

Noes—25.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	(Teller.)

Majority against—5.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. NULSEN: I have one small amendment which I think the Minister might consider. If a person contravenes this clause, he commits an offence for which the penalty is £50. The amount is too high, because it is so easy to commit such an offence. One is inclined to forget distance. I have done so myself before this. This is not a criminal matter, and the penalty is only in the nature of a deterrent. I move an amendment—

Page 139, line 30—Delete the word "fifty" with a view to substituting the word "five."

Progress reported, and leave granted to sit again.

BILLS (6)—RETURNED

1. Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill.
2. Administration Act Amendment Bill.
Bills returned from the Council with amendments.
3. Absconding Debtors Act Amendment Bill.
4. Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill.
5. Radioactive Substances Act Amendment Bill.
6. Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE*Show Day Adjournment*

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [12.1 a.m.]: I would like to acquaint the House with the fact that we will not be sitting on Show Day. That is the usual practice.

*House adjourned at 12.2 a.m.
(Wednesday).*

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 21st September, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Broome Water Supply : Availability from local bores	1256
Esperance Electricity : Improvement of service	1255
Fremantle Harbour Trust : Land resumptions	1256
Payment of Departmental Accounts : Use of instalment stamps	1256
Traffic Lights : South Street and Carriington Street intersection	1256

BILLS—

Chevron-Hilton Hotel Agreement Bill—	
2r.	1257
Com. ; report	1265
City of Fremantle (Free Literary Institute) Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	1256
Coroners Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	1256
Country High School Hostels Authority Bill—	
2r.	1276
Com.	1276
Dog Act Amendment Bill : Com.	1269
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	1256
Health Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	1265
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	1257
Licensing Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	1257
Marketing of Onions Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1266
Com. ; report	1266
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	1256
Stamp Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	1268
State Housing Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1267
Com. ; report	1268
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE : SPECIAL	1285

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**ESPERANCE ELECTRICITY***Improvement of Service*

1. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Is the Minister aware that the output of the local power station at Esperance is totally inadequate to meet the demands for lighting and power within the town boundaries?
 - (2) Will the Minister ask the Government to have an early investigation made with a view to giving the townspeople a better service?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) The direct current supply is known to be inadequate; but the installation of adequate A.C. plant, for which the Government made available a grant of £30,000 in June, 1959, is well advanced.

BROOME WATER SUPPLY

Availability from Local Bores

2. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to take immediate action to replace the existing inadequate supply of very poor quality water at Broome with supplies of excellent quality water available from bores within eight miles of the town?
- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The Government has been active for some time in seeking a suitable source of potable water for Broome. Standard tests are in progress to prove the area mentioned as a suitable source of supply.

It has been necessary to move the boring rig to Broome to reline No. 4 bore with the object of ensuring a suitable supply to the town until the new scheme can be provided.

- (2) Answered by No. (1).

FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST

Land Resumptions

3. The Hon. E. M. DAVIES asked the Minister for Mines:

Further to my remarks during the Address-in-Reply debate relative to the proposal by the Fremantle Harbour Trust to acquire land bounded by Queen Victoria Street, James Street, and Beach Street, Fremantle, for harbour purposes, is the trust continuing with this resumption?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The Government is continuing resumption, but the area to be resumed might be materially reduced. Action is being taken to define the precise areas required.

PAYMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTS

Use of Instalment Stamps

4. The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY asked the Minister for Finance:

To assist the householder similar to a method acceptable to the Commonwealth Government in the payment of wireless and television licenses and of income tax

by the purchase, periodically, of stamps, will the Government give consideration to the implementation of a scheme whereby it would be possible to purchase stamps of suitable denominations from the Treasury to meet, on an instalment basis, governmental accounts such as water rates, land taxes, electricity charges, etc?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The implementation of such a scheme would involve considerable administrative difficulties and expense which would have to be borne by the taxpayer or ratepayer. For this reason the proposal is not favoured.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

South Street and Carrington Street Intersection

5. The Hon. E. M. DAVIES asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister inform the House when it is intended to provide traffic lights at the intersection of South and Carrington Streets, Fremantle?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

There is at present no intention to provide traffic lights at the intersection of South and Carrington Streets. Traffic lights at this location would be in isolation, and under present road and traffic conditions the installation is not warranted.

6. *This question was postponed.*

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING

1. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.

On motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), Bill introduced and read a first time.

2. City of Fremantle (Free Literary Institute) Act Amendment Bill.

On motions by The Hon. E. M. Davies, Bill introduced and read a first time.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING

1. Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill.

On motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

2. Coroners Act Amendment Bill.

3. Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill.

On motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), Bills read a third time and passed.

4. Licensing Act Amendment Bill.

On motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, Bill read a third time and passed.

CHEVRON-HILTON HOTEL AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th September.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [4.43]: Last night I obtained the adjournment of this debate in the hope that I would get some information today, but, to date, it has not been forthcoming. Nevertheless, I have one or two comments to make on the Bill; but, at the same time I, the same as other members, have no alternative except to support it. It seems a pity that agreements of this nature are signed before Parliament has an opportunity to consider them because very often—as Mr. Wise pointed out last night when referring to two or three anomalies in the agreement with which we are dealing—some anomalies could probably be smoothed out before the agreements were finally negotiated.

I wish to deal with one point, in particular, in regard to the principle of town planning as it affects the small man, and the big man, of finance. It seemed to me and some of my friends that there was a certain amount of undue haste over this agreement, with people rushing into Perth by plane and the authorities being told that there were only two or three days in which to do this or do that. Such practice is all very well; and although everyone is desirous of seeing large amounts of capital introduced to Perth, such haste in negotiating important agreements of this nature seems rather unwarranted; especially when local people have to wait months before obtaining a decision over a piece of land.

On two or three occasions when the Minister for Town Planning (the Hon. L. A. Logan) was speaking last night, I interjected concerning people who own blocks of land on the outskirts of the city and who at times have sought subdivisions, but who have been told in no uncertain manner that they cannot do this or that because it would be contrary to the Stephenson Plan.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: This agreement will not alter the Stephenson Plan.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: However, I was pleased to hear the Minister tell us that the plan can be altered from time to

time; and I am sure there are many people in the province I represent who will be making approaches to the Minister within the next twelve months or so in regard to certain land; and I will expect them to receive the same treatment as the Chevron-Hilton group is receiving now.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We have not altered the town planning.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Minister waits for an honourable member to rise to his feet and then says what he likes as to whether the Government did not do this or did not do that; but actual fact disproves his statements.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: But he is a most reasonable man at heart.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am not speaking against the person, but against the principle that is adopted by the Government. With that in mind, I have been expressing the sentiments of a number of property-owners in my province who were extremely pleased when I told them today what the Minister stated last night.

There is one other point with which I have to agree in the same way as other speakers have done; and here I refer to the invidious position in which the Licensing Court has been placed as a result of this agreement. I hope that when the court is subjected to criticism on some future date for refusing to grant a license, the Minister will defend its action. Having been unsuccessful in obtaining the information I was hoping to receive, I will conclude my remarks by stating that I will support the Bill.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [4.47]: Surely the Government must be heartily congratulated on its successful efforts in having a hotel of this size and type built in this city. No matter what criticism may be levelled on the score of haste in entering into the agreement, as was mentioned by Mr. Lavery, I think we sometimes overlook the way Americans conduct their business. They spend money at a rate we cannot appreciate; and £2,500,000 to them is not such a great amount. Therefore, when making decisions of this sort they expect them to be finalised in rapid time.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: They expect plenty for it, too.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think it will be found that we will get plenty for it, too. We will be the ones that will gain from the acquisition of this hotel. The interesting speech made by Mr. Wise last night must bring to our minds certain points concerning which we must express interest.

First of all, one would like to be assured that, in any future alteration to the town planning of the city area, Government

House will be preserved for all time. Any suggestion that Government House should be removed from its present site must surely be frowned upon by all.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: But not necessarily retained as Government House.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No; it need not be retained as Government House. There are other purposes for which the building could be retained. It may be as well to cast our minds back over the history of this building. Convicts came to this State for the first time in 1850. They were accompanied by E. Y. W. Henderson, who was then to take over the position of Comptroller-General. The foundation stone of Government House was laid in 1859. The plans for the building were drawn by the Royal Engineers, and most of the plans were signed either by E. Y. W. Henderson or E. C. Sim. The name of R. R. Jewell, as Superintendent of Works with the Royal Engineers, also appears on some of the documents. It was Governor Hampton who first occupied Government House in 1863.

We should realise that Government House was built with convict labour; and it is one of the very few institutions remaining in this State which were built by convict labour. The main projects built by the convicts were Government House, the Perth Town Hall, the Perth Causeway, the Pensioners' Barracks, and Fremantle Bridge. Of those, the only ones remaining at present are Government House, Perth Town Hall, and the Barracks. It seems that the Barracks will one day be removed—although part of them may be preserved and shifted elsewhere—and that the Perth Town Hall and Government House will, shortly, be the only two major projects remaining which were built by convicts.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Is there any merit in their being preserved for posterity?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Is there any merit in tradition?

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What tradition.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Is there any merit in history? Is there any merit at all in preserving the structures built by those who came to this State in the very early days? There are very few people who regard it as unessential to be able to look back to the early days of the settlement of this State and to be able to attach special interest to buildings which have been preserved.

Until the coming of Governor Hampton, the usual punishments of those days were inflicted on the convicts. Dr. Crowley recorded that there was no real brutality in the treatment of prisoners. After the coming of Governor Hampton, who had

been in charge in Tasmania, the punishments became more severe—an indeterminate length of isolation was one form. Physical punishment was also considerably increased under his regime.

If we are to have a historical society in this State, surely we should preserve some of those early buildings so that such a society could bring before the coming generations the history of the early days of the settlement of Western Australia. I trust that with the development of town planning in the future, Government House will be one of the structures to be retained. I suggest it is situated on an admirable site for conversion into a museum of industry and science, such as one sees abroad.

It was of infinite interest to me to see a very large number of young people spend their Sunday afternoons in the Jefferson Building of Science in Philadelphia, and also to see the large number of persons of all ages who visited the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago. These were two of the most interesting features I saw in the U.S.A. What interested me was the youth of the community taking such a vast interest in these museums. I suggest the Bill before us can be the means of providing such a museum in this State.

Right in the heart of Perth, in beautiful surroundings, is located Government House. It should be preserved as an illustration of the early culture of this city. Other aspects have been mentioned in this debate; and many of them must appeal to all of us. One matter which was mentioned even before the Bill was introduced in Parliament must be the cause of great concern; that is, the retention of Victoria Avenue—the avenue of trees. I do not think there is a more beautiful sight in the city than those trees during the arrival and departure of summer. First, the leaves are a vivid green; and later, as the season progresses, they change their colour. I trust the Minister will give us an assurance that these trees will be retained.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Professor Stephenson has the same idea as you.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am glad to hear that. There has been some concern for those trees; and the concern was heightened last evening when Mr. Wise stated that he could not obtain an assurance that they would be preserved.

The question of the widening of St. George's Terrace must also be taken into consideration in the town planning scheme, unless the proposed ceremonial drive is meant to stop at Victoria Avenue and turn around to the front of the new town hall. I was pleased to read in this morning's newspaper that there is no great hurry to construct the new town hall. There does not appear to be any rush to have it completed before the

Empire Games in 1962. Probably, the first part of the town hall to be built will be the administrative buildings. If that is done, the Perth City Council will be given an opportunity to review the whole question of the siting of the new town hall.

Now that replanning of this area of land is being undertaken, the question whether it is big enough to include a new town hall for a city which will shortly have a population of over 1,000,000, must arise. In Europe and the U.S.A., wherever a new town hall has been erected, a very large space has been left at least in front of the building, if not around it, to accommodate a concourse of people. It seems to be a habit among the European and British races to hold demonstrations in large numbers in public squares; although these numbers are not nearly as great as the numbers in places like Russia, and Italy where festivals are held frequently.

In this State there still remains the need to provide a space for a concourse of people in front of the new town hall. As there is no haste to complete the building, the question of the site may have to be reviewed. The purchase of a large block of land by the Perth City Council on the north side of the railway line—on the assumption that the railway line through the city will be removed—may be the answer to the provision of a suitably large site for the new town hall. There is the question of the purchase of land, before the erection of the building, to be considered.

Under the Stephenson Plan, the purchase of land by the Perth City Council for a new town hall site does not arise; but it does arise if the council acquires land north of the city. Of course, the question of economics will come into the picture. If we are to benefit from the experience of the growth of cities abroad, we should look very carefully into this question of economics and its effect upon the erection of large structures within the heart of the city; because to move a building, or to erect a further building, is much more costly than to construct the complete building at a time when it is needed.

I must also commend the idea for the provision of the ceremonial drive referred to in the plan. I think that will be an asset to the State; but I draw attention to the fact that the Supreme Court building is likely to remain for many a day. From my inquiries into the proposed ceremonial drive, it looks as if this project will not materialise in the lifetime of most of us here. It is only suggested as a feature of future planning.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: We have only just made additions to the Supreme Court building.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That is so. The ceremonial drive is something planned for the future. Therefore, when the future

generations are able to look at it, it may be constructed from a different plan; because, despite what we might lay down on paper here, if we do not build it now, then those who are in office at a later date could quite easily alter the plan.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: If they take us as an example they will certainly alter things.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am always reminded when such planning is made that one of our most eminent statesmen said that the land belongs to the living; and therefore at present this land belongs to us who live here. The Government has accomplished an excellent task in arranging for this hotel; and the plans have given us an idea of what this area could be like in the future. I therefore support the second reading.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [5.1]: I rise to add my small contribution to this debate; but I am not going to agree with other members, as I am opposing the Bill. The main reason for my opposition is the site on which the hotel is to be built. There have been some good speeches made during this debate, but it seems to me that the present Government can use its money to buy anything. It will not buy health or education, evidently; but anything else it will. Although this might be a great project and might be something futuristic for Perth, I believe that the wrong site has been allocated as there is other land in that vicinity which could have been utilised. It is almost sacrilege to build a pub—and that is what it is: a pub!—

The Hon. G. Bennetts: To supply poison to the public.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: —on the proposed site when there is land right opposite which would have been as good. I lived for 23 years in Victoria Avenue, so I know this to be a fact; and this land to which I am referring could have been purchased for much less than is being paid for the site outlined in the plan. I like to see progress, but the present trend of architecture leaves much to be desired. I look with no pride on two or three of the new buildings in the city as they are just great blocks of metal and glass with nothing beautiful about them whatever.

It is sacrilege to build on historical ground, such a building, jammed right up—as it will be—against the law courts and Government House. We are a young State; and at the moment the only historical portion we have of the Swan River is that portion where our forefathers saw fit to establish the aesthetic buildings of this State. Yet we are going to allow Americans to use their money to take over that site; and it is to this that I object. I do not mind who disagrees with me,

I also object to the fact that our Licensing Court is to be overridden. If this were desired in any other circumstances, there would be a great hue and cry; but because it is a matter of big money, it is permissible. This Government is doing all the things which should not be done by an ethical Government. In the mad grab for a few million pounds, no thought has been given to anyone or anything.

The Christian Brothers' College, from which many fine scholars have emanated, and which has its historical roots in that site, is to be bulldozed and shifted to another site further round the river where there is very little room for its expansion.

We paid Professor Stephenson a large sum to help us to plan our city, and his plans are being followed so long as they do not interfere with money. Apparently the power of money can alter anything. This Government will not have much to be proud of in the future because of its mad rush for money.

Tourism is a good, shall we say, by-product of a city or State; and we have plenty here to offer tourists; but it is not the mainstay of a community, by any means. We ought to develop our natural resources much faster than we are doing, and we also ought to be spending more money on education to enable our young people to take their place in the life of this State.

Many more suitable sites could have been found for this hotel rather than that part of Perth right on the foreshore of the river. There is now, on the south side of the river, a project by the name of Key West about which the South Perth people are protesting. I believe we should have enough vision to want to hand down to posterity something by which we will be remembered with pride. Dr. Hislop referred to the historical association with buildings built during the convict regime. I do not want to remember the convict regime, because of the horrors associated with it. There has been a tremendous amount of camouflage of this period of our history, particularly now in connection with this project. A lot of fine words have been used to camouflage the truth.

As I have already stated, this building will be nothing more than hotel accommodation and a bar, but it will be erected on a palatial scale. Our society is at present being demented by the curse of drink, but no-one is mentioning that. I am no wouser in any way, but I say we should be aware of the further opportunity we will be affording our young people to abuse society. We have only for a moment to think of the cults which are growing to realise that these are the things that should be concerning us, and not whether a millionaire or two pay us a visit.

With regard to the beautiful avenue of trees in Victoria Avenue, I went down there today and I cannot see how, with

modern traffic and the type of buildings to be erected, there is any hope of saving those beautiful trees.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If the boundary were shifted another 50 ft., they could be saved.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I do not think there is a hope of saving them at present, and I trust that this matter will be given grave consideration.

As I have said, I object to the overriding of our Licensing Court. I have made applications to the Minister in connection with this matter but he has stated that nothing can be done; but we find in this case that plenty is done, because big capital is involved. I do not believe that we should hurry with this project just because the Americans desire speed and have some money behind them.

I do not want to give the impression that I am against tourism. We have many beauty spots and numerous attractions. Several times I have asked various Governments to give some consideration to creating a reserve for wildflowers. I have pointed out that on the road to Northam there is a wonderful setting through the hills—we have no mountains—which could be utilised for the establishment of a wildflower reserve. Every species could be cultivated there; and if this were done we would not need a hotel to attract tourists. The reserve could be established and maintained without major expense. A gardener could be employed full-time on the reserve, or he could just make fortnightly visits once the plants had been established. If this were done the practice of cutting down the forest right to the roadside would be stopped. No time is given to the consideration of these matters, but plenty of time is spent in talking; and half of the talk is not real. Admittedly it receives a lot of publicity in the Press, but that does not make it any the more real.

I am not decrying anything that has been done by this Government to attract people to the State. I think more could have been done in the past; and more will be done in the future. I know that in a case like this, progress will be made as time goes on.

We are told that the need for speed in passing this legislation is because of the Empire Games in 1962, but if we study the matter closely we will realise the real reason. This is the mad rush for money. The Government should remember what happened in Rome. The plans there did not turn out as people thought they would. They counted on the "Golden Harp," but they did not get it. That situation could easily arise here, and the hotel could easily turn out to be a white elephant for a long time.

I think that a sober approach should be made to this subject. We have been asked to be proud of the history of the

convict settlement. I think that is about the last thing we should be proud of because of the horrors that were committed at that time. I think we should forget that part of our history well and truly, and bury it. I would not save any of the Barracks if I had a say in the matter.

Therefore, while I hope that this project may succeed, I am protesting against the site. I think too much glory, to say nothing of the halo, is being placed around this project which, after all, will only be a drinking house and a building with a lot of rooms. This sort of building could have been erected anywhere. I am wondering about those who have spent a lifetime in developing a business here in the hotels. I agree that our city hotels are not so bad in most cases. I have been in much worse ones in Sydney and Melbourne—only in the middle-class hotels, of course; I have never aspired to staying at any of the Chevron-Hilton hotels. I want to know what the ordinary person will get out of all this, and how this project will affect him.

I hope that in the future the Government will not adopt the same approach to questions such as this, but that a more ethical procedure will be adopted so that if we get someone here to do any planning for us we will do the right thing by him and not alter his recommendations in this way. All this Bill does is to override the plan which has been drawn up. We should not do that sort of thing simply because it suits big business to do it. Apparently everything is all right so long as big business agrees with it; that is the golden key. But somebody was supposed to have £1,000,000 to invest in South Perth, and when the project was investigated it was found that he had no money at all. This Government seems to swallow anything if the pill is gilded sufficiently.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [5.16]: In replying to the debate I should first like to state that last night, when Mr. Lavery sought an adjournment of the debate, I called "No." Mr. President, because of a miscalculation. I had quickly calculated what time was left this week, and I was of the opinion that perhaps the Bill would not be passed until next Tuesday if an adjournment were granted. As we all know, adjournments are not usually refused in this House, unless there is some good reason for it, and had I been given a little more time to calculate the position, and provided there were no amendments to the Bill, I would have seen that it could still have been read a third time tomorrow. In that case I would not have called out as loudly as I did. However, the House decided that the honourable member was entitled to an adjournment; and, as far as I am concerned, that is the end of it.

The debate on this Bill has been extremely interesting, and I want to take an early opportunity of thanking members

who made some research into this question and who made some worthy comments on the Bill. I also wish to thank them for the support that has generally been given to the Bill—that is up to the last speaker who says she intends to oppose the Bill because the site is simply being given away. According to the honourable member the Government rushed in and made some hasty agreement to provide for the building of a hotel of this nature, without giving any thought to it; she accused us of answering the call of the mighty dollar, and all that sort of stuff.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It was good stuff, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Nothing could be further from the truth. Of course, the honourable member would not be expected to know when the negotiations for this agreement started—nobody would expect her to know—but I would like to tell her that negotiations were first commenced on the 28th January, 1960.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Isn't that rushing into it?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That was eight months ago; and that is not rushing in nearly as much as the honourable member continues to do. As we all know, agreements are made and then presented to Parliament for ratification.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: The overriding of the Licensing Court is one of the worst features of it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like to say to the honourable member that we extended to her the courtesy of listening to her contribution in silence, and surely she should extend the same courtesy to me. Like other agreements that have been made with various Governments, this one is brought to Parliament for ratification. There has been no haste about it; as a matter of fact the deliberations have been many and varied; and, as I explained when introducing the Bill, of necessity certain aspects of the agreement have had to be changed during the last seven or eight months. The claim that the Government has simply rushed in is completely false. The Government—and I make no excuses for it—has been very anxious, and still continues to be anxious, to negotiate agreements of this nature; and I am sure that every member of this Parliament must be satisfied that such agreements will, in the ultimate, be of benefit to Western Australia.

All members realise what this project will mean in the way of employment—workers engaged on the building itself: the sale of materials, fittings and fixtures: the future work that will be provided; and the facilities that the hotel will provide for visitors from other parts of the Commonwealth and, in fact, from all over the world. The ridiculous assertion that it will be just a drinking house is so foolish that it is not worthy of any comment.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: American hotels do not rely in a major degree on bar trade.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This hotel will not rely on the bar trade; this project promises to be a £10,000,000 investment. Surely that is worthy of encouragement by any Government! I venture to suggest that if the position had been reversed, and the Chevron-Hilton group had shown an interest in Western Australia during the regime of the previous Government, that Government would have done as this Government is doing—that is, it would have tried to the best of its ability to negotiate a satisfactory agreement and bring this group to Western Australia. So I make no excuses whatever about this; and it is pleasing to see the Bill being supported.

It is only logical that criticism will be levelled where members think it is justified; but I would like to take the opportunity of replying to some of the comments that have been made. Dr. Hislop mentioned the question of the retention of Government House. It will be remembered that Professor Stephenson recommended and envisaged in his report the maintenance of Government House as a historical building. Of course, he did not envisage that it would remain where it is for the rest of time as Government House. He spoke of the days when another Government House will be built in some other part of the city. He also expressed a personal point of view that it is very important to the community to hold on to both history and tradition because, after all, great things are built on history and great things are built on tradition. Government House is one of those things because it is a very old landmark in Western Australia, and it would be a pity to see it go. I do not think it is envisaged that it will go.

Regarding the point raised by Dr. Hislop about the trees in Victoria Avenue, I will leave that matter and deal with it later on in my remarks, because other members also dealt with the same matter. As I said, I do not think there is any doubt that the new hotel will represent a strong forward move for Western Australia, and that it will be of great benefit to the State.

Mr. Strickland raised a number of points to which I would like to make some reference; and my colleague, the Minister for Local Government, last night answered Mr. Strickland in respect of some of his statements on town planning. I would like to point out again that some of the statements he made about town planning were inaccurate. Of course one never envisages that a town plan laid down now, ten years ago, or even in ten years' time, will remain unaltered forever. That is just not possible; and the honourable member must know that during the regime of the previous Government the Stephenson Plan was altered in various ways. I think last night mention was made of the Klinger

factory, which was established at Fremantle, in Mr. Lavery's district. The town plan had to be changed in order to make provision for the building of that factory.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Not in Fremantle; it was in Melville.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Very well! In the Fremantle district. There is nothing wrong about that. Plans have to be altered at times; we cannot expect them to be made and remain unaltered for all time; and it is certainly not a valid criticism of a measure of this nature to say that we have altered the plan and, because we have altered it, we should be subjected to criticism. Professor Stephenson in his report said that for this area he envisaged a series of tall buildings with garden settings between. I suggest that the Chevron-Hilton Hotel will most certainly fit into a picture like that.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It will certainly be a tall building.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Furthermore, the sale of the land is in conformity with Professor Stephenson's ideas when he said that the proceeds from the sale of the land should be used to provide public buildings on the Observatory site. Last year the Government made no secret of what was going to happen to this site, or a portion of it; and just to remind members of the fact I would like to quote Mr. Logan's remarks when he introduced the Reserves Bill last year. I quote from page 3570 of Vol. 3 of *Hansard* of 1959 where the Minister said—

It is proposed also to excise from Reserve No. 22240 a strip of land 1 chain 70 links wide on the western side of the proposed Taxation Department site, extending from St. George's Terrace to Terrace Drive and comprising an area of 1 acre 1 rood 36.6 perches, which may be disposed of under the provisions of the Land Act, 1933, for such purpose and subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor may approve.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That does not mean anything.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I can understand that it would not mean anything to the honourable member.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It does not prove anything.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It did to those who took an interest in the debate last year. It did to Mr. Wise, for instance, because he has had a long association with this sort of thing and he knows that area of land particularly well. He knew what was going on down there, and he made mention of it. There is a further comment by the Minister which reads—

Valuation of the two sites has yet to be completed and the conditions of the sale of the areas have not been

decided, but these are matters that can be approved by the Governor in Executive Council, if Parliament approves of the use of the land for purposes other than those for which it was excised from the Government Domain. It is intended that the proceeds of any sale of the land shall not be credited to Consolidated Revenue but shall be devoted solely for the purpose of the erection of new public offices on the site referred to as the Observatory site.

At that time a company was interested in the other piece of land—not the land set aside for the Taxation Department, but the other piece—but because negotiations were pending we were not able to give the name of the company concerned. As I said when I introduced the Bill, when the Chevron-Hilton group made approaches to the Government, the other people realised what was likely to take place in the way of building activity and they took no further interest in it because they could see that what they wanted would be provided for in this plan.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The provisions in the Reserves Bill of last year, and those in this one differ entirely from normal procedure and disposal of land, because of the strictures of the Land Act.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That may be so; but I am trying to point out that even at that point of time Parliament knew about it, and nobody took exception to the fact that the land was to be disposed of. I will have a little more to say about that in a minute. It was suggested that it was wrong to sell land by private negotiation. As I pointed out, the words used were, "To be sold on what terms the Governor-in-Council may think fit."

I would like to suggest that by selling it in the way it has been sold, Parliament approved of the principle enunciated last year that it could be disposed of.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: We did not know the Governor's thoughts in the matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We did not know them ourselves, because at that time the Chevron group had not become interested. It was to be disposed of for some other important purpose.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Once it is cancelled as an "A" class reserve it is a very different matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It was going to be disposed of for some other important purpose; and the important purpose in mind then, in respect to the name, did not eventuate as it has now; but the purpose in mind was very similar. Mr. Strickland mentioned that the Taxation Department would have resumed the land.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said it could have resumed the land.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I beg the honourable member's pardon; but I would like to remind him that the Government of which he was a member was approached by the Taxation Department which asked that Government whether it would sell the land. The Government of the day said it was not interested in selling the land.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Taxation Department could not acquire it while it was an "A" class reserve.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Taxation Department did not show any interest in resuming the land. Mr. Strickland said that if the department wanted to, it could have resumed the land.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It could have after it ceased to be an "A" class reserve.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But the Taxation Department did not show any interest. But when the Government changed in 1959 an approach was made by that department to the present Government about the land, and we said, "Yes, we will sell you the land"; and it was offered to them for £95,000.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Very cheap.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The offer was subsequently withdrawn, because the department did not do anything further about it. As I have conveyed, the price was considerably more than that in the Bill. I might also say in regard to Mr. Wise's remark that the price was very cheap; and we understood, unofficially, that the Taxation Department, in its opinion, considered the figure too high.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They were the purchasers.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In fixing the price for the land the Government adopted a figure considerably in excess of the valuation fixed by the Public Works Department; and I related the land assessment officer's figure on the value of the land as fixed by a private valuer. Of course we were criticised because we did not sell by tender. That could be a valid criticism. I would ask members, however, if they think it would have been possible for us to sell it by tender and, having done so, to tie a tag to it stating that upon the land should be constructed a £2,000,000 hotel with the possible investment of £10,000,000? Of course it would not have been possible to tie such a tag on the land. As part of the disposal of the land there is an agreement, which is a schedule to the Bill, which provides for the construction.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The point was that nobody had the opportunity to tender.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Even if anybody did tender, we would not have done as well as we have. We must bear in mind that the company does not get

a title to the land until it has put up the building. Do members think we could have got that by tender? Of course not.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: We are talking about the use of the land.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The question of the Licensing Court has been raised by a number of members, and it has been said that the agreement overrides the authority of the Licensing Court. The agreement provides that the Chevron Hotel group will be given a license; but as Mr. Heenan said last evening, he could appreciate the predicament in which the Government found itself in respect to the whole proposition; and it was only reasonable to say to the company, "Yes, there could be provision for a license to be granted." I would like to mention two important facts, however: After the first year the principals of the hotel must apply under the normal conditions of the Licensing Act for the renewal of their license; and the Licensing Court has the right to fix the premium in the first and second years.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Every license is annual.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; but in the second year the hotel group must apply to the court as is the case with any other body. I repeat, the company must pay the premium fixed by the Licensing Court.

On the question of the preservation of trees in Victoria Avenue, I interjected last night and said that I understood those trees would be preserved. I am informed that Mr. Green, the Town Clerk, says it is the intention of the Perth City Council to preserve the trees.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In order that the trees may be preserved, the building alignment is to go back to provide a dual carriage way. I cannot go beyond that undertaking: that is the advice I have from Mr. Green. It is the main reason for widening Victoria Avenue.

Mr. Wise mentioned the matter of widening St. George's Terrace. The widening of St. George's Terrace will not go through to Barrack Street, but will terminate at the town hall site. This of course as members can appreciate, is a matter for the Perth City Council. The widening is a matter of construction; but I am told it will terminate at the town hall. The area shown on the council plan as a possible site for future law courts has not in any way been set aside for that purpose. There is no obligation whatever upon the Government either to provide new law courts; or, if it does so, to build them in this area. The agreement merely states that should the Government at any time provide new law courts on any site, the council will be given the opportunity to acquire the Supreme Court site. If

there is no decision by any future Government to take action, then there will be no question of the Supreme Court site being acquired; but if some Government decides to take such action, then the Perth City Council will be given the opportunity to acquire the site, for which it will pay.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: How much land will be left in Stirling Gardens for the enjoyment of the public.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not able to say how much land there will be left, but I have tabled the plans.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You are telling us the council will have the Supreme Court area.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is trying to be difficult. I said that if any Government decided in future to build further law courts, it would be permissible for the council to acquire the area as defined on the plan. I do not think there is any reason to be misled beyond that point. Mr. Wise said he thought it might have been better for the Government, rather than for the council, to acquire the Christian Brothers' College site. I would like to say that before the council's proposals were considered, the Government reached agreement with the Chevron-Hilton group to sell it the block next to the Christian Brothers' College; and these proposals did not really require Government action. The Government agreed to postpone final arrangements with the Chevron group to give the council the opportunity to reach agreement upon its scheme, should this be possible.

Again, when the council became aware of what was going on, it had a look at this and said it would like to have something to say about the matter, with the result that negotiations were held open—not hurried as has been incorrectly suggested—so that those negotiations could take place. In respect of the claim, or accusation, that the college is being bulldozed out, I would point out that the statement is quite false, because Christian Brothers' College wanted to move. It is completely satisfied with the move. It is going from a cramped area of something like three acres, to a site of about 14 acres. Surely that is a valid reason for it to move! It is quite satisfied with its part of the arrangement.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It has been wanting to move since Aquinas College was built.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would not contradict that; and it is of course helpful to the statement I am making about the attitude of Christian Brothers' College. Nobody has bulldozed the college at all. It was not possible for the Government to acquire the land, nor was it practicable for the Government to do so, because an arrangement was made with Chevron, and the Christian Brothers' College themselves.

I do not know that there is anything else that requires comment, except to say that when the general over-all plan reaches fruition it will be of great benefit to Perth and Western Australia. It is not correct to say that the Chevron Hotel will be jammed up against the Supreme Court buildings, because there is a considerable amount of land, not forgetting Government House, between where the building is to be and the Supreme Court building.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is how it appears on the plan.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It will not be jammed up, and anybody with any knowledge of the matter will know that. I think this is a step forward. I would say that members of the Perth City Council have adopted a far-sighted attitude in this matter. They have taken upon themselves a good deal of responsibility in the future planning of Perth. Maybe one of these days when this plan comes to complete fruition, somebody might be kind enough to say that the wise old boys of the day who put forward the agreement really had something; and members of Parliament might be thanked for their part in it. I hope that will be the case rather than that it be criticised and torn down; or that it be said it had no practical value whatever.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I am afraid you will not be given a thought.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That may be so; but in this context I have often thought there were some wise old boys who did some sound planning in this community. One of the heritages they gave us is King's Park. The planners of long ago established Parliament House on a site overlooking the City of Perth. The plan before us will be another move towards the decorative adjustments of Perth, in an endeavour to make it a more beautiful city than it already is.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: What about the pipeline to Kalgoorlie?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What about it?

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That was good planning.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course it was. I do not see what the pipe line to Kalgoorlie has to do with the Chevron Hotel except that—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —if I did not know the honourable member to be a teetotaller I would think he was thinking of pipelines anyway.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: A wise old man planned that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In conclusion, I hope this Bill will pass—I think it will judging from the remarks that have been made—as I feel sure it is a move in the right direction.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.51]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

A high number of puerperal deaths in 1937 at a private maternity institution in Perth, together with the State's high maternal mortality figures around about that time, prompted the introduction of legislation providing for inquiry, on a magisterial basis, into every death occasioned by pregnancy or childbirth. The resultant legislation may be found under section 336 of the Health Act.

The substance of the legislation passed is that a magistrate, together with a representative nominated by the British Medical Association and a representative of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association, decides whether an inquiry is necessary before proceeding with it. Such an inquiry, when conducted, was equivalent to a coroner's inquiry, but the magistrate was required to submit his findings to the Minister for Health. The basis of the inquiry was to establish whether there was any negligence in relation to the death of the deceased woman.

Though the measure was described within a few months of the passing of the legislation by the B.M.A. representative as "futile in a very large majority of cases," such inquiries have been carried out over the past twenty-two years. The legislation now being brought down provides—as an alternative to a magisterial inquiry—for an investigation by an investigator, namely, the obstetrician duly appointed, who will carry out a completely confidential inquiry, the results of which may not be divulged to any but the chairman of the Maternal Mortality Committee. Further, it is provided that the chairman may not divulge such information to any other member of the committee except for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the proposed new part 13A of the Act.

Several good reasons have led to the decision to scrap the old order. Some members of the medical and nursing professions make the point that the work of

the obstetrician and the midwife is being made the subject of unfair discrimination with the prospect of a magisterial inquiry continually hanging over their heads. This point is well made because, in all cases where there is reason to suspect criminal negligence, a magistrate or coroner still has all the rights of investigation he has for other unnatural deaths.

The State Health Council gave special consideration to the matter of maternal deaths in June, 1958, as the result of which a sub-committee consisting of Professor Gordon King and Dr. D. Snow was appointed to study the adequacy of section 336. The sub-committee found that the retention of some form of inquiry into each maternal death was desirable. It considered, however, that the purpose of the inquiry should be educative rather than punitive. It was of opinion that the inquiry should be more detailed and more technical than that carried out under the existing section.

The sub-committee consequently recommended that section 336 of the Health Act be repealed. Since that time, Dr. Snow, having been abroad, was asked to visit Minneapolis with a view to reporting upon a system of inquiry which has been found very satisfactory in Minnesota. The measure now before the House stems from his report, and the findings of the 1958 sub-committee; and, consequently, the Maternal Mortality Committee to be constituted will work in a somewhat similar manner to that operating so satisfactorily in Minnesota. The maternal death-rate there is one of the lowest in the world.

The following is an extract from a report on maternal mortality in Western Australia presented to the Maternal and Infant Health Committee of the State Health Council on the 14th April, 1953:—

The operation of section 336 has been accompanied by a reduction in the maternal mortality rate; whereas in 1937 it was 4.18 per one thousand live births, in 1951 it was 1.08 (provisional). Whether and to what extent magisterial enquiry has contributed to this reduction are debatable questions. The advent of the sulpho-namides and penicillin, increased hospital and other facilities, and an improvement in the quality of obstetric care independent of the enquiry, are factors which were probably much more effective in attaining the reduction than the enquiry itself.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Those figures are a great tribute to our professional people.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They are. The report went on to say:—

One can look back upon section 336, therefore, with mixed feelings.

The old order has been given a very fair trial, and, from the experience of the past, it is expected that the new proposals will be much more satisfactory.

On motion by the Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned till Tuesday, the 27th September.

MARKETING OF ONIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.57]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is purely a machinery measure, but a very important one. Section 17 of the principal Act refers to the keeping of accounts and their auditing by the Auditor-General. Section 19 of the Act empowers the Government to make certain regulations.

Members will be interested to know that in 1945, a Bill was passed through all stages, for the insertion of a new paragraph (c) to subsection 2 of section 17 of the Act. The Bill was, in fact, intended to be an addition of such a paragraph to section 19, as it introduced the right to make regulations concerning the quality and standard of onions. The fact that the paragraph was written into the wrong section of the Act was not noticed over all the years for the reason that the authority given to make these regulations stood as a section in its own right; and, incidentally, any cross-reference did not refer to the section itself, but to other sections of the Act.

The necessity to rectify the matter was brought to a head when the Act came up for reprint, and it is considered most desirable and necessary that the matter be attended to. Clause 2 of the Bill will effect the necessary amendment which back-dates to the 9th January, 1946, the date of assent of the amending Act No. 13 of 1945.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.59]: We, on this side, have no intention at all of holding up this measure. If it were a case of such a matter being dealt with by a committee of the House, it could almost be considered as a typographical error; one of those elicited through the years, and one which could be a veritable nuisance if not corrected. It is simply because the section has not been used that the figure has not caused embarrassment in the past. We have no objection at all to the Bill passing in this form.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

STATE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Housing) [6.0]: I move

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for the amendment of the "eligibility income" provisions of the principal Act as a consequence of the margins decision as it affected the basic wage. The eligibility income figure was set by the principal Act in 1946 at a nominal figure of £500. In the matter of adjusting this figure over the years in accordance with basic wage increases, the £500 has been regarded as consisting of the basic wage in 1946, plus an arbitrary figure of £369.

The principle of applying basic wage increases to this nominal figure was recognised by Act No. 27 of 1950, when the figure of £500 was increased to £750; and in the following year the Act was further amended by Act No. 52 of 1951 to provide that such marginal increases should become automatic. This principle is preserved in the amending Bill now before the House.

In conformity with the principle of adjusting this income figure in accordance with basic wage rises, it is proposed it shall be adjusted also in accordance with the margins case determined by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court in mid-December, 1959, which increased most incomes by 22½ per cent. Through the incidence of this large margins increase, a number of applicants hitherto eligible ceased to be eligible. This Bill will reinstate their eligibility.

The Government considers that as the margins were granted by arbitration, the amount of the margins, namely £83, should be added to the eligibility figures in the same way as basic wage rises are automatically added. It will be seen at a glance that the figure of £1196 is made up of the basic wage of £744 per annum as at the 2nd May, 1960, plus the arbitrary margin of £369 set out in 1946, plus the over-all margins increase of £83. Beyond that, I think it is unnecessary for me to make any further explanation.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [6.3]: It would be unjust indeed if provision were not made in such a Bill to permit of eligibility increasing as basic wage and margins increase; otherwise it would be excluding people who heretofore were eligible, but because of an increase in salaries and margins became ineligible.

If we trace the history of this paragraph, it is interesting to observe that even in the original Act of 1911, the permissible income was £400—£400 when wages were

about 7s. or 8s. a day for skilled people; and when £400 was a lot of money! The figure of £400 is in the parent Act of 1911; and the rest of the paragraph is in the consolidated Act of 1946. The proviso reads that an additional £25 for each child is permissible above the stated sum.

That position obtains today. So that this £1,196 may be added to by £25 for each child. I draw attention to the fact that that is the identical figure of 49 years ago; because £25 was then allowed for each child in addition to the then-stated sum of £400; and that figure has persisted as this section of the Act has been amended through the years. When the figure was altered to £500, £25 was allowed for each child; and when the levelling process took place and the amendment of 1946 made it £750, the £25 per child still remained. While it is not proposed to amend that figure, when we regard the present value of money and the attendant responsibility of parents to provide a home for a family, the ability to borrow a little more money means a great difference in the type of accommodation available for a family of two, three, or indeed more.

That is something worth looking at; and something which, I think, should be considered when this Act is next amended. There is a great responsibility in designing a home to suit a family consisting of a man, his wife, and, say, three children, to come within the scope of their ability to finance a home commensurate with their domestic needs. Therefore, if the figure of £25 permissible for each child was examined, we should give, additional to the marginal increase covered in this amendment, some added ability to borrow, which could only be to the good of the people concerned, in that better type of accommodation could be found. I support the Bill.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North) [6.8]: I quite support this Bill. But even with its further interpretation and extensions, it does leave the problem with which we have had to deal in the past at ministerial level. This concerns the case of a tradesman being situated temporarily in the North-West, who endeavours to purchase or rent a home for his family in the metropolitan area. I hope that this amending Bill will not exclude members from the right to place before the Minister the case of a tradesman who is employed in the North-West for a period of one, two, three, or five years, and have it dealt with on the basis that he is essentially a metropolitan dweller and will be returning to his former vocation in the metropolitan area within a short space of time.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Housing—in reply) [6.10]: I think the honourable member knows that in respect of the North-West—north of the

26th parallel—the Minister for Housing has discretion in the matter of income; and it is recognised—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Mr. Willesee is concerned about when a tradesman returns.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am coming to that. I would like the honourable member to know that as the Minister concerned, I am anxious to do all I can in these cases. But it is very difficult indeed to provide for everybody. Not only do we have the case of the man who goes from the south to the North temporarily, and comes back again; but we also have the reverse situation. I cite as an example a man who is employed in a country town as a policeman and who receives a transfer. The policy of the commission provides that one cannot transfer from one house to another unless one has been there for a certain amount of time—we adopt a period of two years. Our system is this: If we bring a man from a northern town, or an agricultural town, to Perth and say, "Because you have been away in a country area in the course of your employment, and you have now been transferred, we will give you another house in the metropolitan area," we are immediately obliged to give him preference over other people who have been anxiously waiting their turn on the metropolitan list. That is not easy.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is the Minister dealing with rentals or purchases?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This amendment pertains to purchases.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I mean, in the Minister's argument.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am making general comments regarding both purchase homes and Commonwealth rental homes. It must be borne in mind that the State Housing Commission builds very few State Housing Act homes in the North; they are all Commonwealth rental homes; and, again, the Minister has a fairly wide discretion and exercises it for the benefit of the people in the North. I have exercised that discretion, and so have other Ministers before me. I would like the honourable member to appreciate that this is not an easy matter. We find that a person is ready to receive the keys of a house, and somebody else is brought down—for reasons put forward by Mr. Willesee—and we find ourselves stepping over that person. It presents quite a problem.

I have endeavoured to arrange for some departments to have a limited number of houses in big towns, so that should a policeman, or a teacher, or anybody else in a Government department, be transferred, the transfer could be effective from house to house in order that the person moving into the city would not be without a house. I have endeavoured to do that to a limited extent.

The honourable member will remember the workmen's inspector at Port Hedland, whose case he submitted to me for what I may call preferential treatment because the man was living at Marble Bar. I had an interest in that case, since he happened to be one of my own men. But nevertheless, there is still a difficulty in dealing with such cases. I would say that whenever a member desires to make representation on behalf of a particular person, I will be pleased to look into the matter; and, in accordance with the policy I have adopted, I will investigate each individual case and assist wherever possible.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The only other comment I wish to make concerns a point raised by Mr. Wise about the £25 allowance for each child in the family. This provision has not been amended since the inception of the scheme, as the honourable member said, but I shall have a look at that provision.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [7.33]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members will be happy to know that this is a Bill which gives a concession. I might mention, before introducing it, that the Commonwealth Savings Bank is not subject to State stamp law, and is accordingly at liberty to make its own concessions to its customers. As members are aware, there is a State stamp duty of 3d. payable on each cheque drawn by a customer on a bank account. Friendly societies are, however, exempted from this tax on cheques drawn by them on accounts kept in Government savings banks.

There are, however, other exemptions operating, which are not provided for in the Act. These were brought about by the entry of banks other than the Commonwealth Savings Bank into the savings bank field. Under the Government's direction, these new savings banks were allowed to offer free cheque accounts to organisations of a charitable nature, and those of a community welfare, or patriotic character. These exceptions have not been validated in law.

The purpose of this Bill is to authorise the Commissioner of Stamps to certify particular organisations coming within several

groups as being exempt from payment of stamp duty on cheques. The Bill extends the concession also to cheques drawn on certain accounts kept in trading banks. It is understandable that the new savings banks should make some representations with a view to their being enabled to provide similar facilities for duty-free accounts, as the Commonwealth Savings Bank was in a position to make available to its customers. The Commonwealth Savings Bank concessions were very limited, however, before the other banks came into the same field of business. But from then on, the Commonwealth Savings Bank extended the scope of its concessions.

Following upon representations being made for an extension of exemptions to all organisations of a non-profit-making character, and a request by the trading banks for similar treatment, a survey of conditions existing in the other States of the Commonwealth was made. As a result, it was ascertained that the types of organisations enjoying this benefit were broadly those set out under paragraphs (a) to (d) of proposed new section 49A in clause 3 of the Bill. Some States permitted extensive exemptions, while in others they were very limited.

The proposals in the Bill do not go as far as to grant all the exemptions available through the Commonwealth Bank to all non-party organisations, which the savings banks were seeking; but agreement with the banks and the trading banks has been reached over the conference table, and the proposals now being submitted to this Chamber are acceptable to them.

While complete uniformity is desirable, the State considers it has gone as far as it can go in the matter of exemptions; and it is felt that any further steps in this direction would need to be taken by the Commonwealth Government. By listing the type of organisations and authorising the commissioner to certify a particular organisation as being eligible for the benefits, we have an assurance that upon written application being made, no existing organisation will be overlooked; and, at the same time, the grouping is such as to enable new organisations of the future to apply. The duty-free cheque books will be available at any bank upon presentation of the commissioner's certificate.

I commend this legislation to members as being an encouragement to worthy organisations. It ensures more uniform application of the concessions, and has the added benefit of free and open competition between banks, so that no matter where an organisation banks, the system will operate equitably as between the various banking institutions.

On motion by the Hon. W. F. Willesee, debate adjourned.

DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Section 19 repealed and re-enacted:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I have tried to amend the wording of the clause to make it more suitable. In accordance with paragraph (c) on page 3 of the Bill, a man, in order to obtain his dog, would have to pay a reasonable sum and produce his receipt for the registration of the dog. That apparently will apply to an area where there is no pound, but not to an area where there is a pound. I move an amendment—

Page 3—Delete paragraph (c) in lines 5 to 7.

If I am successful in this amendment, I shall then move to insert the amendment standing in my name on the notice paper.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I cannot understand why Dr. Hislop seeks to insert a proposed new subsection (5) instead of inserting another paragraph (c). It would be better to include his provision as paragraph (c).

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not mind, but I want to make certain that this provision will apply both to where there is a pound and to where there is not a pound. If it is put in as paragraph (c), it might apply only to instances where there is no pound.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is the idea; the two are supposed to be separate.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not mind where it is put. The owner would surely have to pay the registration if he took the dog from the pound or from the place where there was no pound. I intend to move my next amendment as a new subsection in order to cover both instances.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Where there is a pound, the local authority can gazette by-laws which would not cover the situation where there is no pound; and the provision here is to apply where there is no pound. That is where Dr. Hislop may be confusing the points at issue.

At the moment I will accept the amendment as it stands, but I will get the draftsman to have a look at it; and if the Bill needs to be recommitted, I will have it recommitted.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

Page 3—Add after subsection (4) in lines 11 to 14 the following new subsection:—

(5) In all cases where a dog seized under this section is returned to its owner the owner shall

produce the registration of the dog or pay the fee for the registration of the dog before resuming possession of the dog.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 put and passed.

Clause 6—Section 29A added:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

Page 4—Delete all words after the word "be" in line 17 down to and including the word "disease" in line 19 and substitute the following:—

examined by a registered veterinary surgeon and isolated or destroyed in such manner as the veterinary officer may require.

The wording of the clause leaves the question of the diagnosis of the dog's condition—that is, whether it is suffering from an infectious or contagious disease—to the owner. Therefore, we are throwing a lot on the owner to decide whether it is in an infected condition; and, finally, to decide whether it shall be placed in isolation or destroyed. It would be better if we provided that any dog suffering from an infectious or contagious disease must be examined by a veterinary officer and isolated or destroyed in such manner as the veterinary officer might decide.

These dog diseases can be dangerous to human beings. I can recall that we had a red setter that became very well-known to the people of the City of Perth. As a result, she was given by her many friends many titbits, in the form of cakes and other delicacies; and she even got to the stage of entering Foy & Gibson's store to enjoy a meal of any cakes that were dropped on the floor by the customers.

After a while, we were forced to give the dog away to people who lived in Rockingham; and because of the change in diet and district the dog developed a skin disease. We were advised by a veterinary officer that it was contagious and impossible to control, and therefore the dog would have to be destroyed.

Where a common informer makes a complaint that a dog is not being isolated, it is leaving a lot to the justice of the peace to ask him to decide that it should be destroyed. In my opinion he should do that following advice received from a veterinary officer.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Who would pay the veterinary officer's fees?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In both cases it would be the owner because he would be the one who would have to call in a veterinary officer. I take it, therefore, that the justice of the peace would rule that the fees of the veterinary officer would have to be met by the owner. A veterinary officer might be asked, firstly,

to diagnose a certain condition in the dog; and then, subsequently, to destroy the animal. Therefore the owner would be responsible for the fee of that officer in each case.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The amendment is very sound. But what will happen in those towns where there is no veterinary officer? Even in a town the size of Bunbury veterinary officers are extremely hard to find. Those that are there are extremely busy, even with general work; and in many other sizable towns there is no such person as a veterinary officer. If the amendment were agreed to and became law, and there were no veterinary officer available, it would probably absolve the owner from all responsibility.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: People in small towns would have to travel hundreds of miles to obtain the services of a veterinary officer.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: What the honourable member has said is quite true; and that would present some difficulty, if the amendment were passed.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I support the amendment; and to overcome the problem raised by Mr. MacKinnon, I would point out that in many parts of the State medical practitioners perform the work of veterinary officers. Therefore, perhaps Mr. MacKinnon's problem could be met by a certificate being issued by a medical practitioner.

I am perturbed about infected and contagious animals. On the goldfields there would be, I suppose, about one hound to every individual. It is impossible to find anyone who will agree to be appointed as the dog catcher, or even to police the Act. One woman that I know of owns three dogs, and she enters the various stores in the town with two trotting at her heels and one under her arm.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I hope the honourable member is going to connect his remarks to the amendment.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman; that is what I am coming to. If one of those dogs has not got a skin disease, I will be very surprised. However, there is no person on the goldfields to check whether any dog is suffering from an infectious or contagious disease. I do not know what the local governing authorities are going to do about this problem, because it is extremely difficult to get anyone to police the Dog Act. On the goldfields we have even offered additional pay and bonuses to anyone who will perform the duty; but, to date, we have been unsuccessful in appointing anyone. I support the amendment.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I wonder whether the Committee would agree to the addition of the words, "or in his absence a medical practitioner or justice of the

peace" after the words "veterinary surgeon" in the second line of the amendment. That would provide three persons to whom an owner could appeal.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The honourable member has referred to a "veterinary surgeon" in the first part of his amendment, and to a "veterinary officer" in the second part of it. Perhaps it would be better if he were to make the wording uniform.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Very well. I could make the amendment read, "after the word 'veterinary' add the words 'officer or in his absence a medical practitioner or justice of the peace'."

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I think perhaps the honourable member should first seek leave of the Committee to alter his amendment.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I formally seek leave to alter my amendment by deleting the word "surgeon" in the second line and substituting the words "officer or in his absence a medical practitioner or justice of the peace," and deleting the words "veterinary officer" in the fourth line and substituting the words "that official."

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: My amendment, as altered, now reads as follows:—

examined by a registered veterinary officer or in his absence a medical practitioner or justice of the peace and isolated or destroyed in such manner as that official may require.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Although I agree to the amendment, we should take some cognisance of the duties which may be delegated to health officers by the district medical officer. In many towns the medical officer is a very busy person and there is need to engage a health officer. Several towns in my province appoint a medical officer as well as a health inspector. In considering the amendment, we should recognise the right of the medical officer to delegate some of his duties to the health inspector.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In view of those remarks I ask leave of the Committee to again alter my amendment by deleting the words "justice of the peace" and substituting the words "health inspector."

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: My amendment, as further altered, now reads as follows:—

examined by a registered veterinary officer or in his absence a medical practitioner or health inspector and isolated or destroyed in such manner as that official may require.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I notice the term "veterinary surgeon" was used in the amendment, and now it is to be replaced by the term "veterinary officer." I want to inquire of the Minister which of the two terms is the more embracing.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I cannot answer that question. Formerly this type of practitioner was known as a veterinarian, and he was termed a veterinary officer in our legislation. The term "veterinary surgeon" was used for the first time in the Bill. In recent years it has been the practice of veterinarians to call themselves veterinary surgeons. I think the term "veterinary officer" will cover the situation more adequately than the term "veterinary surgeon."

Amendment, as altered, put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

Page 4—Delete all words after the word "disease" in line 24 down to and including the word "disease" in line 29, and substitute the following:—

the Justice may on the advice of a registered veterinary officer, medical practitioner, or health inspector order the dog to be destroyed and the carcass disposed of by the owner in such manner as that official may require.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 8—Third Schedule amended:

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I have four amendments on the notice paper dealing with clause 8. As they are all related, I wish to deal with the four at the same time.

The principal object of the registration fee is to restrict the number of dogs. The method to restrict the number is to compel the owners of dogs to register them and pay a fee for such registration. Admittedly that fee includes the costs incurred by the local authority for registration. The aim of registration is to restrict the number of dogs.

By increasing the registration fee from 7s. 6d. to 10s. for a dog, and from 10s. to £1 1s. for a bitch, as proposed in the Bill, we will not be going far enough in our efforts to restrict the number of dogs, of which there are large numbers wandering around the metropolitan area. In the main they were taken in as pets while they were pups; later, when they grew up, they were thrown on to the street. Those animals bred freely, with the result that the dog population in the metropolitan area has increased to such an extent that they have become a menace to motorists, children, and other people.

We should make the registration fee very high for an entire animal. Owners who think highly enough of their animals

will readily pay that high fee in order to keep them intact. To enable owners to retain animals purely as pets—as distinct from those retained for breeding purposes—I propose in my last amendment that the registration fee for sterilised dogs shall be 5s. instead of 10s. I am fully aware that in the parent Act, section 21 provides that if any slut is at large in any street, road, or public place whilst on heat the owner shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £5. However, unfortunately at present, because most modern homes do not have any front fences, it is extremely difficult for owners to keep their pets locked up during that period. I feel that there are many instances where breaches have been committed but not because of negligence on the part of the owners. However, if the pets had been sterilised when they were younger, such breaches would have been avoided.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that under the parent Act, any working dog may be registered at half fee; and I realise that it is necessary for a working dog to be entire because a sterilised animal is of not nearly the same calibre as an entire animal. Such a working dog may be registered for £1 while the fee for a working bitch is £2 10s. I do not believe that those amounts are excessive and I therefore move an amendment—

Page 5, line 6—Delete the figures “0 10 0” with a view to substituting the figures “2 0 0”.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I oppose this amendment. I agree with Dr. Hislop's belief that dogs are part and parcel of the humanitarian education of children. There are many homes in which a mongrel pup grows up side by side with children and in a great number of these cases the owners would not be able to afford an increased amount for the registration of their pets. I am thinking at the moment of instances where I have seen three or four children running along with a dog at their side. The dog is such a companion that it almost seems he is laughing with the children. If we institute too much of this type of legislation we will destroy that situation which is to be applauded so much.

I have not a great deal of time for the Pomeranian which goes down the street followed by a highly scented lady who holds it on leash. I do not care how much she has to pay for her animal; but I do have a great appreciation for the type of animal which I have in my own home. This animal has grown up with one of my youngest children for the last ten years. If necessary I would pay more for that animal than I do now. However, I am sure there was a time when the license was worth more than the animal; but his affection for us has continued to grow, and the things he has done within the precincts of my home could not be measured in money. It is for these reasons that I feel

we should bear in mind the association these dogs have with children. They have an effect on them which can only be gained from the affection of a dog.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: I cannot for the life of me see why this amendment should be accepted. We already have adequate provision in the Bill, the fee being 10s. for a dog and £1 ls. for a bitch. I am quite sure that any local authority will find that the money gained from these charges is sufficient for it to engage an inspector to control unwanted dogs. Mr. Mattiske's amendment is unrealistic and would be an imposition on our community. I am therefore very much opposed to it.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I, too, am opposed to this amendment. I feel that we have to consider more than the individual dog. Although Mr. Mattiske has pointed out that under the parent Act a working dog can be registered at half the full fee, I think that we should remember those who have large sheep properties for which they have 20 or 30 dogs. It can be imagined how much they would have to pay for the registration of those animals.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: I am opposed to Mr. Mattiske's amendment. After listening to his interesting discourse the other evening on the habits of his own dog and then listening to him tonight, I have come to the conclusion that his animal must have been run over during last weekend. He gives as his reason for an increase in the fees that the excessive number of dogs on the street will be reduced. I have in mind the many working-class people in the metropolitan area who, although they will not be able to afford the increased fee, will not possess the courage to do away with the family pet. They will, therefore, take him some miles away to dump him and just trust that he does not have the characteristics of a bloodhound. Others who will be able to steel themselves to do so will wait until the children are in bed and will then take the family pet down to the woodshed and bash its brains out, or something of that sort.

I believe that the fees are steep enough as it is. After all, most dogs are family pets and in many instances are as well looked after as the human members of the household. The problem of stray dogs will not be solved by increasing the registration fees to the extent proposed in this amendment.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I most certainly will oppose this amendment. I am surprised at the honourable member because I did give him credit for much more mentality than he appears to have exhibited on this occasion. He obviously does not have any knowledge of the feelings of the general community in regard to this matter. There are a number of people throughout the State who breed

dogs for show purposes; and during the week two people rang me up and asked me to tell Parliament that no dog is allowed to be shown on the bench if it has been sterilised and therefore no person who desires to breed dogs for show purposes will be able to have them sterilised. One of these people, who, incidentally lives in the portion of South Perth which is in my province, stated that as far as he was concerned he would, under the Bill, have to pay £7 to license his animals. If this amendment were carried he would have to pay at least £24 more.

There are a number of aged people who engage in small businesses and keep a pet on the premises. Again I can quote two businesses in Beaufort Street the owners of which—who incidentally are not of my political faith—were going to deal out I don't know what to Mr. Cunningham because they thought it was he who suggested the fee of £5 for the female. This amendment is out of all proportion. Let those of us who originally spoke against the increases—and I am one of them—be prepared to accept that the increases to 10s. and £1 1s. are necessary to permit road boards and municipalities to employ a man to control the dog nuisance; but let us be fair and say that the fees as set out in the Bill are sufficient.

Point of Order

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think it would be appropriate if I asked you, Sir, whether you think this amendment is in order. Do you not think that it is amending a charge?

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): As a matter of fact, I have been giving this matter some consideration and I believe that it is out of order. Section 46 (3) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act states that the Legislative Council may not amend any Bill so as to increase any proposed charge or burden on the people. I therefore have no hesitation in ruling that the amendment is out of order and consequently it cannot be dealt with.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: You allowed them a good discussion anyway.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I have been waiting for someone to raise the question.

Points of Order

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: In view of your ruling, how is it that the previous amendment was proceeded with? Surely that is raising the charge also by increasing the number of people who are to destroy diseased dogs. Surely the people will have to pay for that destruction?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In view of your ruling, I would like to raise a further point of order. This Bill has been introduced into this House; but does it not also propose an increased charge upon the people? In my opinion, it, too, is out of order.

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The honourable member will find that point is covered by section 46 (1) which states—

Bills appropriating revenue or moneys or imposing taxation, shall not originate in the Legislative Council; but a Bill shall not be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys, or to impose taxation, by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties, or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses, or fees for registration or other services under the Bill.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: That applies to the amendment also.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I take it that the amendment is covered by section 46 (3) which specifically states that the Legislative Council may not amend any Bill so as to increase any proposed charge or burden on the people.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would suggest, with respect, that the two questions stand or fall together; and I think it is hard to say that the Bill is in order but the amendment is not.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Bill has been introduced in this Chamber because, according to the advice received, it did not require a Message. However, any attempt by the Legislative Council to amend the charge intended by the Bill would be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I have already ruled the amendment out of order. I am prepared to proceed with the further amendments.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: As I have been the cause of disturbances previously in moving to disagree with President's and Chairman's rulings, I was patiently waiting for someone else to do it this time. However, I entirely agree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I would like to ask Mr. Mattiske whether he intends to proceed with any of the other amendments.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: No; they are all tied up. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The amendments I have on the notice paper might appear to affect only the fees to be charged for licenses; but it is the reason for the

reduction of the fees which I wish to stress. With my amendments I am endeavouring to ensure that within a few years much of the menace of unwanted dogs will disappear from our streets; and instead of neglected mongrels roaming the streets there will be fewer dogs, and certainly no unwanted animals. A sterilised animal is a better and more affectionate pet, and no less effective as a watchdog; in addition, it has cleaner habits. Let the breeders breed the dogs for purchase and let us get rid of the thousands of unwanted dogs in our community.

Mr. Bennetts said there are millions of dogs on the goldfields. I doubt that; but he said there is one for every person, and that is bad enough. I was struck by the remarks of Mr. Mattiske the other evening when he said that a dog catcher in Scarborough caught 90 unregistered and unwanted dogs. Mr. Jones mentioned the dozens roaming in the vicinity of his home in Nedlands; and my amendment will do much to clean up this menace.

My proposal is that a dog should be sterilised prior to registration, which is prior to six months of age, when a token fee would be charged. If later on it was found necessary to increase the fee, and the public were used to this provision, I would have little objection to it. My amendment is that a fee of 2s. 6d. should be charged where a person registers a dog of either sex and the registration form is accompanied by a certificate signed by a registered veterinary surgeon, or a statutory declaration certifying that the dog has been effectively sterilised.

I made inquiries of the Chief Veterinary Officer of the State before framing this amendment to ensure that this proposal would not affect household dogs. I was told that the reverse was the case; that a sterilised dog is cleaner of habit; at least as affectionate, although it has a tendency to get fat and its diet must be more strictly watched; and that really it is a better animal for a child's pet.

People who need dogs to work for special purposes, can register them as entire dogs; and the same applies to breeding dogs. I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 8—Delete the word "bitch" and substitute the words "dog of either sex."

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I appreciate Mr. Wise's approach to the problem; but I think the fee of 2s. 6d. is a little too low. The local authority has to do a certain amount of work in the registration of dogs, whether those dogs have been sterilised or not. It has to make out a certificate of registration; keep a list—arranged in alphabetical order—of the names of all persons who register dogs in the current year; send the list—and any alterations or fresh registrations made during the year—to the local police station. In addition, the local authority has to supply a disc.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: The local authorities always lose on the discs.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think the fee of 2s. 6d. is too low; and if Mr. Wise is prepared to accept 5s., I will agree to it.

The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am prepared to support the amendment moved by Mr. Wise, because it will go a long way towards helping to get rid of the stray mongrels that are wandering around the streets at present. But there is one feature which should be mentioned. The metropolitan area may be well served with veterinary surgeons; but people in country areas would be faced with terrific charges in sending their dogs away to be sterilised if no veterinary officer were available in the local town. Only last week someone in Kalgoorlie wanted to send his dog to Perth to be sterilised; and the charge was something in the vicinity of £10, simply for transporting a dog to and from Kalgoorlie by train and boarding the animal for the period involved. Also, I think the fee of 2s. 6d. is a little too low, because the local authorities have to do a certain amount of work in connection with the registration of dogs.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I must support the amendment because it is on all fours with what I proposed a few moments ago, except that I intended to make the fees more restrictive. However, I must make reference to the words used by Mr. Lavery just now when speaking to my amendment. Had I used such strong language against him, as he used against me, I am sure he would have taken umbrage; and I am sorry to have heard him use such words when referring to me.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: There was no personal offence meant. I am sorry.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I hope the honourable member will be more careful in his choice of words in future. I agree with the Minister that a fee of 2s. 6d. for a sterilised animal would not cover the local authority's costs; therefore, I think the fee should probably be 5s., which would still give effect to what Mr. Wise wants.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: While appreciating what Mr. Wise intends to do, I support Mr. Cunningham's remarks. Even in the metropolitan area the cost of sterilising a dog is about £3 10s. to £5 5s.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think this amendment could be of benefit to many areas, and would help in the control of dogs. I know of local authorities in the metropolitan area that are only too ready to accept license fees, and to canvass areas to collect those fees; but they give no service in return. Therefore I think Mr. Wise's amendment could have the desired effect.

The point has been raised that a local authority could, for the sum of 2s. 6d., effectively discharge its duties. Dogs do

not wear out the roads, but push bicycles do; and the cost of a license to the owner of such a bicycle is 2s.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You will burn your fingers on that one.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It must be remembered that for the 2s., a plate, plus a document in triplicate, is issued. So a simple receipt issued in Fremantle plus a very small medal will adequately be covered by the 2s. 6d.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: My object in having a fee of 2s. 6d. is to give as much inducement as possible; but not to be effective for some time; because a generation of dogs will pass before this will be effective. It is essential to make a beginning in some way in a manner not compulsory. If professional men charge £3 3s. or £5 5s. for this service, it is extortionate; and I am sure some of the practical men on this side of the House will agree with me. Hundreds of thousands of animals of other kinds are treated in this manner annually.

The Hon. A. P. Griffith: For a different purpose.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: And for a different reason; and some of them are more difficult to attend to than dogs. This matter will adjust itself in the minor fee to be charged, and spread over a period. Let us suppose a dog lives five or six years as a pet of a household, and the registration fee is 5s. a year. That will be 30s. for six years. In the other case the same animal will cost over £3. The margin is in favour of the owner in all cases. That is why I am approaching this without any suggestion of compulsion and, at the same time, trying to apply a curative measure which will have a marked effect on the well-being and health of our community in a few years time. I am not wedded to the 2s. 6d.; and if there is to be any loss to the local governing body, I am prepared to move that the amount be 5s.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I now agree with Mr. Wise. When I was a member of a local governing body, the fees we collected for dogs were not nearly enough to help us carry out our duties; particularly when one considers the necessity to employ a dog catcher. This will help to keep the number of animals down, and will also overcome the question of high fees being charged on the goldfields and in country towns. You know as well as I do, Mr. Chairman, that there are men on the goldfields who are capable of carrying out this job even though they are not veterinarians. I support Mr. Wise's amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: For the information of members, I have a list of collections in each municipality of the State.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: That does not convey anything. There is nobody to collect them.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The revenue of the Kalgoorlie Road Board was £60 10s.; although some of the local authorities in the metropolitan area had a higher revenue, while others collected only 17s. 6d. I think we all accept Mr. Wise's approach in principle. As he said, it will not take effect today, but in a few years time. Anybody who charges £3 3s. for this service is nothing but a gangster. The amendment will result in the job being done more cheaply. Now that Mr. Wise has accepted my compromise of 5s., I agree with his amendment.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I would like to draw attention to the words to be substituted. In the parent Act a dog is defined as a dog of either sex of three months. I think the words, "dog of either sex," in the amendment are redundant.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I would like to keep it clear.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 11—Insert after the word "surgeon" the words "or a statutory declaration."

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Does this mean we can obtain any person to do the job?

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

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That answers the query.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Does this mean that people must go to a veterinary surgeon to have a dog treated? I know that a number of questions are going to be asked about this in my electorate.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: As I endeavoured to explain earlier, the amendment is designed for two reasons, the second of which is to avoid any compulsion whatever. It is a matter of voluntary action on the part of the owners. Whether they come within the prescribed minimum; or whether in what they do they render another service to the community in assisting to get rid of unwanted and neglected animals, they are not having any charge imposed except by their own decision. If a statutory declaration is available at the time of registration it is on all fours with a veterinary certificate that such-and-such is the case.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I agree with the amendment. But will it not be necessary to put in the words, "competent person"? And who will make the statutory declaration?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The person who owns the animal; before a justice of the peace.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise, clause further amended as follows:—

Page 5:

Line 12—Delete the word "bitch" and substitute the words "dog of either sex."

Line 14—Delete the word "ten" and substitute the word "five."

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In view of the changes that have already been made in clauses 3 and 6 where the word "surgeon" was altered to the word "officer," would you, Mr. Chairman, consider that the word "officer" should appear in this clause?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Despite the assurance of the Minister, the word "officer" has a connotation that he is a Government appointed veterinary officer, whereas a veterinary surgeon is more specific.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): Under Standing Orders I cannot go back to any of the amendments which have already been passed by the Committee. The Bill would have to be re-committed for that purpose at a later stage.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would like to ask the Minister whether paragraph (b) of the schedule in clause 8 is a new departure in regard to the owners of kennels.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, it is. Where a person owns three dogs—say, two bitches and a male—it would be cheaper for that person to register each single dog and not register as a kennel; but where a person is breeding dogs, probably £5 for the kennel would be cheaper. I do not know how to meet cases in between, but the provision has been asked for by local authorities.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I was not present when clause 5 passed through the Committee as I was absent on business. It is my desire to re-commit this Bill for the purpose of considering clause 5 (c) which pertains to the denying of aborigines having a free license to keep a dog.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The Bill cannot be re-committed until the next sitting.

New clause 3:

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Insert the following to stand as clause 3:—

3. Section ten of the principal Act is repealed and re-enacted as follows:—

10. (1) Every registration shall be in force from the day upon which it is made until the Thirtieth day of June next ensuing and no

longer and shall be again made in like manner from year to year.

(2) Every registration made within twenty-one days of the First day of July in any year shall be deemed to have been made on that day.

When the Bill was printed it came to me for consideration, and I made a quick check through the principal Act. I found that section 10 was amended in 1923 for a specific purpose, and part of this section does not now apply. I thought that while we were amending the Act we might as well bring it up to date.

New clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading

Order of the Day read for the resumption of debate from the 20th September.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair: The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Today I received from Wittenoom a letter which has a great bearing upon this legislation. During my second reading speech I mentioned that the Bill would not cover the northern half of the State; and it will not unless the Minister declares that the junior high schools at Derby and Carnarvon shall come within the ambit of the proposed Act. It is my intention to move an amendment to include primary schools in remote areas in the scope of the Bill.

The letter I received from Wittenoom was from a father who sent his child to board at Geraldton so that that child could attend the school at that town and obtain the required education. The father mentioned in the letter that he would like me to protest to the Minister for Education about the conditions at this particular boarding-house. It is Coulston House, 130 Augusta Street, Geraldton. He says it is not fit for students; and he mentions girls in particular. He says that the food is bad; that the ablution facilities are insufficient; and that in one case two girls are sleeping in a three-quarter bed. I mention this case because it has quite a lot to do with the intention of the proposed legislation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 17—Add after the word "school" the words "or in a primary school."

I move this amendment in order to achieve my objective of including primary schools within the scope of this Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry I cannot agree with the amendment put forward by Mr. Strickland. I think his amendment is outside the scope of the Bill. But I am not going to take objection to it on that point, because I believe his amendment is well intended. It must be appreciated that this is a piece of—I will not say trial, but commencing—legislation to try to overcome difficulties in country areas in respect to high schools; and the term "high schools" under the Bill includes junior high schools.

I have consulted with my colleague, the Minister for Education, and I am informed that it is not possible at the moment to go so far as to include primary schools, because the amount of money available is insufficient to do so; but the setting up of the Country High Schools Hostels Authority is a start.

I appreciate the good intention of the honourable member's amendment, but for the time being the Education Department cannot see its way clear to go beyond the scope provided in the Bill; and that means any high school within the State—and the term includes any junior high schools within the State.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am very sorry the Minister takes that particular attitude towards this amendment. I know it is not the Minister's department, and that the Minister is required to carry out any instructions from the Minister for Education in relation to this matter. But I cannot agree with him that the definition of "high schools" brings junior high schools within the scope of the Bill—not directly, because it says—and I quote as follows:—

... any junior high school established or maintained as a junior high school under the Education Act and so situated which the Minister declares to be a high school ...

My amendment will add to that, "a primary school which the Minister declares to be a primary school for the purposes of the Act." So that if the Minister had insufficient money to establish, take over, or authorise this authority to supervise a hostel, he need not declare the junior high school hostel or the primary school hostel to come within the scope of this Act. I understand that when introducing the Bill in another place, the Minister said definitely he did not propose to bring junior high schools within the scope of the Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He said for the time being.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: That is so. If we add primary schools in remote areas—in my opinion they are most necessary for the children in those areas—I cannot see that they would be any more difficult to administer and finance than will be the requirement under the present proposal. It is intended to provide this authority with £100,000 a year in order to administer these hostels. Surely £100,000 is a lot of money, and can be made to go a long way. I think that first things should come first and that younger children, living under conditions which I described here earlier—two in a three-quarter bed, and so on, from families 400, 500, 600, and 1,000 miles distant from Geraldton—should be enabled at least to finish their primary education. Surely the Government will give this matter a little more thought, and make some provision for those unfortunate parents whose children cannot obtain the required standard of schooling in their particular areas, or towns, in the remote parts of the State.

I hope the Minister will give this matter a second thought, because it is urgent and much desired by people not only in the North Province, but people on this East-West road about which we hear so much.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: And on the Commonwealth Railways.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: My proposed amendment would deal only with those cases of which the Minister approves. Surely there is nothing wrong with that?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: One would think that the Leader of the Opposition had originated this idea. We have gone on for years in this State without any provision of this nature being made.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I do not claim to have originated it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The way Mr. Strickland is talking about it, one would think he had. We have the Minister for Education, because of the situation which he knows exists in country areas, trying to make a start towards alleviating the problem. He desires to make a start in connection with high schools. I do not take instructions from the Minister for Education—I take advice from him; and the advice I got during the dinner hour was that at this time it is not practicable for the Education Department to take the scheme beyond the point at which the Minister hopes to make a start. I quote the Minister's words as follows:—

While I would say there is no present intention of declaring any such place or town in which a hostel will be required for junior high schools, with the possible exception of Carnarvon, nevertheless it is desirable that

the term "high school" should include the term "junior high school" where such a declaration is made by the Minister who is in office for the time being.

The Minister says that in getting this £100,000, and in making a start on the problem, he feels that is as far as he can go at the present time.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He has still got to get the £100,000.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so. I appreciate the well-intentioned move by Mr. Strickland, but it is not possible. However, the Minister did instance to me, during the dinner hour, the case of Hall's Creek. He said to me, "You may tell Mr. Strickland that wherever possible something will be done, as in the case of Hall's Creek."

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What is the position at Hall's Creek?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member would know the position there better than I, but I understand there is some provision there.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is a hostel at Hall's Creek at the present time.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, for primary children. But the Minister cannot take it as a general practice to apply the term "junior high school" throughout the State. The amount of money available would not scratch the surface of the problem. If the House will accept the Bill in its commencing stages, perhaps later on other improvements could be made. But the Minister cannot see his way clear at the present time to accept any further impact on the scheme; and I feel that if we did send this proposition to the other House—and of course it is quite competent for this House to do so—the Minister would decline the suggestion there.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I regret that the Minister is so sensitive or touchy on the matter—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am not, really.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: —of what he accepts as criticism, but which is merely the stating quite fairly of the case of those very much in need of assistance in this connection. The honourable Mr. Strickland made no claim to originating this idea; he simply endeavoured to give those underprivileged people—the parents and the children—the same equality of education as will apply, if this Bill is passed, to people in the southern part of the State.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I appreciate that.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If we are to deal with first things first in this matter, and are to deal, in the Minister's own words, on the basis of need, there is no

doubt whatever that the fundamental basis of need is the primary education of children in remote areas. The mothers of those children, wherever possible, have the responsibility of supervising the teaching of their children by correspondence lessons—

The Hon. G. Bennetts: And half of them are not qualified.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: —and of taking their children as far as they possibly can, with very limited opportunity in time and service, and with a visit bi-annually of an itinerant teacher to see how the teaching is progressing. We are endeavouring to make a special plea for those children who are more advanced in years, than those better privileged in the south where high schools are 50 or 60 miles apart. We are speaking of a range of country where the distance between schools is 500 miles, and where children are living 100, 200, and 300 miles from a primary school.

The cases are not many numerically, but they are, unfortunately, very important; and since the principle has been established, not only in the case of Hall's Creek, but also at other centres—and I include Derby—we hope that this principle is to be extended, and that within the scope of this Bill there will be the ability to cater for under-privileged children who cannot attend a primary school.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What is the position at Hall's Creek.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: A small hostel has been constructed in recent times for children of the desired age from remote stations, for the purpose of receiving primary education. That is the plea we make: not to spend this £100,000 to provide facilities or advances in an already-advanced part of the State where distances are very easy to overcome compared with other parts of the State. The objective of Mr. Strickland is simply, where practicable and at the discretion of the Minister, to have a hostel provided or subsidised through this authority to cater for children who would otherwise be 200 or 300 miles from a primary school.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The case put up by Mr. Strickland and Mr. Wise has considerable merit and must engage the sympathy of everyone. But I point out that there is a deal of difference between the conduct of a hostel for children under the age of twelve and the conduct of a hostel for those over the age of twelve. It is somewhat simpler to deal with the older children. The hostel idea has grown, and it will continue to grow; it is filling a definite need. The authority to be set up under the Bill will be able to call on people with some experience in the running of hostels for children attending secondary schools; but children attending primary schools range in age between five and twelve or thirteen years.

I have discussed the question with several people who are involved in this matter, and I agree with the Minister that we would be wise to accept the excellent forward step embodied in the Bill and allow the authority to become established before subjecting it to pressure for extension into a field in respect to which it cannot call on experienced people; with the possible exception of those at Hall's Creek.

The difficulties are real. It does not matter to a parent or to a child whether the distance is 50 miles or 500 miles, because in each case the homesickness and other problems are present. In conjunction with the Minister, I ask Mr. Strickland and Mr. Wise to accept the Bill as it is and allow the authority to become established and experienced before we seek to expand it.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I agree with Mr. Strickland. His area would be the most affected. Just fancy a woman in the heat of the North-West having to do her housework and attend to the children's correspondence lessons! I think something should be done for those people. Some years ago I was on a committee which tried to obtain the Maritana Hotel at Kalgoorlie for use as a hostel. It was suggested that we should raise some money and then ask the Government to contribute a certain amount, and the Lotteries Commission, too, and so get the hostel started; and if that were done, the Government could later take over the proposition.

Mr. MacKinnon said that the young children would present a more difficult problem than the high school children. I do not know that that is so. At least we know where the younger children are; and the responsibility of looking after them would not be as great as it is with the older children. Perhaps a hostel could be established somewhere in the North-West.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No-one has spoken in opposition to the measure; therefore we applaud it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are not going to oppose it, are you?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No. The amendment will add something to the measure which will be available for use when the time comes for it to become operative; otherwise next year, if it was opportune to act under the amendment, we would have to bring the Bill before the Chamber again. The country members should applaud the amendment; most of them can recall having seen children taking correspondence courses.

I cannot appreciate the difficulty raised by Mr. MacKinnon. I am connected with an orphanage where much the same problem as he mentioned has arisen. In the

remote areas, very little accommodation would be required; perhaps only eight to ten children would have to be accommodated. Cottage mothers could do the job; and perhaps a four or five-roomed house would be suitable.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: Unlike the previous speaker, I feel we could well afford to pass the Bill in its present state; and in due time we could make provision for the primary schools in the North-West.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You will be one of the beneficiaries at the moment, won't you?

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: If we agree to the amendment, the authority will become bogged down before it is able to do the job that the Minister for Education desires that it should do. I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Strickland's submissions, and I think the time will come—I hope it will not be far distant—when we can deal with his proposition. If we include the primary schools in the remote areas, I can imagine the pressure that will be put on the department.

It was stated that I will be an immediate beneficiary of this piece of legislation.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You were asked whether you would.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: Yes. Admittedly, as I said when speaking to the second reading of the Bill, the measure will be applicable to two places—particularly Narrogin—in my province. I do not see anything wrong with that. I do not know whether I am supposed to be embarrassed at being a beneficiary, but I am far from it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I fully appreciate the reasons which have actuated Mr. Strickland in moving the amendment. The points taken by Mr. MacKinnon were well made in respect to the difficulties in connection with accommodating young children as against accommodating children of junior high school age.

The question with which we are now dealing did arise during the course of the debate in the Legislative Assembly, and the Minister for Education said he appreciated the point of view; and that whilst he was not in a position to say that immediate consideration could be given to the request, if it were at all possible at a later stage, the scheme could be enlarged. He mentioned the project at Hall's Creek which is controlled by the Australian Inland Mission. Under this Bill there is no power for the Minister for Education to say, "You shall conduct a hostel for the Government," but the Country Women's Association, particularly, and some of the church organisations have asked for this legislation to be introduced in order that they might help to alleviate the problem.

I am not going to be placed in the position of having to divide the Committee on this question so that it can be said that it appears that, as a member of the Government, I am opposed to any assistance being given to children in primary schools in the country. This represents a start towards solving the problem, but the Minister cannot take it beyond that point which is governed by the amount of money available. Therefore, I ask the honourable member to accept the position for what it is worth; and I assure him that the Minister for Education is very conscious of the problem.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: No-one doubts the sympathy of the Minister and his consciousness of the problem, but that does not solve it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Neither will your amendment.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: My amendment will not solve the problem if the Minister for Education refuses to recognise what it is trying to achieve in regard to a real problem.

Both Mr. MacKinnon and the Minister seemed to place a great deal of reliance on their opinion that it is very difficult for children under the age of 12 and those over the age of 12 to be housed in one school hostel. Mr. MacKinnon said that those two groups could not mix in the one establishment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not say "mix."

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Well, the honourable member raised the point that they could not be catered for in the one hostel, and the Minister agreed with him.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No, I did not.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I said that Mr. MacKinnon raised a very important point—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The honourable member is not going to place words in my mouth.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —when he said that a problem would be created in conducting a hostel where there were children of primary school age and children of high-school age. Members know that every convent in the State houses children of such varying ages; and they have no difficulty at all. Therefore, that is not a valid objection. I do not think the reason put forward that there is a shortage of money in the Education vote should be accepted. The Minister has admitted that the most important education is primary education. The Government can find hundreds of thousands of pounds to spend on improvements to the facilities at Rott-nest, but now for this essential service to the community, it is limiting the amount to £100,000. That is the basis of the opposition the Minister is putting up against the proposal.

I am not worried about a vote being taken on this amendment. This Chamber is set up for the purpose of improving or rectifying legislation that is sent here from another place. Surely any member here is entitled to move amendments to effect better legislation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No-one has said you were not doing that.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister harps on the fact that the Government has not sufficient money to provide this necessary service, but on the other hand his Government glories in the expenditure it has approved for building golf links and providing tourist facilities at Rott-nest.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you think of a move like this when you were a member of the previous Government?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I thought of many moves such as this. I even established and subsidised hostels throughout the North at places such as Fitzroy Crossing, La Grange Bay, and many other places.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why do we need this Bill then?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Because it seeks to set up an authority to conduct and administer country high school hostels. As I explained earlier, a migrant father at Wittenoom has said that he has had to send his child to Geraldton because that is where the nearest boarding-house is situated. There are 15 teenage girls accommodated in that one house. If the Government is desirous of doing something for those parents who are forced to send their children to a hostel so that they may finish their education, why not make it open to all children? No parent would send his child away to a hostel if he had any other alternative. It is ridiculous to say that a hostel could not be conducted to house children of primary-school age and children of high-school age. I hope members will not be convinced by the argument of the Minister that there is not sufficient money to cater for primary school children. Money can be directed from other sources, and the vote could be enlarged in another place to meet the possible expenditure.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What schools are there at Geraldton? Is there a high school, a junior high school, and a primary school?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There are all types at Geraldton.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: The whole three classes?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes; There is a junior high school at Carnarvon and also at Derby. There is not a high school or a junior high school in the Murchison area.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Is there a junior high school and a high school at Carnarvon, and also both types of school at Derby?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes, there are both types at Derby. There is a primary school at Hall's Creek and also at Fitzroy Crossing. The mission conducts the school at Fitzroy Crossing. There is a primary school at Wittenoom, at which centre there is a population of possibly 1,200 at present. There is a school at Roebourne and one at Broome. Children also come from stations in those areas to be sent to the nearest centres. In the southern portion of the State a high school is established about every 50 or 60 miles. Children board in towns only 60 or 70 miles distant from their homes, with a bitumen road from the farm to the high school. Nothing like that can be found north of Geraldton. Some children in the North go to Queensland for their schooling. Children by the name of Quilton, go from Springfield Station to Townsville to be educated.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: They go there by choice I suppose?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is much closer for them to go to Townsville to board than it is for them to come to Perth.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Alice Springs is another centre to which children are sent.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes, children are sent from the Kimberleys to Alice Springs to be educated. Those children have to be sent out of the State because they cannot find board within the State at a centre which is within reasonable distance of their homes. I cannot see why the department should object to the housing of primary school children in these hostels. Schooling is compulsory. If parents do not send their children to school they are liable to a heavy punishment; and, in some cases, the children can be taken from them. The Government has here an opportunity to deal with this question in a broad sense; and yet it is going to confine the legislation to the people in the agricultural portions of the State, while those in the remote areas who really need to benefit from this legislation are to be denied this amenity.

The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am surprised at Mr. Strickland's remarks in stating that no complications would arise from housing children of primary school age and those of high school age in the one school hostel. He must know full well it is a well-established principle in the department that no hostel shall accommodate both primary and post-primary school children. I have just completed 12 months' research into the need for a hostel on the goldfields. Despite the size of the goldfields and the need for

greater educational facilities, from kindergarten to college standard, there is not a hostel for school children.

We had a building, suitable staff and the required number of children—the minimum is 30 before a hostel is able to pay its way—and it was examined by Mr. Bradshaw who recommended the Government to give consideration to our request.

Subsequently the Director of Education refuted every statement made by Mr. Bradshaw, and we lost the opportunity of obtaining a building for the establishment of a school hostel. Up to now the Education Department has had the say in these matters; that is whether an establishment is worthy of assistance by the Government. It is proposed by the Bill that the committee will have this say. Some organisation must be prepared to take over the running of a hostel when it is brought into existence. If we have to cater for primary school children as well as high school children we will require a building three times as large as the one which was available.

The problem of catering for school children at hostels is multiplied tenfold when primary school children are mixed with high school children. From the information which we received on the goldfields, we were satisfied that we would have to establish a hostel for either high school children or primary school children, but not one to cater for both.

The intention behind the amendment is good. When the time comes and the finance is available to implement what is sought in the amendment, I will be wholeheartedly in support of it, but at present the amendment is redundant. The number of expected applications for accommodation at any proposed hostel always seems to fall below the estimate. There was a great demand for a hostel in Derby. When the department made inquiries and obtained the details, after the matter was published in the newspapers, not one single application for accommodation at the hostel was received.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I oppose the amendment. The Minister for Education has given serious consideration to the provisions in the measure; and as was indicated by the Minister in this House, the Bill is in the nature of a start in providing hostels in country centres. The total amount of finance to be made available is £100,000. The Minister is well aware of the number of applications that are likely to be received, as well as the likely expenditure to be incurred.

If the amendment is agreed to, applications will be received from far and wide. The Minister in charge in order that no application might be rejected, would be encouraged to grant more assistance than he should in the first year of operation. The result is that available funds would be spread beyond a practical limit. Should

that position arise there would be insufficient money available for any particular hostel and the whole scheme could collapse.

We should accept this Bill in the nature of an experiment and see what happens after the first year. The Minister is very conscious of the necessity to increase the scope of the scheme to cover primary schools in the near future.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is necessary to consider the original reason for the introduction of this Bill. Over the years—even during the term of the McLarty-Watts Government and the succeeding Hawke Government—the Country Women's Association has requested the Government to establish high school hostels in certain country centres.

Considerable time and thought has been devoted to finding ways and means to meet that request. The reason why the request has not been implemented up to the present is the lack of finance. The reason which prevented the Government of which Mr. Strickland was a member from implementing this scheme was the lack of money; yet he said tonight that the Government had plenty of money available.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said it had plenty of money to spend on tourism at Rottneest.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Government has converted a loss of £5,000 into a profit of £5,000 as a result of such expenditure. The amount made available by this Government for education is the highest on record. The greatest number of new schools and classrooms on record are being provided by the Government. Because there was no finance available after all the money had been allocated, the Government had to find some other way to finance the establishment of country high school hostels. So it decided to go outside of loan funds and borrow the money; because that money has to be repaid a limit had to be set on the amount borrowed. That amount was fixed at £100,000 for a start. Mr. Strickland said the Government had plenty of money available.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said there was plenty to spend on tourism at Rottneest.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the Government receives a return for its expenditure, then the expenditure is worth while. There is now a profit of £5,000 as against a loss of £5,000 previously. The Government will be able to use this profit for educational purposes.

As a result of the repeated requests by the Country Women's Association for the establishment of country high school hostels, the Government decided to introduce

the Bill. To build hostels throughout the State to cater for primary as well as high school children, without any thought being given to the manner in which they are to be run, is an entirely different matter. Mr. Strickland complained about the conditions for education at Wittenoom. Had a high school hostel been established at Geraldton, the school children he referred to could have been accommodated there. The children who attend the Geraldton High School come from as far north as Northampton and from as far south as Dalwallinu. That is the reason why hostel facilities are required there.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: When any member on this side criticises the action of the Government, Mr. Logan seems to take it as a personal affront. I ask him since when money spent on education has not proved to be profitable?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You knew what I was referring to.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The honourable member should confine his remarks to the subject matter of the amendment.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I consider I am doing so. If you, Mr. Chairman, were to rule me out of order I would sit down.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The honourable member should get on with the amendment and keep within the rules of debate.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I believe I am dealing with the amendment which is before us. Those who oppose the amendment moved by Mr. Strickland should remember that the proposal for the establishment of country high school hostels was first made in 1915 when I was in Westonia; a request was made for a hostel at Northam.

Since 1948, the amount set aside for education has been increased until now it is approximately £8,000,000 per annum. In fact about 12 per cent. of the income of the State is being spent on education. Therefore this present Bill is to be commended as is the attempt of the honourable member to obtain assistance for the schools in the North. If this amendment were passed, the proposed authority would have to find more money. But why not? Whether this amendment be carried or not, it is right that it should be placed on record that there are people trying to obtain further assistance for people in the outback areas. I therefore support the amendment.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I do not think for one moment that any member of this Committee doubts the sincerity of Mr. Strickland and Mr. Wise in regard to this amendment. The Minister for Local Government has stated that the Bill was

introduced because of continual pressure from parents and citizen's associations all over the State. One of the main purposes of this legislation is to transfer the responsibility for the decisions in respect to the site of these hostels to the proposed authority. In that way political considerations will not be involved.

After all, despite all the applications for the establishment of hostels, only one or two will be built; and this authority will be able to take an objective view and thus avoid wrong decisions being made on political grounds. The danger which would be created were this amendment passed is that political pressure would be brought to bear on the Minister. The over-all effect would be that the authority would be bogged down so that no decisions could be made for some considerable time; and personally I believe it would be far better to allow the authority to commence its operations, thus avoiding further and greater delay in the establishment of these hostels. However, I do want to make it clear that I see the reason behind the amendment and I believe it has been submitted in good faith; but in my opinion if it were passed, the functioning of the authority would be delayed.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I believe that the primary school students who will require hostel accommodation will be very few. Mr. Willmott knows as well as I do that the children who will require such accommodation will be those from stations. There are primary schools already established in towns in the North.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Yes; but there are some from the south who will require accommodation too.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: But there are people on stations which are hundreds of miles from a primary school. They will find it necessary to send their children to a hostel.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: That is true.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How many do you think there would be?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am only making a guess now but I do not think there would be many more than 50 from the North. I do not know how many there are from the Murchison, or the goldfields. The number could be ascertained.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How many hostels do you think would be necessary for those 50?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Possibly two. Mr. Logan mentioned that there is a great demand for high school accommodation at Geraldton; and there is. Geraldton is the most northerly high school in Western Australia; and Geraldton is in the South-West Land Division.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: There are plenty of primary schools in the southern part of the State, and pressure will be brought to bear for the establishment of hostels for them.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I cannot agree with the honourable member's contention, because education is compulsory.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Yes, but the establishment of hostels is not.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If the honourable member cared to inquire, he would find that the education service in the North has been curtailed by the present Government because it has withdrawn the itinerant teachers from the area. This means that the children under those itinerant teachers will now have to find some accommodation in order to attend a school.

Surely the establishment of hostels for the primary school children would be a far better investment than tourism. After all, this amendment is only referring to remote country areas; and to country areas where there are high schools and primary schools, if the Minister so declares. To talk about pressures is different from something that is law. I do not think it is a matter of pressures; because a voluntary organisation is asking to conduct these hostels. The same thing occurred in 1952; and the present Minister for Education was also the Minister at that time. There was an approach from the Australian Inland Mission to build a hostel for primary children at Hall's Creek, and to this request the Minister agreed. I am only asking that provision be made for those in the North; and I do not think there would be need for any more than 50 to be accommodated.

It is absolute rot for Mr. Cunningham to talk about not being able to cater for primary and secondary school children in the one building. We have only to look at every convent in the State and St. Mary's School at West Perth. The children there start from the first standard and go right through to leaving standard.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Add after the interpretation "Minister" the following interpretation:—

"primary school" means a Government school established or maintained as a primary school under the Education Act, 1928, situated in a remote country area of the State and which the Minister declares to be a primary school for the purposes of this Act;

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I want to know how Mr. Strickland will relate this interpretation to the title of the Bill.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It may be necessary to amend the title of the Bill. I discussed that with the Parliamentary Draftsman, and he thought the amendments he drafted would come within the scope of the title. He is there for members' guidance; and that is the only information I have on the matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not want to take this point, but it appears to me that if it is necessary to amend the title, the amendments moved by Mr. Strickland are outside the scope of the Bill. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to give us some direction upon this point before we proceed any further. I want to know whether it is necessary to amend the title. If it is, then I suggest these amendments are outside the scope of the Bill.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: When I said it may be necessary to have the title amended, it was my way of beginning my speech. I discussed that aspect with the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did you discuss the title of the Bill?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: We did. We thought it came within the scope of the Bill.

Point of Order

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I ask you to give us an opinion, Mr. Chairman, as to whether it is competent for us to proceed. I cannot see any purpose in moving amendments if they are not acceptable and do not come within the scope of the Bill. I am not doing this as a means of defeating the honourable member's objective, because, as I said, I wholeheartedly approve of the principle. But as I have already indicated, the Minister has told me that primary schools are outside the scope of this legislation. I would like you to give us some direction on this, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 10.30 to 11.5 p.m.

Chairman's Ruling

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): In answer to the Minister for Mines, I give the following ruling:—

I consider that the amendment proposed is relevant to the subject matter of the Bill but that if the amendment is agreed to it will be necessary to amend both the long and short titles.

Committee Resumed

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 put and passed.

Clause 7—Duties of the authority:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 6, line 5—Add after the word "schools" the words "or in primary schools."

This is a complementary amendment to the one passed previously and I will not elaborate on it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 19 put and passed.

Title:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: You have ruled that it is necessary to amend both the long and short titles, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I move an amendment—

Insert after the word "Authority" the words "to provide or cause to be provided accommodation in hostels for students enrolled in High Schools or in Primary Schools."

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): Would it not be better merely to delete the word "high?"

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: That might shorten the amendment, Mr. Chairman, as long as it does not conflict with other clauses of the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think it is unwise to take out the words "country high school hostels authority" or any part of them because so many portions of the Bill deal with the setting up of such named authority which has specific and delegated powers. So if the titles were amended on the lines suggested by Mr. Strickland, the long title, firstly, would read—

An Act to provide for the establishment of a country high school hostels authority to provide or cause to be provided accommodation in hostels for students enrolled in high schools or in primary schools and for incidental and other purposes.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: I think the title as it stands is adequate notwithstanding the amendment. It refers to incidental and other purposes in the Act which are covered by it.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I agree with Mr. Watson but since it was ruled that it was necessary to amend the long and short titles, the title I read out would embrace the points embodied in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): In view of what Mr. Watson has said, does the honourable member wish to persist with his amendment?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am prepared to withdraw my amendment and let the title stand; it was only because of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, that I moved my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall) : I think the title as it stands would cover the situation.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If we say that the title as it covers the situation, we reach the point where any Bill that is presented, and which has the words "for incidental or other purposes," will be wide open to the insertion of any amendment we please. The committee has gone right outside the intention of the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: The Chairman has ruled otherwise.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The point I raised was: Did Mr. Strickland propose, if the interpretation of primary schools were accepted by the Council, to amend the title of the Bill? And I asked you, Mr. Chairman, to rule whether or not it should be amended. You ruled it should. You said you thought the addition of the interpretation of primary school was within the scope of the Bill, and it would be necessary to amend the title.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall) : I said I considered it would be necessary.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let us be consistent. The Government does not bring before Parliament Bills for anybody to deal with as he wishes; it brings down Bills for a specific purpose as is the case with this one. But now we propose to change the whole purpose of the Bill.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister has missed Mr. Watson's point, namely, that the Bill is to provide for the establishment of a country high schools authority.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is what we wanted to do.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: To leave the matter in no doubt I will proceed with my amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not wish to differ on this point or to see us get to a ridiculous stage. I would like members to appreciate that by accepting this amendment we can, after this, add anything we like to the title of a Bill. We can say, "An Act to Provide for the Establishment of Country High School Hostels Authority"; put in what Mr. Strickland has suggested; and then add, "Get Accommodation in the Chevron-Hilton Hotel." The Bill seeks to establish an authority to raise money for the provision of hostel accommodation for country high schools, including any junior high school. That is where it starts and finishes.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That interpretation is not sacrosanct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We might find, however, that another place may have something to say about it.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: From the Minister's argument one would imagine this is the law of the Medes and Persians; that it is unalterable. That is not the case.

All that has been done is to make an amendment clearly within the scope of the Bill to deal with primary education. Within the scope of the Bill lies authority vested in the Minister to provide for schools other than high schools for the purpose of this authority's jurisdiction. It is idle to say, therefore, that if such an amendment to the title is accepted it leaves any title open to amendment with irrelevancies. This is relevant to the subject matter in the Bill; it is associated with the proposal and dealing with it in substance.

Amendment put and passed.

Title, as amended, put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments, and an amendment to the title.

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 11.21 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 21st September, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Allawah Grove Settlement : Unemployed natives and establishment of training centre	1289
Bogle Castings : Manufacture by Bradford Kendall	1286
Collie Coal : Marshall report on open-cut supplies	1288
Electric Current : Increased charges in metropolitan area	1287
Empire Games Village—	
Cost and subsequent disposal of residences	1288
Land involved	1287
Source of developmental funds	1288
Tabling of relevant documents	1287
Escort of Prisoners : Provision of special railway van	1286
Fishing : Use of traps	1286
Public Works Department : Establishment of Midland Junction branch	1289
Underground Water : Survey of Swan and Chitling valleys	1287
Water Supply and Drainage : Departmental officers for Midland Junction	1288