreement and to abide by that agreement. Most dealers and collectors had refused to sign the agreement, objecting to the monopoly given by the association to Hayes Bros. and to the poor price offered by Hayes Bros. for dealers' bottles. The offer at that time was only 1s. 6d. a dozen. This has since been increased to 1s. 7½d. a dozen.

Dealers felt they should be paid 2s. a dozen for their bottles. Bottles purchased from Western Australian Glass Manufacturers—and I would like members to be attentive on this point—cost 7s. 6d. a dozen at the factory, which means that they cost up to 9d. each by the time they are washed and are available to the establishments which fill and label them.

Members of the Branded Bottles Association claim that the bottles should remain their property and should be surrendered to them. Licensed collectors and dealers feel they should have unrestricted right to collect bottles whether branded or otherwise; and when the bottles have been paid for, they should remain their own property. A principle of free enterprise is involved, and it would allow licensed collectors and dealers to trade on a fair basis and to sell the bottles direct to those firms whose names appear on the bottles and who wish to purchase and reuse them. Both branded and unbranded bottles are used over and over again.

Members of the deputation felt that when secondhand bottles—or thirdhand, or fourthhand bottles—were used as containers the public should not be charged the full price of a new bottle for the bottle and the contents therein.

Mr. Lewis: How do you know that they place the full price on the bottle when it is used the first time?

Mr. FLETCHER: The full price could be charged 100 times. I suggest there is extra profit involved in the transaction, and it should not be condoned. The Swan Brewery used all branded bottles and gave dealers and collectors a fair deal when most other firms were attempting to exploit dealers and collectors by forcing them to sign agreements which were found to be inequitable. After frequent discussions it was agreed that inquiries should be made to ascertain from the Parliamentary Draftsman whether effective legislation could be provided to lay down that ownership of bottles, branded or otherwise, would pass in every instance, with the contents, to any person purchasing a bottle of beer, a bottle of wine, a bottle of sauce, or a bottle of any other commodity. The purpose of this Bill is to prevent a monopoly over the collection and disposal of these bottles.

The Bill before us will make it possible for householders to sell any bottles to any collector who, in turn, can dispose of them to the nearest bottle yard. The yard proprietor would then be entitled to sell, subject to a satisfactory price, direct to the firms whose brands the bottles bear, instead of having to surrender those bottles, as is the case at the present time, to Hayes Bros. at their price.

Mr. Mann: The so-and-so scoundrels!

Mr. FLETCHER: The member for Avon Valley says, "The so-and-so scoundrels." I agree with him entirely. I ask members opposite who have bottle yards in their electorates, to support this measure. From my point of view, to use a colloquialism, it is simply a case of "Fair go, Aussie." If members opposite believe in free enterprise; let these bottle yards deal directly on a fair basis with Hayes Bros., and do not allow this one firm to absorb the entire business.

Dr. Henn: Is the consumer going to get any more for his empty bottles?

Mr. FLETCHER: There is a bottle yard in my own electorate. The proprietor lives in the Leederville area, and he has no doubt approached the honourable member on this subject. I expect other members opposite have been similarly approached by persons who deal and trade in bottles. I ask members of the Government to support this measure. Both bottle yards and collectors are licensed to deal in these bottles, and I ask that they be allowed to deal and trade on a fair competitive basis with the firm which at present appears to have the monopoly.

A dealer named Mr. Cooley, of Cooley and Freeman, South Fremantle, informs me of information obtained from the

proprietor of a firm called West Enterprises of Frobisher Road, Osborne Park, or Scarborough. I believe it is in the electorate of the member for North Perth.

Mr. W. Hegney: No; it is in the electorate of the member for Mt. Hawthorn.

Mr. FLETCHER: The proprietor to whom I have referred states that the cost of a new bottle is charged for every bottle on refill at his plant. The management of this particular enterprise has made that statement.

There is another unfair aspect of this matter. This antiquated Act of 1902 lays it down that each collector shall be licensed and run his own cart, or his own conveyance, for the purpose of collecting bottles. The Act has not been amended since 1902, and I suggest that members opposite co-operate with me for the purpose of amending this antiquated Act so that at least its provisions will be fair.

I believe that Hayes Bros. have 14 employees who are all in possession of a license to collect bottles. So members can immediately see the advantage that firm has over other firms. Those employees are licensed as marine collectors almost in defiance of the Act in that they work for an employer. Any one of those 14 men can be seen any day around the Fremantle area at the hotels, clubs, restaurants, and wine saloons buying direct from those concerns bottles at 1s. a dozen. Later I will read the agreement under which a collector is bound not to pay more than 6d. a dozen. Yet these people who are associated with Hayes Bros. are offering 1s. a dozen.

If that state of affairs is permitted to continue, the inevitable result will be that the itinerant bottle collector will finish up on the wages staff of Hayes Bros.; or, alternatively, go out of business. That might not be of any consequence to some members opposite, but it is to me and to those who own these business undertakings and whose families are dependent on them. One collector, for example, Mr. Tilley, took over the business from his father. It is a flourishing little business, but he could lose it as a result of the unfair trading practices that are being indulged in at the moment. If they are allowed to continue, most of these itinerant collectors will finish up working for Hayes Bros. on wages, the same as the other 14 men I have mentioned.

In some Fremantle hotels notices are displayed stating that those who purchase half-gallon flagons of wine will receive one shilling on the return of the flagon to Hayes Bros. Why should not all collectors be able to take those bottles to the nearest yard and let those yards deal with them? Why should those flagons have to be taken to Hayes Bros.? But it is laid down in the notices that they shall be taken there.

I have no doubt that the hotel proprietors would pay one shilling to the customer when he returned the flagon

provided he bought another full one. However, according to the notice, the flagon has to be returned to Hayes Bros.; and there is another potential source of revenue denied to the people who have traditionally made a living from this particular type of trade—if it can be called such—being taken away from them.

Cooley & Freeman are the present proprietors of a yard which has been in the Fremantle area for about 50 years. Yet that firm is denied the right to send its bottles direct to the Branded Bottles Association and receive the same price as Hayes Bros. I will read the pertinent clauses of the agreement later; but as a result of it, if a collector comes into the yard with a truckload of bottles the branded bottles have to be sorted out into crates and sent to Hayes Bros. for 1s. 6d. a dozen. They in turn send the bottles to the Branded Bottles Association and make about 3s. a dozen. I believe a sum in the vicinity of 4s. 6d. a dozen is the price paid to Hayes Bros. As I said earlier, that is half the price of the original new bottle.

That is a very poor state of affairs, and Cooley & Freeman are suffering as a consequence of this monopoly which has been developing and is growing rapidly. If something is not done about it, and if this Bill in its present form or in some other acceptable form is not passed business undertakings that have been in existence for as long as 50 years will fall by the wayside.

In short, apart from the protection attempted to be given to collectors, the Bill does not prevent those firms which sell their products in bottles, jars, flagons, etc., from having the firm's name moulded on the container. However, it does give the right to other existing licensed bottle yards, together with Hayes Bros., to sell these bottles, containers, etc. direct to the firms or companies whose names the containers bear.

Members may raise the point that a similar product of another firm could be sold in a container bearing the moulded name of the original company which purchased the bottle or container from the manufacturer. I would suggest to the House that since a label has to be attached to that particular bottle, redress could be sought through common law against any firm or person who attempted misrepresentation such as I have outlined—that is, of putting a similar article in a bottle which purported to be its own or somebody else's product.

I have here an article which appeared in the *Daily News* of the 13th October. The heading of the article is "Bottles Back—To Wait." It reads—

Thousands of dozens of wine bottles which have been stored for months are pouring into a central bottleyard.

They will be stored again for months until they are needed.



This is one of the ironical results of the end of a dispute between marine collectors and the Branded Bottles Association.

The dispute has ended after bottle collectors stored up wine bottles for more than eight months, refusing to deliver them.

I will interpolate here. These collectors, in view of the fact that there was a Branded Bottles Association, formed themselves into a union and were given coverage under the Miscellaneous Workers' Union in the Fremantle area. I do not want members opposite immediately to become suspicious because a union is associated with this. It was just the usual tug-of-war. There was a Branded Bottles Association and, as a consequence, it was necessary for the men who collected bottles to have some union coverage. That there should be a union to protect the rights of those people is quite a natural and reasonable state of affairs. I will continue to quote from this newspaper cutting as follows:—

#### ROSTER

Now the return of this huge quantity of bottles is being rostered, as bottle-ohs try to return their accumulated supplies.

Are the bottles returning just in time for summer trade?

Well, they will provide plenty of bottles for the Christmas trade . . . but wine is mainly a winter drink, and many of the bottles will wait some months before being refilled.

Dealers, who withheld the bottles while they disputed a number of issues, reached agreement when certain points were decided.

The main point was the provision of a central Perth yard for returning wine bottles. This is being established in Palmerston Street.

Dr. Henn: I am glad you brought that into it.

Mr. FLETCHER: There are two other predominant features in this matter. The collectors have received some satisfaction as a result of withholding the bottles, but the bottles are now in the process of going back into the hands of the Branded Bottles Association, so the bargaining powers of the collectors have disappeared as a consequence. The Branded Bottles Association will now be in a position to impose again conditions on the collectors which they were forced to impose on the Branded Bottles Association; so whatever way one looks at the question one finds it necessary to bring in legislation to resolve the problem. In the process, the public is paying the piper. On the face of it, it looks quite simple, but it is not so simple as it appears. In effect, those who hold the bottles try to dictate the terms.

The collectors have had some satisfaction, particularly from the brewery. They have gained some concessions in relation to the bottles. They have not gained all they set out to achieve, and so the bargaining will continue; and Hayes Bros. have attempted to impose this agreement on collectors and on bottle yards.

Mr. Brand: Move the second reading.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not know whether the Premier is serious, but I would like to make some further points that are mentioned here. I ask the indulgence of the House, even at this late hour, to do so, because it is necessary to make some of this information known. The agreement is headed "Branded Bottles." I will pick out the most important parts of the agreement. Clause 1 reads as follows:—

The Agents hereby appoint the collector as an authorised collector to collect bottles above described from any person having the same in his possession and deliver the same to the Agents in the manner and upon the terms and conditions hereinafter mentioned.

Also, there is in this agreement a provision whereby the Branded Bottles Association can indulge in zoning. That association can direct the collectors to where they shall go to collect the bottles; and, in doing so, they can send them into an area where there are very few bottles available, and send their own collectors into an area where there are plenty. Another clause in that agreement reads as follows:—

That the Collector will not either directly or indirectly and whether as principal, partner, agent, servant or in any other manner or capacity during the continuance of this agreement sell or supply or deliver to or collect for or agree attempt or purport to sell supply or deliver to or collect for any person, firm, company, corporation or association other than the Agents any of the said bottles.

Here is another prime clause in the agreement—

Provided that the collector shall not be required to deliver the said bottles to the Agents on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays.

It is extremely magnanimous of them to give them those days off.

Dr. Henn: I thought they gave them a separate bottle yard.

Mr. FLETCHER: Yes, but the bottle yard is right out at Morley Park.

Dr. Henn: Now it is in central Perth.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is in regard to receiving the accumulated bottles now in store. The important point is that the bottle yard proprietor previously had to put them in cases and cart them out to Morley Park where he received only 1s. 6d. a dozen for them, the price he is allowed to pay the collector. He has to

shift those bottles at his own expense, in his own vehicle, and this is grossly unfair. Here is another clause in the agreement—

The Collector may make to the person from whom the bottles are collected as aforesaid for having kept the same in safe custody an allowance not exceeding the following:—

- (a) For quart bottles — 6d. per dozen.
- (b) for pint bottles — 4d. per dozen.
- (c) For 5 oz. bottles — 4d. per dozen (flasks).

Mr. Roberts: What do the country dealers think of this proposed legislation?

Mr. J. Hegney: Will the honourable member who interjected speak up, please? We cannot hear what he is saying.

Mr. FLETCHER: The member for Bunbury is now delaying the House.

Mr. Roberts: Well, I will not continue to do so.

Mr. Rowberry: Have a suck at the bottle!

Mr. FLETCHER: Continuing to quote from this agreement—

The Agents may at any time without giving any reason therefor determine the Agreement—

Some honourable member may suggest that this agreement should lie on the table of the House; and I am sure that if any reasonable or impartial person were to read it, he would agree that it is iniquitous; and he would realise how wrong it is to try to impose these conditions on the persons I have mentioned, including those who are conducting the bottle yards and those who are the collectors.

I ask members opposite to study carefully what I have said, and try to assist me to put this Bill through the House, because I am sure the measure will prove to be advantageous to the community as a whole, to the collector, and to those in charge of the bottle yards. I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

On motion by Mr. Perkins (Minister for Transport), debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Thursday).

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 20th October, 1960

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT—</b>	
Tabling .....	1979
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Bindi Bindi-Lyons Camp Turnoff : Road widening .....	1980
Mining—	
Incidence of accidents and diseases .....	1979
Pension allowances .....	1979
Jobs for displaced workers .....	1979
South of Perth Yacht Club : Change of site .....	1980

### CONTENTS—continued

	Page
<b>BILLS—</b>	
City of Fremantle (Free Literary Institute) Act Amendment Bill : Returned .....	1988
Esperance Lands Agreement Bill : 3r. ....	1980
Health Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Recom. ....	1989
Further report ; 3r. ....	1992
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 3) :	
2r. ....	1988
Local Government Bill : Further report ....	1980
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill : 2r. ....	1992
Traffic Act Amendment Bill : Com. ....	1980

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

#### Tabling

THE PRESIDENT: I have received from the Auditor-General a copy of his report on the Treasurer's statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1960. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### MINING

##### Incidence of Accidents and Diseases

1. The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Are State figures available on—
  - (a) goldmining,
    - (i) incidence of industrial accidents,
    - (ii) incidence of industrial diseases;
  - (b) coalmining,
    - (i) incidence of accidents,
    - (ii) incidence of diseases?

- (2) Which of the two occupations is considered the more dangerous?

##### Pension Allowances

- (3) What is the comparable figure for retiring pension allowance for—
  - (a) coalmine workers;
  - (b) asbestos-mine workers;
  - (c) goldmine workers; and
  - (d) leadmine workers?

##### Jobs for Displaced Workers

- (4) When active mining for gold ceased in the towns of Wiluna, Big Bell, Reedy, and Youanmi, what obligation devolved on the State Government to provide work, homes, and other forms of compensation for displaced workers in this industry?