Legislative Council

Tuesday, 4th November, 1952.

CONTENTS.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1, Rents and Tenancies Emergency Provisions Act Amendment (Continuance).

2, Margarine Act Amendment (No. 1).

QUESTIONS.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION.

(a) As to Rates on Leased Houses.

Hon. L. CRAIG (for Hon. C. H. Henning) asked the Minister for Transport:

Referring to my question of the 28th October re non-payment of rates on houses leased by the S.E.C., is the saving passed on to the tenant?

The MINISTER replied:

A fair rental is assessed, based on the value of the houses and comparative rentals in the district concerned.

(b) As to Employees, Departments and Cost.

Hon. A. R. JONES asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) How many employees are on the pay roll of the Housing Commission?

(2) What departments are within the Commission and what are the functions of each?

(3) How many persons are employed in each department?

(4) What was the total cost to the State, of the Commission, for the year ended the 30th June, 1952?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 321 as at the 31st October, 1952.

(2) The Commission administers the following Acts:—

State Housing Act.—Comprehensive legislation which provides, among other things, the financing of workers' homes either under leasehold conditions, contract of sale or freehold conditions. Also provides for acquisition and development of land.

War Service Homes Act.—The Commission acts as agent for the War Service Homes Division in Western Australia and is responsible for the administration of all the provisions of that Act.

Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act.—By an arrangement entered into between several of the States, including Western Australia, and the Commonwealth, the Commission has been charged since 1944 with putting into effect the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. The Commission carries out the acquisition of building sites, planning and construction of rental homes, the selection and installation of the tenants and the management and care of the estates.

McNess Housing Trust Act.—This Act brought into existence the McNess Trust to put into effect the bequests of the late Sir Charles and Lady McNess, a scheme devised to provide housing at a nominal rent for the aged and infirm. No charges are made by the Commission for the services rendered, although the Commission carries out all of the administration necessary to implement this Act.

Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act.—This measure, which was first enacted in 1945 and has been renewed annually, is administered by the Commission. The policy of gradual decontrol has now reduced the Commission's activities to a minimum and it is necessary now to employ only one officer exclusively on this work. Applications for building permits are now necessary in respect of only industrial, commercial and entertainment buildings.

(3) Except for the one officer employed exclusively on applications for industrial and commercial buildings, every department of the Commission carries out a multiplicity of the functions described in answer to question No. (2). It is not possible, therefore, to state that so many persons are employed in each department.

(4) The only cost to the State for the year ended the 30th June, 1952, was £24,660 for administering the Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act. All other costs are recouped from fees and other remuneration earned by the Commission under the various schemes it administers. In view of the reduced activities under the Building Operations and Materials Control Act referred to in the answer to question No. (2), the estimated cost of the Housing Commission to the State for the current year is only £8,000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. H. K. Watson, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. H. Hearn (Metropolitan) on the ground of private business.

BILL—COOGEE-KWINANA RAILWAY.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [4.40]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [4.41]: In view of the importance to the people of Fremantle generally of the proposal to establish industries in the Kwinana district, because we have not had an opportunity to have all the information placed before us, and because it is hoped that a certain amount of business will accrue to Fremantle as a result of the establishment of those industries, I ask the Minister to make the aerial photographs and plans available to the City of Fremantle. The town hall and municipal offices could be utilised for the exhibition of these photographs and plans.

If the Minister is prepared to do this, arrangements can be made with the Mayor of Fremantle to see that the necessary facilities are made available and that invitations to view them are issued to interested people in the Fremantle and contiguous districts. If this is done, I am sure a number of people will be pleased to have a look at the photos and plans. If the Minister accedes to my request, I would also like him to make available a competent Government official to explain the photographs and plans.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.43]: As a result of the railway and of certain industries being established in the Kwinana area, it will be necessary for the main road to be altered. When the Director of Works was here the other day, he suggested it would take a certain line. On Sunday I went over the area, and I can see it is quite possible that the road will cut almost in half a number of properties that have been worked for a considerable time. It appeared to me that the cutting up of these blocks could possibly be avoided. I would like the Minister to emphasise to the surveyors and the other persons who will have the job of deciding where the road shall go, that the cutting up of established properties must be avoided wherever possible.

I know that very often a road has to be taken through a property, but when I looked over this area it seemed to me that, with a slight deviation—without detriment to the road itself—and extra care being exercised, the cutting up of some of the properties could be avoided. I would like the Minister, when he replies, to give an assurance that instructions on these lines will be given to the surveyors and the other people who will eventually authorise the construction of the road. We know there is to be a widening of the road.

The potato-growers, particularly, and other market gardeners in the area, are anxious about this position, and would like to know just how much of their land will be taken for the widening of the road. As soon as the information is available, I would like it to be published. We have found in the past that certain Government departments—the Main Roads Department and others—have done jobs, and the people concerned have been sort of suspended in the air for months before knowing what was to happen. I hope that instructions will be given so that immediately a definite decision is reached, it will be published so that the people whose properties will be affected will know where they stand.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland—in reply) [4.48]: Mr. Davies was good enough to mention this matter to me, and I assure him I will be pleased to make available the aerial photographs and plans that he seeks, and also the services of a competent officer to explain them. When I pass the suggestion on to the Commissioners, the necessary arrangements for a suitable time can be arranged with the Fremantle City Council. In regard to Mr. Fraser's points, I will have the notes of his speech placed before my colleague, the Minister for Works, and will discuss them with him. I have no doubt that he will go into these matters with the Director of Works and, if something can be done along the lines Mr. Fraser suggests, I am sure that every possible consideration will be given to doing it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland—in reply) [4.49]: I have obtained from the department some information that will be of interest to the House, and which I think will clarify one or two of the points that have been raised. I am pleased that the House, generally, is in favour of the principle expressed in this Bill, which is an effort to improve the nursing situation in Western Australia.

The Nurses Registration Board, as well as those persons concerned with the tutoring of nurses and those who work with nurses, have all been concerned at the position in which the nursing profession is placed in this State. The consensus of opinion is that, with the rapid developments in medicine and surgery that have taken place within recent years, the effort to raise the level to which nurses have been trained in order to equip them to act as assistants to doctors in the carrying out of modern treatment has not been uniformly successful. At the same time, the basic nursing duties remain unaltered. It is still essential for a nurse to care for the physical needs of the patient who is confined to bed because of illness. Nursing duties are of all grades of complexity from this basic care of the patient in bed extending up to complicated procedures in which the nurse acts as the doctor's assistant.

As I mentioned when introducing the Bill, an analysis conducted by the American College of Surgeons found that two-thirds of the nursing procedures performed on the average patient could well be done by a nurse who was trained to a lower level than the general trained nurse, and that only one-third of the procedures required the services of a highly trained nurse. The opinion has been gaining ground that what the nursing profession requires is a smaller number of more highly trained nurses and a larger number of less highly trained nurses in order to provide a complete and balanced nursing service.

The Bill is an attempt to provide the second of these categories. It must be realised that in no way does it affect the standard of the training of the trained nurse as we know her today. The inclusion of the nursing aide in the nursing service would ensure this standard. The nursing aide would work under the supervision of a trained nurse and would not at any time be entirely responsible for the treatment of patients. The curriculum of the nursing aide will provide for instruction in her duties. There is also provision for her to be examined at the end of her year's course. This examination will differ in type from that of the trained nurse, being more practical, but it will be an examination nevertheless. There will be nothing to stop a trained nursing aide from commencing her general training subsequently as a trained nurse if she so wishes and if she has the ability to do so.

I was very interested in the comments made by Dr. Hislop which I referred to the appropriate authorities. I am informed that the hon. member's remarks are very true in many respects and that they will be of considerable value when it is proposed to modify the training which is given under this Act to our trained nurses. However, at present, it is considered that action is required urgently to regularise the position of the nursing aide. It must be realised that the great majority of the hospitals in this State already have nursing assistants of whom there are 332 in employment today. These girls now may enter a hospital at almost any age over 14 years and undertake nursing duties without training of any kind whatever. With experience, many of them become quite capable in the performance of some of the routine tasks of bedside nursing; but there are gaps in their knowledge and there is a risk that they may attempt to do more than is justified. They are unselected and their relationship with the trained nurse is comparatively ill-defined.

These problems, of course, are not new. In other States and in other countries they have been discussed for years, and in Great Britain, New Zealand Victoria and Tasmania, provision has been made for the training of a nurse of a category similar to that which is being proposed in this Bill, although the title may not be identical. The New Zealand and Victorian schemes have been in successful operation for some time. The training, which it is proposed will be instituted if this Bill is passed, will be based on the New Zealand and Victorian systems of which a close study has been made. As I informed the House when introducing the Bill, these proposals have been explicitly approved by the Western Australian branch of the Australasian Trained Nurses Association and the Western Australian Nurses Association, which as members are aware, is the nurses union in this State.

Another matter with which the State Government, the Public Health Department, the hospital authorities and the Florence Nightingale Memorial Committee have been concerned very closely is the post-graduate training of the trained nurse. Every year the State Governmennt grants four scholarships to the College of Nursing in Melbourne, and the Florence Nightingale Memorial Committee awards a similar number. The intention of these scholarships is that selected trained nurses in this State shall undergo post-graduate training in the specialities of nursing and that they will then return to work in our hospitals in order to improve the quality of the nursing services.

Already some of these scholars have returned and are doing excellent work in our hospitals. It is hoped that by this means, with the use of the educational resources that are available in this country,

we will be able to build up a corps of highly trained expert specialist nurses who will be responsible for the direction of actual nursing in our hospitals.

It is agreed that no radical change is proposed at present in the training of the trained nurse. This does not mean that the Nurses Registration Board and the nursing authorities in this State are unaware that this might be advisable in the future. They are continuing to watch the position closely. Dr. Hislop's comments in this respect have been read with interest. I am informed, however, that the Nurses Reigistration Board is of the opinion that the most urgent matters at present are the training of the nursing aide and the post-graduate training of trained nurses. The Government and hospital authorities, with the Florence Nightingale Memorial Committee, are proceeding with the higher education of a selected number of trained nurses. Any alterations in the general training of nurses may be left to a later date.

With regard to the references made during the debate of the difficulties applicable to the salary of the trained nursing aide, this is a matter which has not yet been before the Arbitration Court and, at this stage, it is not advisable to attempt to prejudge the decision of the court. The difficulties which have been anticipated might not occur. Mr. Lavery was concerned that in the case of any actions being taken against nursing aides for alleged derelictions of duties, they would have no person or organisation to represent them. However, I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that when introducing the Bill I stated that the Western Australian Nurses' Association, which is the nurses' union, had applied to the Arbitration Court for an amendment to its constitution, so that it could include nursing aides in its membership. Even had the association not taken this step, the aides could, as nursing assistants are now, become members of the Hospital Employees Union.

I might say at this juncture that the Nurses Registration Board is well fitted to undertake the work and to deal with the problems that arise with regard to nursing training. Its members are all professional people intimately associated with medicine and nursing and have made a close study of nursing matters, both in Australia and oversea. The complement of the board includes four medical men in the Commissioner of Public Health, who is chairman; the Inspector-General of Mental Hospitals, Dr. E. J. T. Thompson, and two nominees of the B.M.A. in Dr. J. A. Love, who is an obstetrician, and Dr. L. Le Souef. Other highly qualified members of the board are Matron Selgele of the Royal Perth Hospital and Matron Walsh of the King Edward Memorial Hospital, who represent training hospital staffs, and Miss Edis, Miss Cockerell and Mr. C. M. Scott who were nominated by the general, midwifery and mental nurses. Members will realise from this information that the board is truly representative of the medical and nursing professions and is particularly fitted to cope with the problems associated with nursing.

His remarks showed that Mr. Boylen was not enamoured of the titled of "trained nursing aide" as proposed in the Bill. He felt that it might create a false impression in that the public might consider these aides to be qualified nurses, and he therefore suggested that the term "trained hospital aide" be adopted. I have had this proposal examined by the Nurses Registration Board which does not favour it. The board stated that the circumstances postulated by Mr. Boylen have not arisen in other countries where the title is similar to that proposed in the bill. In England the women are called "state enrolled assistant nurses"; in New Zealand and Victoria, the term is "nursing aide"; Canada refers to them as "nurses aides" and the United States of America as "practical nurses". So it will be seen that the word "nurse" or "nursing" is used in other countries where, I understand, it has caused no confusion.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: No one else uses the word "trained".

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I had a talk with Sister Ready, matron of the Mullewa Hospital and an old friend of mine, and she seemed rather anxious to retain the term "nursing aide" because she thought "hospital aide" might lead to confusion in the minds of some people with other hospital employees who are already enrolled by the Hospital Employees Union. She seemed to think it should be retained.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: She is not too happy about the word "trained".

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I am not sure that came under discussion but she seemed rather anxious that the Bill should be preserved.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: When I discussed the matter with her she was not too happy about the word "trained."

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: She left me with the impression that she wanted the Bill preserved as it is. The title of "trained nursing aide" has met with the approval of the Australasian Trained Nurses Association and the Western Australian Nurses Association—both organisations of nurses who are jealous of the standing and responsibilities of the nursing profession. I am informed by the Nurses Registration Board that in its opinion the status of the trained general nurse or professional nurse is not threatened by the use of the term "nursing aide",

but that, on the contrary, her status is clearly defined and, in fact, elevated. The training of nursing aides will not take in all the non-professional nursing personnel engaged in the nursing field, for there would be many people still employed as nursing assistants in country hospitals who will not, for various reasons, seek training as aides. They will remain valuable members of the nursing team and so we will still have the term "nursing assistants".

A relatively small portion of untrained people are engaged in private practice, so that it is not anticipated that a trained nursing aide would seek employment outside hospitals. The title "nursing aide" is adopted because there is great need that a title be used which requires a minimum of explanation in order to be understood and the term "nursing aide" is more generally known, used and understood by the nursing and medical professions and by the lay public than any other term. A nursing aide is a person trained to care for subacute, convalescent, and chronic patients requiring nursing services at home or in institutions, who works under the direction of a licensed physician or a registered professional nurse and who is prepared to give household assistance when necessary. A nursing aide may be employed by physicians, hospitals, custodial homes, or by the lay public.

This definition suggests specific controls and limitations of nursing aide activities. It establishes relationships with the physician and the professional nurse, and implies that patient-care comes first and that care of the home is justified only to the extent that it is necessary to ensure the patient peace of mind and desirable home conditions. For these reasons, which are the considered opinion of the Nurses Registration Board and the nurses organisations in this State, and as well to follow the example set oversea and elsewhere in Australia, I trust that the Bill will be passed without amendment.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 1B amended:

Hon. G. FRASER: I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to report progress with a view to the consideration by other members of the words "trained nursing aide". Members would like to consider the matter with a view to inserting other words in lieu but have not made up their minds as to the words they desire to substitute.

Progress reported.

BILL—PRICES CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT AND CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [5.7]: Like other members, I am not too happy about the setup of the Bill. Why we should get a fruit-salad Bill presented to us I do not know. We have the first part of the Bill which deals with the price of butter and cheese and the second part which refers to the continuation of the Bill and, lastly, there is the desire to repeal altogether the Profiteering Prevention Act. We know the first part is necessary because of the arrangement made by the Commonwealth Government with the dairying people for a five-year plan.

I should advise those members who would like a very good explanation of the plan, to read a report in "The Farmers Weekly" of the 30th October. It gives Mr. McEwan's statement when he introduced the Bill and it would furnish members with a fair idea of his intentions. That is why it is necessary for price-control to be continued on those commodities. But I do not agree that it should be handled in this way.

The Minister for Transport: Was not that at the express wish of the Minister for Commerce?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, but he did not say that we should do it under this Bill. He said that he wanted the States to come into line and support the Commonwealth Government. But why put it in a Bill like this, one that has nothing to do with the dairying industry at all?

The Minister for Transport: That may be. I was under the impression that it should be administered by the Prices Minister.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If we threw out the second part of the Bill, the first portion would not be valid because there would no longer be any Bill. That is the silly part of it. We are trying to control prices of commodities for which there is a five-year plan and which it is necessary for this State to arrange for the next five years. If we throw out the prices-control Bill there would be no control in this State over the price of butter, and that is what I want the Minister to realise. It is too silly—unless, of course, it is a sprat to catch a mackerel, and we have to agree to it entirely for another five years.

This House should have the right to vote on each of these problems separately and they should not be connected up as they are in the Bill. Regarding the second part of the measure which deals with the continuing of the Prices Control Act for another 12 months, in my opinion price-control has never been a success, and is never likely to be one. If we study price-control in Australia we find that it has

caused bad management and inefficiency and it has not controlled prices to any great extent. It was aimed more at profit-control rather than price-control.

When I say it bred inefficiency and bad management, I say so because managements of business concerns knew full well that whatever their costs, they would still get their profit, plus. Consequently they never worried about their costs at all. I would enlarge upon that by citing the case of two factories, where because certain people did not work, they apparently put others on to help them not work. There is a certain shoe factory that was producing 2,600 uppers a week. It was decided to retrench 20 per cent. of the employees. That was done and the following week the factory's production rose to 4,000 uppers, which proves that it was bad management in the first place. The management was not worried about costs because it knew that the expenditure would be returned.

I would also like to refer to Chamberlain Industries, which was producing 3.2 tractors per week. Some 200 of its workers were retrenched and production rose to 5.3 tractors per week. It is just bad management and nothing more! Those concerned were sheltering behind the tariff barrier, and the Commonwealth was pouring money into them without restrictions. I do not know what it has cost to keep that factory going, but I should think it was pretty expensive.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That information was in this morning's paper.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It already shows an expenditure of £1,110,000, but I do not think that is a true figure.

Hon. L. Craig: Why do not you vote against the Bill?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I intend to vote against every clause of the Bill. I would rather see the Profiteering Prevention Act in operation than the Prices Control Act. But if this Bill is thrown out on the second reading, the Profiteering Prevention Act would still be in operation. As I have stated, these provisions should not be served up together. There is no need to make a long story about this. I have pointed out the fallacy of the whole setup, and I intend to vote against the whole Bill as it stands.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.15]: My enthusiasm for price-control has become less and less every year.

Hon. L. Craig: So you will vote against the Bill, too, will you not?

Hon. G. FRASER: Do not anticipate! As a matter of fact, I think that last year, when speaking on a similar Bill, I described it as a shandy-gaff measure—shandy-gaff prices legislation.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: It is only gaff now!

Hon. G. FRASER: As Mr. Dimmitt says, there is no shandy-gaff about it now; it is only gaff. My enthusiasm this year has been sapped altogether.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Hurrah!

Hon. G. FRASER: It is my intention to vote against the second reading. We cannot amend the Bill, so there is only one thing to do and that is to try to defeat it at the second reading stage. Apart from my lack of enthusiasm about price-control, I realise that if the Bill is carried, the Profiteering Prevention Act will be removed from the statute book. That means that if no price-control legislation were introduced next year there would be nothing in its place. Knowing how little good, or of what little value price-control is to people today, I would much prefer to see that go overboard and the Profiteering Prevention Act remain on the statute book.

Price-control has become less and less and less. There are so few articles of any consequence under control today that it appears to me the public are not very enthusiastic about it. It causes a lot of worry to business people and there is no advantage to anybody. I believe that the officers of the Prices Control Branch are doing the best they can under adverse circumstances. They have done the work as well as it would be possible for any human being to do it. But, under present circumstances, I cannot see any justification for endeavouring to retain that department. So, without further ado, I notify the House that I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill, mainly with the idea of keeping on the statute book the Profiteering Prevention Act.

I think it is necessary to retain that Act so that if the necessity arises to deal with that phase, we will have a measure that can be put into operation quickly. It may be asked why we should not allow the Profiteering Prevention Act to disappear and then, if circumstances require it, pass fresh legislation. But that might necessitate a delay of six or nine months before any action could be taken, due to the fact that we would have to wait for Parliament to assemble, for the Address-in-reply to be concluded and for the necessary legislation to be passed by both Houses. By that time the emergency might have disappeared. Summing the whole position up, I can see only one course for me to take. On this occasion I shall join the decontrollers and vote with them for the decontrol of prices. I oppose the second reading.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [5.19]: I will not weary the House with my opposition to this measure at any great length. I have opposed price-control in all its forms on each occasion that this hardy annual has come up for consideration, and I continue to oppose it. I believe that

price-control has added costs to most articles we have been buying over the years. Because of lack of competition, both the manufacturer and the person he employs to help him in the production of his goods have felt there has been no need to give of their best, either administratively or in actual production. The manufacturer has known that whatever the cost of the article produced, he would be able to add a certain amount to it to cover himself for expenses and reasonable working profit. Thus the situation has snowballed to the extent that we have paid more and more for everything we have purchased, with a few possible exceptions.

On the distribution side, the storekeeper has never known where he has stood. He is supposed to work to a price list that is compiled every month, but by the time the list gets to some storekeepers it is out of date. One can recall the time when one would go to a grocer's shop and buy 20 articles and the grocer would write the prices on the docket as he went along. Today the procedure is that the price has to be turned up in a book and the docketing is made complicated and costly. The additional cost is added to the purchase price.

For the control of prices, quite a number of personnel are employed in offices that could be used to better purpose. There are also a number of inspectors on the road using transport of some sort, which is quite costly. While that is not a direct charge on the people, it is a charge in the way of taxation. So whichever way we look at it, price-control has done us no good whatsoever in the form in which it has been carried out, and I have no hesitation in asking members to support decontrol by opposing this measure.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.22]: I am rather pleased at the reception of the Bill. It is somewhat unexpected, if I may say so. The measure proposes three things. Firstly, it is designed to continue price-control. Secondly, it proposes to hand over price-control of milk and cream used for the production of cheese and butter for consumption in Australia to the Federal Minister for Commerce and Agriculture for a period of five years. It is a very foolish thing to make long-term agreements and hand over the fixation of prices to some authority outside the State.

Hon. A. L. Loton: How the wheatgrower knows that!

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. Yet here we are falling into it again and proposing to give somebody, thousands of miles away, full control over the fixation of the prices of those commodities for a period of five years.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: We have not fallen yet.

Hon. L. CRAIG: You are on the way, laddie! I am very glad to see members of the Country Party adopt the attitude they have in regard to this matter. If anybody should know the folly of handing over control of prices, it is the primary producers. One section of primary producers who have withstood pressure for the fixation of prices has been the woolgrowers, They have always said, "We will take the world price, whatever it may be, and we will allow our product to be used rather than be stored and built up against us."

Tremendous pressure has been brought to bear on woolgrowers to induce them to come into line with other primary producers; but to their eternal credit, they have always resisted. And how right they have been proved to be! Year after year they have proved themselves to be quite right in accepting the world market price, whatever it may have been; because, in the end, price-control does not give any more to the producer but costs the consumer a lot more. It causes confusion for everybody, and I do not think it has any beneficial effect in the end on the price charged to the consumer.

If anything is in very short supply, a blackmarket immediately springs up, and those willing to pay the most get the article. We have an instance of what has occurred in connection with meat. Prime meat is selling at Midland Junction for as low as 4d., 5d. and 6d. What will be the effect in the shops? I think that with the removal of price-control there may be delay for a while; but there is no question in my mind that meat will eventually reach its real level, at which price the people will be able to pay for it. If they are unable to buy meat of one quality, they will buy some of another quality.

The third objective of the Bill is to repeal the Profiteering Prevention Act. I personally feel that that measure is very much better than this one. Nobody would object to action being taken against anybody who used a certain situation to make undue and unfair profits, who profited by some adverse circumstances that arose. I do not think that any fair-minded person would really object to action being taken against people of that sort. I do not see that much harm will be done to anybody by our allowing the Profiteering Prevention Act to remain on the statute book.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That will be brought into force immediately this Act ceases to exist.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That measure is for the prevention of profiteering. It has to be proved that profiteering has taken place.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It is only price-fixing by another name.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, but not in the same way. The Profiteering Prevention Act was in force years before this one. If I remember rightly, little or no harm was done to anybody by its existence.

Hon. H. C. Strickland: Were there any prosecutions?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not remember, but I do not think there were. I do not recall any. The fact that the Act is on the statute book has in itself some restraining effect on people who would perhaps use an emergency to trade unfairly. I have heard of no repercussions as a result of our passing that measure, so one can assume it has not been harmful to trading generally. If it had been, sections of the commercial community would have raised objections long ago. I am very glad at the attitude this House appears to be taking in regard to the Bill, and I oppose the second reading.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM (South-East) [5.28]: I am not happy about price-fixing, and I am not prepared to support the second reading of the Bill. I propose to deal with only one aspect, as it applies to retailers. Other phases have been dealt with pretty thoroughly by other members. I intend to speak of the small businesses rather than the big ones which can look after themselves. For years, injustices and hardships have been imposed on small family businesses in the suburban and country areas by price-control, and those people have not had much redress.

One could go at any time to the offices of the Prices Control Branch and make a complaint about an overcharge for a load of firewood or some other article of daily consumption, and the complaint would be investigated almost immediately. The next day an inspector would be out checking the facts. That is what applies to the buyer. The same does not apply when the small businessman strives to have some injustice rectified. I can prove that statement. If it applies to one, it should apply to all. It has been said that the Profiteering Prevention Act is only price-fixing legislation under another name, but that is not strictly so. If a man begins profiteering on some commodity that he is selling, a charge must be laid and proved against him and the due process of law has to be followed. But when the Prices Branch fixes the price that shall be charged for a particular article, there is nothing to say that it shall allow a fair margin of profit for the trader.

To illustrate how ridiculous the position can become, I will show members two tins of Imperial Camp Pie that I have here. They are the same article, processed by the same firm and at the same time, one being a 12-oz. tin and the other a 16-oz. tin. The anomaly constituted by the prices of these two sizes of tins was drawn to the attention of the Prices Branch over a period of months but was never rectified, and I do not know whether it has yet been dealt with. Nothing could be done about the question, no matter who took it up with the department concerned. The 12-oz. tin had a fixed price of 1s. 11½d. and the 16-oz. tin a fixed price of 1s. 9½d.

Hon. Sir Frank Gibson: Surely that was a misprint!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Indeed it was not. This instance was drawn to the attention of the department time and time again by the Retail Traders' Association.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Perhaps one tin contained better cuts of the dog than did the other.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: No, the contents are identical.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: The cost of manufacture may have gone up between the times of packing of the two tins.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: They were bought from the same firm at the same time.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: But the packing firm may have increased the price—

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Can members imagine the position of the retailer who had these two sizes of tins on his shelf? A customer might ask for a small tin of camp pie and be charged 1s. 11½d. for it and then decide to take a large tin, for which the retailer would have to charge 1s. 9d.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Did the retailer pay different prices for those two tins?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That information can be obtained if the hon. member really wants it. The trouble was that the position could not be remedied by going to the Prices Branch.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Why not?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I have here a journal to which I will refer in a few moments. It is a monthly publication containing the alterations in the prices of literally hundreds of commodities which must be checked in every single instance by the retailer. How do members think the shopkeeper can keep abreast of the changes in prices, when they are not published in the Press? Each shopkeeper is not supplied by the department with a monthly list of the alterations in prices, but instead a single copy is sent to the clerk of courts in each town and every store in the town is supposed to send someone along to go over the list and check the prices of everything on the shelves in the shop. That is what the Government has expected shopkeepers to do, and it has been an impossible task.

Hon. H. C. Strickland: They have done it for years.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I say it is impossible. Just imagine a town the size of Boulder or Kalgoorlie and the number of shopkeepers who each month would want that list! To overcome the difficulty the association has gone through the list and published the journal to which I have referred and that, in turn, has been purchased by the various stores. What I have said illustrates the effect of price-fixing as it has applied to the small trader. It has constituted a great imposition and hardship on a small group in the community.

A further difficulty has been that the small storekeeper, who could not buy by the ton and have the commodity weighed out, has had to buy—in the case of flour, for instance—a 50 lb. bag. Let us say that the price of the 50 lb. bag was 50s., or 1s. per lb. The Prices Branch has fixed the price at 1s. a lb., with the result that the retailer has had to purchase bags and weigh the flour out into smaller quantities, following which he has had to sell it at a price which returns him only 50s. for the 50 lb. bag. The same position has applied to sugar, wheat, bran, pollard, potatoes and many other commodities. When the retailer asks, "Where is my margin of profit?" the department says, "It is in the resale value of the bags." Let members imagine the small storekeeper dumping a bundle of bags on the counter at the Railway Department and saying, "I want to send my wife to Perth for a holiday. Here is my margin of profit to pay for her ticket."

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do you say that prices will automatically rise if the Bill is defeated?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I say that most of the anomalies such as this will be able to be remedied.

Hon. L. Craig: The bags are worth up to 6s.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: A new potato sack may be, but many of them are full of holes. The small shopkeeper can do little or nothing about it. If the Bill is defeated, some justice may be done to the small stores that are still holding out, though hundreds have gone out of business owing to the injustices imposed on them by the department.

HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [5.40]: It has been said this afternoon that it is satisfactory to see members of the Country Party opposing controls, and also that no industry has known the effect of price-control, to its cost, more than has the wheatgrowing industry. While I am opposed to this measure, there may come a day when I will support the continuance of certain legislation applying to the wheat industry.

Hon. G. Fraser: You might have to.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: It will be because of the great wealth that that industry has subscribed to the internal economy of the Commonwealth.

Hon. G. Fraser: I misconstrued your meaning.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: There is taking place in another part of the world today something that may have tremendous influence on the whole price structure of the Commonwealth, and here I refer to the presidential election in America. Although I will vote on this occasion to do away with price-control as we know it, I reserve to myself the right to support, if necessary, on a future occasion, certain legislation to assist the wheat industry.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [5.41]: Mr. Cunningham has given illustrations of the mysterious ways in which the Prices Branch has worked and I will refer particularly to butter, which is mentioned in the Bill. In the case of that commodity the retail margin has been controlled by the manufacturers for many years, and so there was no necessity for the Prices Branch to deal with butter. Although in the last 12 months there have been four basic wage rises, members who have business interests must know that no allowance for such increased costs has been made by the Prices Branch.

The business man has had the poor end of the bargain and has lost out all along the line. He has been expected to take the knocks for the benefit of the consumer and I think it is about time price-control was done away with so as to allow prices to find their proper level. With the abolition of price-control there may be a slight and justifiable rise in the price of certain commodities. No trader can afford to sell an article at a price that allows him no margin of profit. The retailer of petrol, for instance, has received no rise in his margin of profit in the last 20 years. He receives today the same 3d. per gallon that he received when petrol was retailed at 1s. 3d. per gallon.

Hon. A. R. Jones: But he has sold much more petrol.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In spite of four basic wage rises in 12 months, no rise has been allowed in hotel tariffs. The Prices Branch asks hotels to supply their balance sheets, though what such a balance sheet has to do with the fixing of tariffs, I fail to see. Officers of the department know the prices of all commodities, most of which are fixed by them, so surely they must be able to assess what it costs to keep a lodger at a hotel. In the case of liquor, also, the Prices Branch must have officers capable of deciding what is a reasonable margin. Perhaps there are other provisions in the Act I could refer to, but I think I have expressed sufficiently my feelings on the Bill and I oppose the second reading.

On motion by Hon. H. S. W. Parker, debate adjourned.

BILL—WAREHOUSEMEN'S LIENS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [5.46]: I secured the adjournment on the debate to enable members to study the Bill. It is an entirely new piece of legislation that provides for warehousemen to follow ordinary business ethics recognised by other businessmen. Not knowing very much about the activities of warehousemen, I cannot see much wrong with the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [5.50]: I have carefully considered the ramifications of the Bill and I support the second reading. The measure, I think, will prove to be one way of speeding up the flow of traffic and will possibly prevent many accidents. When it becomes law, it will be something in readiness for the future control of traffic on the Causeway. Over the years as traffic increases on the circus at the eastern end of the Causeway, the present arrangements will no doubt prove to be inadequate and eventually roads will have to be made over and under it.

The Government has taken a wise step by introducing this measure because it is necessary to keep the flow of traffic moving steadily along, and that cannot be accomplished with vehicles entering the highways at many points as they are permitted to do today. No doubt the principle of roads going over and under at crossings will be adopted not only in Perth but also in Fremantle and at various intersections of our main highways which, I am sure, will result in the easier handling of traffic. There is only one disadvantage against such a principle, namely, that people living close to such structures erected to facilitate better traffic flow, would have to travel back from the main highway via a lesser street to a point of entry to the through highway. However, I consider that the advantages would far outweigh any disadvantages.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.53]: In view of my experience as a driver of all types of vehicles on which I have been earning my living for the past 25 years both in the city and in the country, the Bill causes me some concern. While I agree that the density of the city traffic is increasing daily, it is only at those points where there is a great congestion of vehicles that access roads are needed. Apart from that, I cannot see that they will be of much use in regulating traffic in the city.

The Minister for Transport: They are intended to apply to future highways rather than to those at present existing.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I thank the Minister for that information. In the short time the Bill has been before the House, I have given it all the consideration I could and from inquiries I have made, I have four or five questions to put to the Minister to which I would like answers for my enlightenment after I have explained how I gained some information on the Bill. The volume of traffic on the Stirling and Canning Highways does not warrant the provision of access roads.

No one is more keen than I am to see a drop in the accident rate in this State. I am an instructor in the St. John Ambulance Association and I am fully fully aware of the expenditure on hospitalisation alone, realising as I do the number of accidents that occur. For four months I was a patient in the No. 4 and No. 9 wards of the Royal Perth Hospital. The No. 9 ward was full of accident victims and was known as the "Saturday night ward" because of the great number of accident victims brought into it.

Whilst I am prepared to do all I can to assist the traffic authorities and the Minister to facilitate the control of traffic, I must fully agree with the remarks made by Mr. Dimmitt during the debate when he said that there was necessity for the various authorities concerned with traffic to be co-ordinated into one body. What I am mainly concerned about is that the Traffic Act is not being properly policed today. I have in mind the control of traffic on highways where it is necessary for drivers entering them from access roads to stop and look both ways to make certain that the road is clear for them to turn either to the left or right. There. is nothing wrong with that traffic regulation, but unfortunately it is not being fully enforced. In my opinion all legislation, no matter what it covers, is like a pie crust; it is made to be broken unless it is policed correctly. The main reason why the law is not being properly enforced is that the Commissioner of Police has not sufficient men.

Hon. L. A. Logan: He has policed the two-up school at Kalgoorlie.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Commissioner of Police has not sufficient officers at his disposal to enforce the traffic laws. To prove that contention, I would point

out that the members of the Police Force, although they have a 40-hour week award, are working 48 hours a week, because their numbers are insufficient to carry out all the duties required of them. If the Bill becomes law, I am concerned as to whether it will ultimately be policed in a proper fashion. Because of these considerations, I would like the Minister to answer some questions I shall put to him.

Hon. A. R. Jones: This will cut out the police.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I disagree with the hon. member. I have discussed this matter with several experienced traffic constables, men who are endeavouring to carry out the law at present, and they are not at all happy about the situation.

The Minister for Transport: Do you mean about this Bill?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am referring to access roads. I have made inquiries at the Royal Automobile Club. As a result of what I have ascertained, I would like the Minister to answer the following series of questions:—

1. Are the members of this House to be told where these or any of the suggested access roads are to be designated?

2. Are they to be controlled access roads?

That is a vital point.

The Minister for Transport: This refers to future roads to be laid down, and the actual location of the road will determine whether it is an access road or a controlled road.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: To continue with the questions—

3. If so, are they to be—

(1) manually controlled; or

(2) mechanically controlled, such as with lights or automatic devices?

4. Has the Automobile Club been consulted?

5. Has the Traffic Department been consulted?

6. Has the Traffic Advisory Committee been consulted as to the practicability of this proposition?

7. What is the estimated initial cost of the implementation of this Bill?

The Minister for Transport: The sponsor of this measure is a member of most of those bodies.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The information I have is that the Royal Automobile Club, at any rate up to Thursday evening last, had no information about this matter. I cannot speak as regards the Traffic Department, because I did not make inquiries there. My information also is that the Traffic Advisory Committee was not consulted. That committee, which is an honorary body, comprises representatives of the whole of the transport system in the metropolitan area. They include those concerned with buses, both Government and privately-owned, the Royal Automobile Club, the Master Carriers' Association, the Traffic Department, and various other organisations of that description. I regard this measure as of vital importance because we hope to achieve the better organisation of traffic in years to come, with the consequent saving of loss of life and the avoidance of accidents. It is hoped to save people from themselves, particularly those who apparently cannot adequately control the vehicles they drive. I am very worried about this measure, which is simply put before us and we are asked to accept its provisions without knowing much about them.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That is not so! You are expected to make your own inquiries.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I have made my inquiries, and I am telling the House the results of my investigations. Nowhere else in Australia is there provision for access roads. That system is not in operation even in England, where the traffic is so dense.

The Minister for Transport: I think you are wrong there.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is the information I gleaned from someone who has just returned from an interstate conference held in the East. As a matter of fact, I got that information from the secretary of the Royal Automobile Club. I understand Mr. Young, of the Main Roads Department, has been in America, and he saw what is done there. No doubt the system operates well in that country, but that is no argument why it should be applied here.

In my opinion, the density of traffic in Perth does not warrant the expense that would be involved in implementing this legislation. No one seems to know quite what cost will be entailed, but I can assure members that the investigations I made last week revealed the fact that apparently no one outside the Main Roads Department knows anything about the proposition. I trust that the debate will be adjourned so that, at some future date, the Minister will be able to furnish me with information in reply to the questions I have submitted. I am not too happy about the position as it stands, and will reserve my decision respecting it until I have further information.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [6.7]: This is a very good measure. Mr. Lavery need have no worries about it, but may rest in peace. The Bill does not endeavour to do anything in respect of established highways, such as Stirling

Highway. It is a pity that such highways were constructed without provision for controlled access roads. We would have a much sounder highway system if that had been done. The cost of road construction in these days is enormous, and we cannot afford to go on spending large sums of money on building highways only to find that as soon as they are completed they are of less use than they were formerly.

Let members consider the position regarding Canning Highway which extends to Fremantle. Recently, that road was widened considerably from the Causeway nearly to Canning Bridge. Prior to that work being undertaken, motorists were accustomed to parking their vehicles at one side of the road, and sometimes cars were left there for long periods. The practice was to drive a car across the edge of the roadway towards the path, leaving only one wheel on the highway itself. Now, the authorities have spent considerable sums in putting down heavy kerbing at the side of the roads, so that the method of parking formerly adopted is no longer possible and cars have to park at the side of the highway.

The effect of that is to reduce the value of the highway itself. Speed must be lessened on the road because motors have to go round the vehicles that are parked, and so the road itself is not of the same use it was formerly. In other words, the highway is more dangerous today than it was before the improvements were carried out. Unless we do something to control entry to, and parking on, highways, there will be greater risk to life than ever. From what I visualise regarding the Bill and from the inquiries I have made, the intention of the legislation is that in future when highways are built in the outer areas, only certain roads will have access to the highway.

The whole planning of the highway system will be carried out in such a manner that there will be no entry to the highway every 200 or 300 yards. Under the proposed system, we shall be able much more effectively to control the even flow of traffic and to fix lights at the points of entry to the planned highway. When I was in Boston during my visit to America, I noticed the system in operation there. On one big road over which we travelled, lights were provided every 500 yards. One could travel for mile upon mile—we must have covered eight or ten miles—timing the trip so that one encountered green lights all the way, other traffic crossing the route at suitable points. The speed of traffic in that city was amazing. Now we are attempting to regulate the position with our highways so that in future we shall have access roads that will ensure a greater degree of safety on the highway and a much smoother flow of traffic at high speed.

Hon. G. Fraser: You could not alter the present setup.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No, that would not be possible; but it could be done with respect to future roads. I am not sure that we could not have control over the position as regards Stirling Highway, but the legislation will apply more particularly to future road construction. If members consider the position regarding Stirling Highway, they will appreciate that, as I have been told, businessmen who live off the highway have often to wait for considerable periods at crossings before they can proceed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That applies right down to Cottesloe.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think it should be possible to enter the highway only at, say, Broadway, Thomas-st. and Dalkeith-rd., taking just one section into account. That would help to ensure the smooth flow of traffic right through. That is what is contemplated for the future. There are one or two points about the measure concerning which I am rather sorry. The Bill does not give power to prevent parking in declared highways. For my part, I would have no hesitation about banning the parking of cars anywhere on a highway.

The Minister for Transport: Would that not be a traffic rather than a road matter?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the whole situation requires to be dealt with in a manner different from that proposed in the Bill. If what I suggest were adopted, we would have smoother running of traffic. The trouble is that we have not regarded highways as highways. We have simply regarded them as broader roads. More traffic tends towards the centre than to the left-hand side of a thoroughfare. It would be far better if the man who desired to travel fast were allowed to use the centre track and the slower traffic to use the side lanes. It is impossible to use Stirling Highway as a highway when from time to time we see great lumbering trolley-buses move out into the central lane to go around a parked vehicle. We cannot afford to continue going to enormous expense in the construction of main roads unless we develop a traffic conscience. At present, we go to vast expense in providing neither highways nor byways.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I have drawn attention to the fact that our highways are not being used really as highways because of the parking that is permitted on them. The first step we should make towards using our highways in the proper manner would be in connection with the new Causeway where faster traffic should be permitted to take the lane nearer the centre and the slow moving traffic the

inner lane. I remember going across the Oakland Bay bridge in San Francisco and there in the centre of the track we travelled at the rate of about 15 miles an hour and crossed the bridge expeditiously stopping at the end only to pay the toll. Something of the same sort could be done on the Causeway because already one can see that the slow moving traffic takes the centre an pursues its way unheedful of other traffic. This would not intrude on the traffic rules and regulations, and I am sorry that the Bill does not place before us some provision to take control in this direction.

The measure itself is really an amendment to the Main Roads Act. The only complaint I have against the Bill is that the clauses from No. 5 onwards do not really belong to the Main Roads Act. Members who sat with me on the Town Planning Royal Commission will realise that the clauses from No. 5 onwards should be transferred to the Town Planning Act, because they really propose to confer power on the town planner in the newer areas of the city, that is, those parts yet to be built on.

There is one clause to which the Government should pay particular attention. I think it would be wise if all the clauses relating to the payment of compensation were withdrawn because they are unsoundly based. Let me explain my view. When local and controlled access roads are brought into being, we shall have areas known as cul-de-sacs in which there will be houses planned more or less in a semicircle and the road fronting them will be used only by the houses within that area. I understand that the question of cul-de-sacs has not been considered by the town planning authorities. There would be a short road with houses on each side blocked at the ends by another couple of houses and the only people who would enter such a road would be the occupants of the houses or those who are delivering services to them.

These cul-de-sacs eventually grow into areas which are regarded as highly desirable parts in which to live. The Bill does not take into consideration that sort of thing but only proposes to grant compensation to those who have land facing a street which does not get access to the main road. It does not take into consideration the value of land in a street that has access to a main road. It is one-way traffic and no betterment clause is provided. Goodness knows what this proposal will cost the Government if it is persisted in! The cost to the Government should be nothing at all, but if the city grows in the manner we expect it to do, it will cost the Government a fabulous sum of money, because everyone who has land in an area regarded as not having access to the main road will ask for compensation, and everyone who has land on a road that has access to a main road will expect to reap the enhanced value without any reward to the Government. Let us suppose that land facing a street which has not access to the main road is selling at £150 a block. Land in a street that has access to the main road might sell easily at £350 to £400.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do not you think it might be a disadvantage in view of all the traffic passing it?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No, because a lot of people would regard that as beneficial, especially the owners of corner blocks.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: A lot of people do not like the traffic passing their homes.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In places where they have access roads, the blocks bring a higher price.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Roads that are not access roads have a higher residential value because of quietness and seclusion.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not mind which way it is taken, but all this Bill does is to provide for the payment of compensation, and I do not think the Government can afford that sort of thing. The Government cannot afford to pay compensation to people who might or might not have improved their property and yet recline not one penny from those who have definitely received enhanced value for their property. I seriously urge the Minister to accept the provisions of the Bill relating to road building, but to withdraw the clauses regarding compensation. To adopt them would be altogether too dangerous until this matter has been given considerable thought by whoever undertakes the town planning of the city.

If members read the report of the Royal Commission on Town Planning, they will find that the betterment clauses caused the Commission considerable concern and lengthy sittings in order to achieve what is included in the report. This is a most complicated matter. From the British report, we learned, a great deal, but even in Great Britain, the preliminary betterment yielded no result. The existing Town Planning Act contains a betterment provision, but we, as a Commission, learned that up to date not one solitary claim has been made by the Town Planning Board for betterment.

The Minister for Transport: You say that the houses would front on to the main highway, but I understand the intention is to stop that sort of thing.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: But some streets will have access to main roads.

The Minister for Transport: Local access roads will be made as well as the controlled access roads.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: And blocks on those roads are likely to bring higher prices than those that are set back, unless people regard the more or less closed areas as more desirable. Whichever way

it is put, there will be a betterment in some of those areas, and no provision is made for that. There is a curious clause that I do not think covers the position in any way and it is certainly very involved. It reads—

> Where the compensation is to be accessed by the Court, the Court shall take into account in assessing the compensation—agreement if any, by the Commissioner pursuant to subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (g) of this subsection; benefit, if any, which may accrue to land in which the claimant has an estate or interest as a result of the construction or improvement, by the Commissioner or any other authority at any time after the proclamation of the controlled-access road, upon land adjacent to the land in respect of which compensation is claimed, of a road whether a local-access road or any other road subsidiary to the road; or by reason of the proclamation of the controlled-access road.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That is simple!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It is about as clear as mud. While the payment of compensation may be refused, there is no suggestion that any betterment should be charged to the individual whose land is being improved.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: How could you establish the value of betterment?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Has the hon. member read the report of the Royal Commission?

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I have not.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It contains pages of suggestions, but I shall not weary the House by repeating the long story of betterments. I ask the hon. member whether he considers that any Government should go on paying compensation to landowners in the outer suburbs, after work has been undertaken with the general approval of Parliament for the better building of the city, without asking for any return to balance it. I do not think it can be done. A man might buy a piece of land 100 or 200 yards from settlement in the hope that a road will be built and that he will reap the enhanced value. We should not undertake this type of development without asking for something in return. I am heartily in favour of the proposal to build this type of road, but I would seriously ask the Government to withdraw the compensation clauses until they have been given a complete and thorough investigation by whoever is appointed town planning commissioner. I support the measure.

HON. W. R HALL (North-East) [7.46]: I support the Bill. I think it is a good one in so far as it will tend to create more safety than we have today on our roads. Getting away from the compensation clauses, the Bill seems to suggest that highways, such as Stirling Highway, will not have as many side streets from which traffic will have access to the main road or highway. Taking Stirling Highway from Broadway to Claremont, I would say there are more than a dozen side streets which have no intersection, but simply lead on to the main highway. They tend to steady the traffic on the highway to a slower pace than it could go, and at the same time lead to more accidents.

Side streets from which traffic can go anywhere have a tendency to throw out of balance the main stream of traffic on a highway, thereby taking away some of the value of the highway. It was quite noticeable to me in recent months that where a bus company was using a side street to go off Stirling Highway to Hollywood Hospital—at Williams-rd., I think—the bus had to run on to the footpath in order to go around. It struck my car in the process of getting around.

Although the driver tried to stick to the road, which was only about 10 ft. wide, and I got up on the footpath, he could not get around without his righthand mudguard taking a fair amount of duco off my vehicle. The roads are too narrow to carry this traffic, whether it be motorcar or omnibus. Traffic has been a problem in the city for many years, and today it is more dangerous than ever to drive a vehicle. Steps will have to be taken to control the speed of traffic.

Hon. G. Bennetts: The magistrate is helping us a great deal now.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I am afraid the magistrate cannot do much, with the roads as they are. I am not as widely travelled as Dr. Hislop, but I have driven in Melbourne and Sydney, and I took particular notice of the position regarding St. Kilda-rd. where there are several lines of traffic —one for cars, one for utilities and one for heavy traffic—and I realise that under such conditions traffic can travel faster with greater safety. That is because of the width of the road. We will possibly see the day when we shall in our main highways, have something in the nature of St. Kilda-rd. By that I mean that rather than allow vehicular traffic to have access from side streets to the highways, it would be better to have an access road which had an intersection to it such as we find at Broadway, and also at Bay View Terrace in Claremont. We could then look forward to having safety lights, but at present it would be impossible to have them on the numerous streets between the two points I have mentioned.

If we have local access roads gazetted so as to have an access road to the highway every half mile or so, as I understand the Bill provides, it would eliminate the possibility of traffic coming on to the high-

way from the side streets and would thereby create a better flow of vehicular traffic. The same conditions apply to Canning Highway, and to a lesser degree on the Great Eastern Highway where we get beyond the precincts of the city proper. In giving this power to the Main Roads Department the Bill will be of assistance in making progress, even if it is only a little progress. It will be the cause of preventing accidents and, perhaps, loss of life.

We all know that numerous accidents occur today, which cause concern not only to the judiciary and the legislators of the State but to members of the general public. Many people, when they read the newspaper in the morning, look for the reports of accidents. The Minister, after listening to Dr. Hislop, may be able to iron out some of the problems in regard to compensation. No doubt the Bill deals, to some extent, with town planning, and apparently if local access roads are provided for, the building lines will have to be placed further back, and the footpaths made narrower to allow of a greater width of road for traffic. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

On motion by Hon. G. Fraser, debate adjourned.

BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [7.55] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill but, in my opinion, a necessary one. I was surprised to learn that there was still legislation embodied in the Criminal Code which permitted of an aboriginal native offender being hanged in public. The Bill proposes to alter that state of affairs by deleting the words "except in the case of an aboriginal native offender" in Section 678 of the Code, and deleting the last paragraph of the same section. Section 678 reads—

> The punishment of death is executed by hanging the offender by his neck until he is dead. The execution, except in the case of an aboriginal native offender, is required to take place within the walls or enclosed yard of a prison. The time and place of execution are to be appointed by the Governor.

I do not intend to read the whole of the section. The last paragraph states—

> The punishment of death in the case of an aboriginal native offender may be carried out at such place as may be appointed by the Governor, and if the place appointed be without the walls of a prison, the foregoing provisions except as to the means of execution, do not apply, but the execution is required to take place in public, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Colonial Secretary.

I think that in our enlightened times this is a blot on the legislation and should be removed. This section was included in the Criminal Code with the idea of its being a deterrent. I know of people who were present at the public hanging of a native in Roebourne.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: When?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Not too many years ago; about the 1920's. I recall that a member of another place was present at such a hanging.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That was before 1920.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Yes, but I know people, who were still alive in 1920, who saw the hanging. To the amazement of the authorities, the punishment did not turn out as expected. The person who was to be hanged had already had judgment passed on him by the native tribes, and they turned the whole show into a great corroboree. Today we can see and hear the story enacted in the corroborees of the tribes around Roebourne. Anyway, the fact remains that this provision is still in our legislation, and in these enlightened times, I think we should do away with it. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Suburban) [7.58]: There does not seem to be any harm in the Bill because no native has been executed, I should think, for the last thirty or forty years—and to my certain knowledge not since 1920.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: You are quite right; not for 30 or 40 years.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Since then there has been a native court, and I do not think a native has been executed for, possibly, 50 years. The present provision is somewhat obsolete and certainly requires alteration.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [7.59]: The Attorney-General advises me that he is quite in accord with the amendment. The present provision is an archaic survival of bygone legislation. As Mr. Barker has said, it was probably intended in the first instance to be a deterrent to the natives, who were not able to read newspapers or appreciate the penalties that were inflicted without they actually saw them imposed. It was felt, apparently, that there was some merit in having public hangings. But as Mr. Parker said, it is many years since such public hangings were conducted. The Government has no objection to the Bill; in fact, it is entirely in accord with it.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North—in reply) [8.0]: I am pleased with the reception the Bill has received and I am

sure that everyone agrees that these provisions should be struck out of the Criminal Code.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Suburban) [8.3]: I agree with the provisions of the Bill, the effect of which will be that only full-blooded natives will come under the authority of the Commissioner of Native Affairs. The Bill goes on to provide that an application can be made to a magistrate by a coloured person, or by the Commissioner, to have such person declared a native and as such he would be under the administration of the Commissioner of Native Affairs. If the Bill is passed, certain complications will arise at various institutions. For instance, Alvan House will cease to come under the control of the department because the people at that institution, if the Bill is agreed to, will not be classified as natives and the same will apply to many of our missions.

When one comes to analyse the position, one wonders why some of these people should be classified as natives. In the animal world it is the sire that transmits the seed and nearly all these coloured people are descendants of white fathers. In America, an American Indian child by a white man or white woman is not classified as an Indian; he is an ordinary American citizen and I do not see why we should call any descendant of a white person a native. If a person is the offspring of a white man and a native mother, or a coloured mother, I see no reason why that person should be put into a special class and be called anything other than a citizen of Australia.

These people are entitled to the rights enjoyed by any other white citizen of Australia. All sorts of migrants have come into this country and they have their rights, but there seems to be a prejudice as regards coloured people. A number of the offspring of natives are extremely clever and able people. Members will have read of many of these people, including such figures as the well known artist Namatjira. There are a vast number of white people who, I regret to say, are far below a great many full blooded natives in culture, cleanliness and decent living. But we do not put those people into a special category, and I am firmly of the opinion that if we grant to natives the same status as we enjoy, they will act accordingly. I am sorry to say that in the past these people have not been treated as one would like. One has only to go round and see the hovels in which they are bound to live.

The Minister for Transport: They are not bound to live in them.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: How can they live otherwise? Our laws prevent them from coming into certain towns at certain hours.

The Minister for Transport: Which towns?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I think there are a number of them where natives are not allowed into the towns after six o'clock at night.

The Minister for Transport: I know of many where they are enjoying the same privileges as whites.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: There are some, but very few; I refer particularly to some of the towns in the South-West and the eastern districts. The natives in those towns are living in most shocking hovels. We would not allow any white man to live in that way, yet we allow natives, who are the offspring of white people, to exist under such conditions. We must do something and once these people are treated as ordinary citizens of Australia, adequate provision will have to be made for them to live in a proper manner. We are educating them, but unfortunately the children go from these hovels to the schools and then have to return to the hovels. I have been astounded to see how well cared for these children are even though they live under such shocking conditions.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is a credit to their mothers.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I realise that it is not the job of the local authorities, but they do not attempt to assist these people if they are living outside the townships. Water is not provided and these people cannot afford to get it laid on because so many of these hovels are a mile outside a township. Something more must be done and the only way we can achieve what we desire is to make them citizens. I do not say that we should provide them with houses of the same standard as must be built under the bylaws of the various local authorities.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Why not?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Because the cost of the houses that are built in accordance with the building bylaws would be beyond the amount which the State could afford. In my youth people used to build their own houses and although they were quite comfortable they would be below the standard now required by present-day building bylaws. In the lower portion of

Mosman Park, where I live, people used to erect their own homes by the light of hurricane lamps. These structures were built of wood and the work done after the men knocked off their ordinary employment. That type of house would not be allowed today, and so I think that something should be done to see that our by-laws are altered in order to enable these so-called natives to live in houses of a lower standard than is now required. If that were done these people, who are mostly in the lower income group, would be able to build their own homes.

Hon. J. McI. Thomson: How do you propose to build these houses?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I think that the Government must make them available. Do not let us forget that the Government has to provide houses for indigent white people and therefore I think the Government should do the same for the indigent people who are descended from natives. If this Bill is agreed to, such people will then become indigent white people.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: They will be precluded from associating with friends and relatives who are perhaps full-bloods.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Why should they not associate with their full-blooded relations?

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: This would prevent them because they would become white people.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: That does not stop them. If the Bill is passed, the definition of a native will simply apply to a full-blooded descendant of the original inhabitants of Australia. Up North I have seen full-bloods working on the wharves and they do excellent work. Some people say that they do not deserve to be called white people because they are lazy and indolent, but they are the descendants of white fathers. If they have some of the characteristics of their fathers, they cannot help it. Why should we debar them from becoming Australian citizens simply because of that. It is regrettable, but nevertheless true, that there are a great many white people who are lazy, but because they are lazy we do not do anything to them, but look after them when they become indigent. So why not look after these people in the same way? They will have to comply with all our laws in the same way as any other Australian person.

The police will have to adopt the same principles as apply to any other Australian and why should a new Australian be better treated than a white descendant of the original inhabitants of Australia? I ask members to give the Bill very serious consideration and look into it very thoroughly. They should try to get away altogether from the idea that we have amongst us an inferior class of person. They are all human beings with the same feelings as we have. Some of them have an infinitely greater capacity than a great many of us in their particular walks of life. A number of them are extremely hard-working people and a great many are extremely good mechanics.

The Minister for Transport: I have not struck them.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Has the Minister not struck a good mechanic among them?

The Minister for Transport: I have known of one.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: We do not keep a white man in the background because he is lazy or because he has not perhaps as many brains as we would like him to possess. I think we should do something, and this Bill is a step in the right direction. It has been suggested that the Bill will give these people the right to vote. It will, but the remedy is not to keep them in the state in which they are at present. What we should do is to strike out the provision in the Electoral Act which compels them to vote, and we should also do away with the provision dealing with compulsory voting and compulsory enrolment. If that were done, I think we would have the greatest objection removed.

Hon. J. McI. Thomson: Do you mean that to apply to these people?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: To everybody. There are a great many people who vote now who have not the foggiest notion of what they are voting for and who get very annoyed when they are taken to vote.

Hon. L. C. Diver: They would be extremely clever to follow it.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Exactly. Yet we require them compulsorily to vote. I am not going to enter into an argument concerning the rights or wrongs of compulsory voting or compulsory enrolment. Let us assume for the purpose of the Bill that there is no compulsory voting or compulsory enrolment. If we get that out of our mind, it may be that this Bill will pass the second reading. I support the measure.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [8.18]: We have been asked by Mr. Parker to give the Bill very serious consideration. I want members if possible to give serious consideration to the repercussions it will have. I do not think members have even thought about that. The long Title of the Native Administration Act passed in 1905 reads as follows:—

> An Act to make provision for the better protection and care of the native inhabitant of Western Australia.

Now, with one fell stroke of the pen, we are going to take away that care and protection which the native has and throw him to the whole wide world.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What do you mean by the whole wide world?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It will leave him open to every possible and feasible method of exploitation.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Is he not able to cope with it?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of course he cannot, and the hon. member knows it. Fancy a man who is 1/128th part native being able to cope with the white man's laws. It is just too silly.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I am speaking of a white man's descendants.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The hon. member has a very poor idea of what the Bill means if he only talks of a white man's descendant, because the Bill will take away protection from every native who is not a full-blood.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They are white descendants, are they not

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If he is not a full-blood, he is not a native under the Act. So if he be only 1/128th part, he will still have no protection if the Bill is passed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: What protection has he got now?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Government protects him in a number of ways.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Do not be silly! Of course, the Government protects him, and the hon. member knows it as well as I do.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Tell me one thing which the Government gives him under the Act.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Government gives him protection and rations.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No. That is only to the indigent fellow.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It seems that in the last few weeks we have had a number of people writing to the various newspapers, trying to tell us what we should do in regard to natives in Western Australia.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: They are our electors.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The humbug that I have read in some of these letters in the Press recently will not, in my opinion, help those natives whom the hon. member is hoping to assist by this amending Bill. A lot has been talked about assimilation, without too many people realising what they mean by that term. In my opinion, there can be only two types of assimilation. One is sexual assimilation and the other social. To my way of thinking, sexual assimilation is out of the question. In so far as social assimilation is concerned, when the native proves that he is capable of being assimilated socially, then the public itself should be ready to assimilate these people and take them into their homes and treat them as white Australians; but it is a lot of nonsense for people to say that the authorities and the Government should take this sort of action by law. We cannot compel a white man by law to take a native into his home.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No one suggests we should.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The hon. member should read the papers and he will see what has been suggested. To give him an idea of the course of action that has been suggested, I will read one of the statements of the Federal Minister for Territories, Mr. Hasluck, in the paper recently. I do not exactly know what he wants us to do, but I do think that after making a statement like this he should be asked to apologise. It is as follows:—

> Australians should kick politicians hard until action is taken on aborigines, declared the Minister for Territories (Mr. Hasluck) to the National Association for the Advancement of the Native Race.
>
> "Politicians are very sensitive animals, and any wind of disfavour is felt immediately," said Mr. Hasluck in an address on native affairs last week.

A statement like that coming from a responsible Minister of the Crown deserves the highest censure. I wonder how many of these people Mr. Hasluck has invited into his home. I wonder how many natives the people who write to the papers have taken into their homes. I think we can safely say none, certainly only a few. But they have the temerity to say that politicians should do this and that Governments should do that. Wherever possible the Government should put up decent hutments and make sanitary and other provisions.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: What about education?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They are educated, too. No child is debarred from going to school. Some children are being educated better today than ever before. What is going to happen to our natives around the camps if this protection is taken away? I wonder if Mr. Parker realises what will happen when some of our degenerate whites and others take a few bottles of plonk around the camp fire.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They do it now.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There is a law to stop them doing so. Take away that protection and it will not be difficult to visualise what will happen. In a few years' time this problem will be 10 times worse

than it is today. It is a serious matter. That is why this Bill should be given serious consideration in order to find out the repercussions it will have on Western Australia and, in fact, on Australia as a whole. We have given these natives protection and we are trying to uplift them as much as we can. The only way in which we can start to assimilate them is when they have shown that they are capable of being assimilated; it will then be the duty of the public. The natives have to be educated to this end; it cannot be done by Act of Parliament. I have spoken to missionaries and asked them what they thought about the matter and they replied that they thought it was wrong.

Hon. H. C. Strickland: Which mission?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Church of Christ for one.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: No.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, I happen to know. They do not want citizenship rights given to everybody, as would happen under this Bill. I think the mission people have had far more experience than anybody in this House. I repeat we must consider the repercussions that will follow. What I am worried about is what is going to happen to these natives—they would not be called natives once the Bill is passed. The repercussions will be very serious in 10 years' time and I hate to visualise them. I urge the House to vote against the second reading of the measure.

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [8.27]: I support the Bill and commend Mr. Strickland for bringing it down. Mr. Logan said that he was speaking with authority and that he knew more about natives than anyone else in the House. If members will look at the report of the Department of Native Affairs which has been laid on the Table they will find I was superintendent in charge of native affairs at Le Grange where I had control of something like 200 natives. So I can also claim some knowledge of these people. The Bill does pot deal with natives but with all coloured people who have mixed blood. These people are not natives. They have every right to be given citizenship rights and equal rights with the rest of the white people.

Assimilation does not mean that we should take them into our homes. That is optional. If one wants to invite a Chinaman into one's home, one may do so; but it is optional. The same applies to these folk. They are good people and they are entitled to something better than we have given them in the past. The public should do something and no one can say that we have not given them a rotten deal in the past. I listened closely to Mr. Parker and what he had to say in regard to homes, missions, etc. which at present are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Native Affairs and which, if the Bill is passed, would no longer be under them, I would suggest that the children in homes such as Sister Kate's Home and Alvan House should be wards of the State. The difficulty would then be overcome.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They would come under the Government department.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: The children in Sister Kate's home are not natives. The Bill does not deal with full-blood natives, but with coloured people who are less than full-bloods. I know of appalling cases of men who fought in the war and came back but are still, under our law, classed as natives. In my opinion, that is not fair or right.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Did they apply for citizenship?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: They would not, because they consider it would be like carrying a tag, like applying for a dog license. If this Bill is passed, white people generally must be prepared to play their part. It would be useless to agree to this measure and then treat them as we do today. I read recently of their not being allowed to attend church in one district in the South-West, and in other places they are not permitted to go to the local picture show.

Hon. L. A. Logan: They can go to picture shows now.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: In some places, but not in others. They are proud people. They do not ask for charity. They do not want us to build houses to be given to them, but are willing to buy them on a rental basis. All they want is equal rights with us.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: What percentage of them?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: All of them. I have never heard of any missions crying out against natives being given citizenship rights. It was my privilege last week to visit a mission at Roelands where I found a happy community. I discussed this subject with the superintendent and he was in favour of these rights being accorded to natives. And that was a Church of Christ mission! Natives are brought up in missions and receive the same schooling as white children. Then they are thrown into the world and receive a great jolt when they are not accepted into our communities. That sets them back. That is a reason why a lot of them drift to their native state again. I hate to repeat it, but if we pass this Bill—and I think we must, because the public are demanding such a measure—we must be prepared to do our part and accept these people as citizens, the same as they would be accepted anywhere else.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.33]: The Bill affords me great delight. I was born in Western Australia and was not imported. I am proud of the State and

of every bit of Australia, and I am proud of the coloured race which was born in it. I am not, however, proud of the treatment the people of that race have received at the hands of the well-intentioned folk who set out to try to help them but broke down half-way through the job. We have in this State a very learned gentleman in Dr. Linley Henzell, and in his report as Commissioner of Public Health, he discusses the native population. I wish to quote from that document.

Before I do so, I would like to point out that, as I understand the Bill, it does not, as Mr. Logan suggested, propose to take away what has been given to the full-blood natives, but seeks to give advantages to those people who are the product of the white race—people who, as I told Mr. Logan a few weeks ago, would not be here if it were not for white men who did not play the game but went to various parts of the State and associated with native girls. In his report, at page 13, Dr. Henzell says—and I would like Mr. Logan to take notice of this—

> The southern natives, 98 per cent. of whom are half-castes or have a varying proportion of white blood, have a population of approximately 3,600 and an estimated birth rate of 36 per 1,000, which is over 50 per cent. higher than the white. The higher rate of natural increase makes them a growing minority problem.

Hon. L. A. Logan: That is on account of child endowment.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I think that is a very feeble statement.

Hon. L. A. Logan: It is not feeble; it is a fact.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The remark does not do the hon. member credit.

Hon. L. A. Logan: You do not know much about them!

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: In 1905, the figures would have been very small and the problem proportionately small. Today it is one of great magnitude. Should the increase continue at the same rate, then in 10 or 15 years' time, if nothing is done about the matter, we will find that the Government of the day and the people generally will have a problem they will not be able to handle. These people came into the world the same way as we did, and they are going out the same way. What happens in between their birth and their demise is the responsibility of each and every one of us. I heard the hon. member say, "Are we going to take them into our homes?"

I speak with authority when I say that for nine years my mother reared a native child. When he reached the age of 14, because there was no further control over him, he went away and we have not seen him from that day to this. I know one of the pioneering businessmen of Fremantle who reared a native boy and the same thing occurred because no provision was made to prevent it. The Education Department is giving full-bloods and half-castes the best education that can be provided, but there is a break between the ages of 14 and 18 when there is no provision for their further education. When our children reach the age of 14 or 15 they can go to secondary schools here, but such facilities are not generally made available to the natives.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Only those who live in Perth can do that.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is correct. The native children are allowed to drift back to their original conditions. Dr. Henzell says, on page 13 of his report—

> Most of the males are employed by the white population on farms or in townships. They live in fairly close geographic proximity to the whites, but there the resemblance ends. Although those earning award rates of wages have to pay income tax and social service contributions and all draw child endowment for the children, not one has as yet been provided with a house by the State Housing Commission although they contribute to the country's finances whence the State Housing Commission draws its funds.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Do they make application?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I will admit that since this was printed, something has been done in that direction by the Commission. Dr. Henzell continues—

> Denied access to their former hunting grounds which are now devoted to the white man's agricultural and pastoral pursuits, they are compelled to work for the white man for their livelihood and yet denied a communal life with him. They are condemned to live in shack and shelter on the fringe of townships and only too frequently the only place where there is water and material from which they can build their shelters is the town's sanitary site.
>
> Need one be surprised at the standard of hygiene and sanitary conscience of a community brought up on an area devoted to the deposition of the white man's rubbish and excreta?

On page 14 of the report he states—

> There can be no doubt that the initial step to be taken in their habilitation is the provision of housing approximating in standard to that of the rest of the community, and the education of the young at any rate among them, in the ability to live

therein. It is impossible to teach any man to use a tool unless he be given the tool with which to practise. It is not possible to learn the art of living on a sanitary site.

There can be no doubt that the majority of natives are at present incapable of using properly housing accommodation which is up to the white standard. Nevertheless, unless efforts are made to educate them in its use, they will never learn.

Any member who gets up in this House and says that this Bill is not a step in the right direction, is living in the dark ages.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Tell us how it will help the natives.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This question is as vital as the subject of main roads which we were discussing earlier. Hundreds of thousands of pounds are to be spent on main roads and the subject of native affairs is one of equal importance. Someone will have to make a start somewhere, despite what Mr. Logan said about the people who have been writing to the Press. I would like him to meet the lady who wrote the first two contributions; it would be an education for him. She herself was trained in the schools and continued her education until she is now training native children to become good citizens. It is not much good my getting up and letting my lungs go, if I am not prepared to do something about it. I make the declaration now that whatever law is passed for the betterment of these people, it will be my earnest endeavour to carry out its provisions, and I will assist in that direction by personal activity.

On motion by Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th October.

HON. R. J. BOYLEN (South-East) [8.45]: The only point I am sorry about in connection with this Bill is that it does not go considerably further. Mr. Craig said that if the Bill went the whole way, he would be only too happy to support it, and I think he has made a similar assertion on previous occasions. I remember years ago—prior to my entering this House—his having made the same comment, that if the measure then before the House sought to give the same franchise for this Chamber as the Legislative Assemly, he would vote for it. While I believe he is sincere in that regard, I think he must realise that it would be futile to bring a Bill of that nature before this House.

On that occasion Mr. Craig criticised the powers of this House, and even went so far as to say that the powers conferred on it were greater than those conferred on the Upper House of any other State Parliament in Australia, or even the House of Lords in England. The Bill now before us is comparatively short and contains only three provisions, the first being that members may be elected to this House at the age of 21 years instead of 30 years, as at present. That question should be given serious consideration as the existing provision was made 50 years ago. At that time it may have been taken for granted that some who aspired to seats in this House might have lacked the education required of a member of Parliament, though that is doubtful as a similar provision was not made for members of another place.

Today, at all events, education is available to everyone from six years of age to at least 14 years, and the average child at that age can now pass the Junior examination. On that foundation, he should, by the time he reaches 21 years of age, be capable of taking a seat in this House. In private industry today one finds many men of less than 30 years of age occupying high administrative and executive positions. When the qualifications of an applicant for such a job are asked nowadays, there is usually no query as to the age of the applicant, and I think the time has come when this provision, which was made at least half a century ago, should be reviewed.

It is often implied that this is not a party House, but surely members realise that a statement to that effect would be nothing short of absurd. Elections for this House are contested on party lines, just as are elections for the Legislative Assemly. We have, contesting elections for this Chamber, Independents, members of the Liberal Party, members of the Country Party and of the Labour Party, so it must be admitted that this is a party House and measures coming before it are dealt with on party lines. That, of course, has been the case in the past, is the case now and will continue to be so for all time.

Hon. A. R. Jones: That is not quite right.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: The hon. member will not tell me that when a so-called Independent comes into this House questions are not decided on party lines—

Hon. H. L. Roche: How long have you been voting for the Government?

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I am talking of the election of members to this House. We support the Government when we know it is in the right. I was referring to the election of candidates and not the debating of measures in this Chamber. The main provision of the Bill is to extend the franchise to either the wife or husband of

the householder. I think the great majority of those with whom I and my friends come into contact know that although a house may be legally in the name of either the wife or husband, both in fact consider themselves the possessors of the property, and see no need to adopt legal processes to decide the question, so surely there is no reason why they both should not have the right to vote.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Can you name seven, offhand, who would like the franchise for this House?

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I could name a hundred, and could put a thousand on the roll if they were entitled to vote, and they would be anxious to exercise their franchise.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Name ten people who have approached you for the franchise. You cannot.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: If I did, the hon. member would not have any opportunity of checking on them, but in fact, I could name a hundred; and they would be people who take an intelligent interest in the politics of this House. It has been stated that if the franchise were extended it would make no difference to the voting in elections for this Chamber or to the ratio of the political components of this House, but the speaker who makes a statement such as that is trying only to convince himself. Such an extension would make a considerable difference to the voting, and that is why we will not achieve it. The same result would follow in this House as in any other State Upper House in the Commonwealth, if the franchise were extended in that way; its political views would vary on different occasions, and the security of tenure of seats by members would be dependent upon their actions in the House. I know of many families in which there are five or six adults, and in spite of that there is only one vote for this House in such homes, though those people all take an intelligent interest in the politics of the country.

There are many of our pioneers who spent their lives in prospecting or developing various industries in the State but who, owing to conditions beyond their control, find themselves today without the qualification necessary to entitle them to vote in the election of members to this House. While we are prepared to allow that state of affairs to continue, we are maintaining a type of dictatorship and a system of sectional legislation, with the result that measures are being passed by the representatives—in this House— of no more than 30 per cent. of the electors of another place. When a similar measure was before this House in the past, it was stated that the franchise as it existed was right, because those who had most to lose in the country should have the greatest say.

I believe that every person who has reached 21 years of age or has assumed responsibilities, either business or domestic, has his or her all to lose. Even with the present franchise, one may have more to lose than another in that one may possess greater financial resources or more property than another, but where is to be the line of demarcation? If members have taken part in a recruiting rally, seeking the services of young men of less than 21 years of age for the defence of the country, they will agree that, were those young men to ask whether, should they return from that service, they would be given a vote in elections for this Chamber, it would certainly be promised to them.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker : They were promised the vote.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: By whom?

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: By the present Government.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: If that question were asked during a recruiting rally, I am sure that those young men would be given that promise. After all, we were willing enough to ask them—at 18 years of age—to assume the responsibility of defending the country and offering everything they had, even their lives, for it; yet, now that they have returned, we say to them, "You have not the qualifications to vote for the Upper House of the State Parliament."

Hon. C. W. D. Barker. If they have not the real qualification, no one has.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I am surprised that the recent congress of the R.S.L. did not do something to ensure that a different attitude would be taken on this question by members of this Chamber. In these days, when people are all capable of doing their own thinking, I believe every elector of the State should have the right to vote for this House, yet the present measure does not ask that. All it seeks is that the age of candidates for this House should be reduced from 30 to 21 years, that the husband or wife of the householder should have the vote, and that plural voting be abolished. I believe many members will agree that plural voting is wrong in principle. I hope that the provisions contained in this measure will be given full consideration and that an advance will be made towards a more democratic and less dictatorial attitude in regard to the election of members to this House.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM (South-East) [8.55]: This measure, which seems to be a hardy annual, invariably has its genesis in another place, and is generally accorded the same response on arrival here —I agree that that is the proper treatment for it. Any measure as vital to this Chamber as to affect its own constitution should originate here. Members may

agree that the time is ripe for some revision as is suggested in the Bill, but surely a move in that direction should originate here and not in another place.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Do you think the time is ripe?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: For some change, yes.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Will you support this Bill?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: No, because I do not think this is the change that is due.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Just wait till you get back to Kalgoorlie!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I will face up to what I say in this Chamber at Kalgoorlie or elsewhere. Interesting figures are quoted from time to time about the number of people on the rolls for this House as compared with rolls for legislatures for which voting is compulsory. We also hear of the number of people who, having the qualifications, trouble to vote at elections for this House. The explanation of the apparent lack of interest is, I believe, either that the electors who are qualified are satisfied, or they are apathetic; and it is the belief of many people that they are apathetic. Supposing we do widen the franchise, as has been suggested—

Hon. R. J. Boylen: This is your Government's Bill.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I do not care whose Bill it is. Supposing the franchise should be widened—I have suggested that because this Bill has originated in another place we should not agree to it—

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Why?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: The Bill applies to the franchise of this House and so should have originated here. If we were prepared to double the number of people qualified to vote at elections for this House, I doubt if there would be any great increase in the number of voters. I have never heard any group of people between the ages of 21 and 30 years voicing an urgent desire to vote for this House or to be allowed to nominate as candidates for it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: No, they know the law is against them.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If people want something badly enough they will let their voices be heard and that has not occurred in regard to this question. I have not heard the wife of any man qualified to vote for this House asking for the right to vote also. Until there is an outcry in that regard I will not support such legislation as this, just in case they may wish to vote. If we have only one quarter of the people on the Legislative Council roll who are entitled to exercise the franchise, I suggest that they are the only electors who have taken advantage of the voting qualifications to which they are entitled. There is nothing to stop the other three-quarters from using the voting powers which they possess. Any member knows full well that if he likes to conduct an intensive campaign he can encourage those voters to take advantage of their extra qualifications.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The same thing applies to the Legislative Assembly elections.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, but the penalty of £2 stirs them up to vote for that House. Until the time arrives when those people already enrolled for the Assembly clamour to have their names put on the roll of a Council province, I cannot see any reason why we should extend the franchise. To give the wife of an elector the right to have a vote is entirely unnecessary.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Will you support the holding of a referendum on the question?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: No, because half the people who would vote are not qualified to do so. This Chamber is claimed to be the most solidly entrenched House in the British Empire.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: It is.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: And I am proud of it. Not only is it the most solidly entrenched House in the British Empire but also its franchise is the most envied. Further, it has the best record for showing plain, solid commonsense.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Solid is right!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It also has a record for sound reasoning on legislation far greater than that of any other State in the Commonwealth.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Legislation for whom?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: In one State the Upper House was completely abolished and its people have never ceased to regret it.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Tell us another one!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Other States from time to time have also abolished the Upper Houses but have reinstated them.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Which State did that?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: New South Wales abolished the Upper House at one time and brought it into being again.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: No!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Well, it was Victoria.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: No.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I will not enter into an argument on that, but I clearly remember reading in some publication that other States of the Commonwealth abolished the Upper Chamber and, at a later stage, reinstated it.

The Minister for Transport: The public of France did it four times and restored it four times.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: France is a little different from the States of the Commonwealth. It has also been mentioned that at one time the R.S.L. considered a member of that organisation should be elegible to have a vote for the election of members to this House. At that time I did not agree with that principle and I still do not. I am a member of the R.S.L. and have been a delegate to its conventions, at which I have expressed the same opinion. I have never heard any great number of R.S.L. members clamouring to have a vote in Legislative Council elections. I do not see any sense in enforcing them to possess that right.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Not to force it on them, but to give them that right.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: They do not want it. Mr. Boylen said that he was amazed at the R.S.L. not applying during this last conference for the right of its members to have a vote in the Legislative Council elections.

Hon. E. M. Davies: They did not want that right for R.S.L. members alone.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It must be remembered that the R.S.L. is entirely non-political. At the end of the last war, I was a strong advocate for the R.S.L to become a political body.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: This seems to be outside the scope of the Bill. Soldiers are not mentioned in this measure.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I know they are not, but I am referring to the remarks passed by another member on the reasons why the R.S.L. did not apply for the right to vote for members of this House. There are one or two changes that I would support to enlarge the Legislative Council franchise, but they are not mentioned in this Bill.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Do you not agree that the wife of a householder should have the right to vote?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I cannot see why a wife of a householder should have the right to vote.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Has she not helped him to become eligible to have that right?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If she is anxious to have the same right as her husband, all she has to say to him is, "Let us make the property a joint holding", and she automatically becomes entitled to a vote. To ask for such a provision is stupid. The limiting factor for elegibility to vote at Legislative Council elections is that a person must pay a rental of 6s. 8d. per week. No matter who the person is, whether he or she be an R.S.L. member, a married woman or anybody else, if the individual can afford to pay 6s. 8d. a week in rent that person becomes eligible to a vote.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: How does a ratepayer get on?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: The qualification on the back of the claim card sets out that the householder does not have to pay rent; he has only to live in a house for which a rental of £17 a year is paid.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Nothing is mentioned in regard to giving a wife the right to a vote.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If her husband has the right to vote, why should she be given the right automatically? At the present time a person who owns a house has a right to a vote, the person leasing it has the same right and the occupier is also entitled to a vote. There is a provision in the Bill to abolish plural voting. A man can own properties in two provinces which are contributing thousands of pounds to the wealth to the country and yet he may cast only one vote. At the same time, it is proposed in the Bill that three people who are associated with a little shack are entitled to a vote on the strength of that qualification. While our franchise gives an interested person the right to cast a voluntary vote and whilst we must continue to entice those people along to the polling booth by giving them free car rides, etc., I am not happy about increasing the scope of the Legislative Council franchise as proposed in the Bill.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Suburban) [9.10]: Members will probably be surprised when I tell them that I intend to vote against the Bill.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Yes, I am greatly surprised.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I was a member of a Select Committee that made certain recommendations which included, I think, one giving wives the right to vote in Legislative Council elections. I also had occasion at one time to introduce a Bill dealing with this subject.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Did you not at one time support provisions similar to those contained in this Bill?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The hon. member was not in this Chamber at the time, but if he listens now I will give him all the information.

Hon. G. Fraser: I think the hon. member introduced the Bill for the Government.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I am sorry the interjections prevent some of my friends from hearing what I am saying.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I introduced a Bill which included, amongst others, a provision granting wives the right to have a vote.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: How can you vote against the Bill now?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: In this instance I am against the Bill because it is not, by any means, anything like the one I introduced, nor does it have behind it the sincerity which backed my measure.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: I am sincere.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The hon. member may be sincere, but he is completely ignorant of the contents of the Bill I introduced. That Bill had for its purpose the granting of a vote to those people who were entitled to it under the spirit of the law, but not under the letter of the law. I am referring to flat-dwellers. I still maintain that a flat-dweller, such as those living in Lawson Flats, who pay, I suppose, upwards of £10 a week in rental, are entitled to a vote according to the letter of the law.

Unfortunately, some years ago flats were not built in the same way as they are now and a Crown Law Department ruling prohibited flat-dwellers from exercising a vote if the premises did not have separate entrances to their flats. In other words, people living in ramshackle accommodation that had an outside entrance were entitled to a vote, otherwise they were ineligible. That was never the intention behind the ruling given by the Crown Law Department, and my Bill sought to rectify the position. I have no objection to plural voting because I do not think it matters two straws whether a man has two votes or not. I defy any member of this House to quote me an instance during the last three Legislative Council elections of any person who has exercised a vote in two provinces.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: If I went down to the Electoral Department, I could give the hon. member any number of instances.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I would suggest to the hon. member that he go to the Electoral Department and cite such instances.

Hon. G. Fraser: As a matter of fact, Mr. Davies can quote instances of plural voting in his province.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Well, why does he not state them? He is very shy about doing so, apparently. Let us get down to bedrock. As to the proposal for a person under 21 years of age being eligible to become a member of this House, I would point out that this Chamber is a House of review and we have certain duties to perform. It is stated that this Chamber is based on party lines. If that is true, why, in a recent vote, did two members of the Labour Party vote for a Bill introduced by the Government and five members of the Country Party vote against it?

Hon. R. J. Boylen: We are not responsible for the actions of members of the Country Party.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: No, I do not suppose the hon. member is and I sincerely trust that he is not responsible for the consciences of members of his own party. I have vivid recollections of being on one side of the House on one occasion and the only persons with whom I was voting were members of the Labour Party.

The Minister for Agriculture: You have done that on several occasions.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Yes, and further, on several occasions there have been a few C.D.L. members voting on the same side as myself. I am not too sure that that is not as it should be, and I hope it will continue.

Hon. G. Fraser: But with matters of importance, the position is different.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: What could be more important than the Coogee-Kwinana Railway? During the course of their remarks some members have referred to the percentage of votes cast at elections for this Chamber. On the other hand, not one of them ventured to quote the percentage at Assembly elections prior to compulsory voting being provided for. This House is extremely fortunate. Although the franchise could be amended in some directions—I suggested, for instance, that flat-dwellers should be given a vote—nevertheless, we are extremely fortunate because those who vote for candidates for this House do so voluntarily. If an individual goes to the trouble of having his name placed on the roll, it is because he in interested in politics. Such a person must have some idea about politics and the political situation. I regret to say that sometimes they take a wrong view of matters!

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That would not be touching on party lines, would it?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Probably not. For my own part, I know there are a great many people who vote Labour when they are dealing with the Assembly but vote for me when I am a candidate.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is because you are a good member.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: At any rate, how do you know they vote for you?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I have spoken to quite a lot of them and they told me so.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is your wonderful personality!

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I know sometimes personality counts. However, that is not what we want in this House. There is one point that I agree is difficult. It is often troublesome to get people to go to the poll. However, those of us who are here have been elected by people who take an interest in this Chamber.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: By people for whom you send cars.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: That may be so.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Why not get more people to take an interest in it?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I was in favour of wives being enrolled, but not perhaps from a strictly moral point of view. It was because I thought that by putting wives on the roll it would double the strength on the roll and thereby put an end to a lot of criticism by a certain section of the community. I do not think it would make one iota of difference in the final result, because I consider the wives would vote in the same way as their husbands did.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Then why not vote for this measure?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: In the circumstances I cannot see any real merit in enrolling wives. The Bill I introduced provided that the spouse should have the vote and that the wife must be living with her husband if she was to get the vote.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That is what the Bill does.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The hon. member can tell me where the Bill says that. While he is looking it up, I shall proceed with my remarks without fear of further interruption. The proposal in the Bill is not genuine in effect and, to my mind, does not merit support because it will not give the vote to those who are really entitled to it because, in the opinion of a lawyer, they are deprived of it. Therefore, I must vote against the second reading.

On motion by Hon. E. M. Davies, debate adjourned.

BILL—MARKETING OF BARLEY ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [9.21]: This is a Bill to continue the operations of the Barley Marketing Board for another three years. I suggest to members that they might give the Bill and all its implications very serious consideration because, so far as I have been able to form an opinion on the information at present available to me, I am inclined to vote against the second reading. Up to the commencement of the last war, there was no Barley Marketing Board in this State. There was a free market and growers sold their output to maltsters and brewers or exported it oversea through various merchants.

Upon the outbreak of war, when the craze was to nationalise and control everything under national security regulations, a Barley Marketing Board was brought into operation to control the growing and marketing of barley throughout Australia. Upon the termination of hostilities in 1946, by means of a transitional Act, there was set up in Western Australia, under an Act passed by Parliament, a State Barley Board in order to continue the operations and licensing of barley growers, the determining of the areas they should grow, the marketing of their product, and so on.

The original marketing Act was extended for three years and then for a further period of three years. Now the Bill before the House proposes to extend the operations of the board for still another three years. It is interesting to note that during the operations of the board, the total area sown for barley has not increased but rather has it diminished. For example, during the year 1946-47 the total area sown to barley was 65,886 acres and in 1951-52 the area was 56,574 acres. Those figures were supplied by the Government Statistician.

As I understand it, there are two classes of barley. What is known as two-row barley and six-row barley. They appear more or less of entirely different qualities and are treated in different ways. So far as two-row barley is concerned, that type is used in this State for malting and brewing and also for pearling and for food. The whole of the production of two-row barley is acquired by the malting and brewing interests in this State, but it is not sufficient to meet the local demand. The result is that from time to time the maltsters and brewers have to import either malt or two-row barley from the Eastern States in order to make up their requirements. On the other hand, the six-row barley is exported except for a very small proportion which the local maltsters and the brewers make use of. The reason for that small proportion being used locally I will explain a little later on. In the main we may take the broad division this way: Largely all two-row barley is absorbed by the local brewers and maltsters and more could be absorbed if it were grown within the State. On the other hand, practically the whole of the six-row barley is exported.

Two years ago the Barley Board adopted bulk handling methods. As I understand the position, the business of maltsters is a pretty technical job. In preparing the malt, the maltster has to obtain an even floor, which is the technical term for what we would describe as a batch. It

is essential for the production of the best malt that it shall be made from barley of the best uniform grade. While supplies of that type were readily available to the maltsters when two-row barley was delivered in bags, it is not so easy to produce high quality malt from barley that is supplied under the bulk-handling process.

In consequence of the adoption of the bulk-handling system, the State is faced with the possibility of having inferior malt. Inferior malt necessarily implies inferior beer. Although the enthusiast may say that there is no such thing as bad beer, I think it will be generally conceded that unless beer is brewed from first-class malt, its quality will not be all that it should be. This is a very serious question for brewers and maltsters, and I understand that their predicament has been pointed out to the Barley Board but so far they have not been able to reach a satisfactory solution of their problem.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: There are satisfactory exports of beer.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: At the moment we are discussing barley. I understand that there is a good export trade for beer, and it is desirable in that regard that we maintain our reputation for exporting the highest quality of beer.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Is not all the beer exported of high quality?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The brewers have raised a protest, but the composition of the board is such that they have very little say in the matter. The board is composed of three representatives of the growers, a representative of the brewers, a representative of the malsters and an independent chairman, and, of course, the malsters and brewers are always outvoted.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not correct.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The members of the board seem to go out of their way to make it difficult for the malsters and brewers to obtain at the best possible price the supplies necessary from the Eastern States to make up the balance of their requirements. Until recently barley has been under the control of the Prices Branch, the officials of which have determined the price. That price fixing has recently gone overboard.

The Minister for Agriculture: But you are in favour of the removal of controls.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Quite so, but since price fixing has gone overboard, why the necessity for the continuance of the Barley Board? It could now be left for the brewers and malsters to negotiate with the purchasers for a fair price. Price-fixing having gone overboard, there is no need to continue the operations of the board so far as the supply of two-row barley to the breweries is concerned.

Coming to the question of six-row barley, the first demand oversea arose in 1937-39 and 1938-39. A market was developed by exporters and merchants acting in conjunction with their London operators on the Baltic Exchange, and it developed into a good trade and a profitable market. The quality was such that Western Australian barley topped the market against that from California, which had been the original source of supply to the United Kingdom. That trade was built up just before the war by private merchants exporting through their own channels. It was definitely through specialised selling; there was no question of bulk-handling in those days.

A merchant here would air-mail a sample to a merchant in the United Kingdom and keep a counterpart in Perth, and on the matching of the two samples, a market price would be fixed. Ten, 20 or 30 samples each having different characteristics would be sent away and sold and paid for on that basis. I mention this to indicate the specialised nature of barley marketing and the peculiarity and requirements respecting it. The six-row barley is largely used in the United Kingdom, but not at all in Western Australia. It was used in Western Australia during the war and then only in small quantities for the sole reason of keeping six-row barley going until the war ended and export could be resumed.

As a result of that specialised selling, the growers were able to obtain better prices for the better quality and they were encouraged to grow barley of the best quality. That happened for two years and then, as explained, the war intervened. Now, owing to developments in the last couple of years and the proposal of bulk-handling for export as well as for the local trade, we find the barley being pooled on a basis of average quality—just take it or leave it.

The British Ministry of Food had been the buyer for 10 years or so of practically the whole of the Australian export, but just before I left England, it was indicated to me that in just the same way as the base metal market was going to be freed—and it has been freed—the time was fast approaching when grain such as barley, oats and other cereals of the sort would again be dealt with on the Baltic Exchange as in the prewar years. If that should happen, I feel that Western Australia should be in a position to ensure that the trade which was built up by the merchants should be retained and expanded.

Another point in connection with barley is that if we ship in bulk, it becomes a real problem in the United Kingdom to handle it, as one of the first things to be done there is to re-bag it before it is sold and that, of course, adds to the ultimate cost to the purchaser.

Hon. A. R. Jones: What is the reason for that?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Out of a bulk cargo of 5,000 tons, a brewer may want only 100, 200 or 500 tons, and it has to be bagged for transport. Another point to be borne in mind is that a brewer may want 100 or 200 tons and it is possible for a merchant to sell him that quantity of the desired variety and obtain a good price for it. A more difficult proposition arises when a shipment of 5,000 tons has to be disposed of. At the moment the great need is to increase our exports from Australia and in respect of barley the question that arises is how can we get that increase. There are three or four methods. The first is to sell to the buyer what he wants and in the manner he wants it.

Hon. H. L. Roche: And at his price?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: No; if he is able to buy what he wants and in the manner in which he wants it, the seller is entitled to command his price because ordinary competition enters and fixes the price. Mr. Craig pointed out this afternoon that wool was the one industry that had prospered and this had been due principally to the fact that the woolgrowers have at all times resisted control. I suggest that in the sale of barley, as many channels as possible should be used. The "Financial News" recently, in a well-considered discussion of the export problems of Australia, pointed out the virtual mess into which the wheat and meat industries had fallen through control and suggested that the remedy was a minimum of interference and an encouragement of healthy competition.

I understand that with barley as with oats, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. would not undertake to handle barley in bulk unless the trustees of the Wheat Pool were given the sole selling rights. Thus the trustees of the Wheat Pool and not the Barley Board would control both the handling and the selling of barley. It would virtually become a compulsory pool, just as the trustees of the Wheat Pool tried to have a compulsory oat pool established, but another place wisely, in my opinion, would have nothing to do with it. This point should also be borne in mind that the discontinuance of the Barley Board would not necessarily end bulkhandling, or a voluntary pool. It would still be open for growers to have a voluntary pool or to engage in bulkhandling, if they so desired.

But I suggest that the opportunity should be given for the free and unfettered dealing in barley, one way or the other. We have a voluntary pool in oats, and there is no reason why there should not be a voluntary pool for barley. I am afraid that at the moment we are witnessing an exhibition of small-town politics. The board has for the last 10 years been under very efficient management, yet the trustees of the Wheat Pool are seeking control, and an order has gone forth that the management is to be transferred to the trustees of the Wheat Pool.

Hon. H. L. Roche: The growers' representatives must have approved of that.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The position as I understand it is that when the question was raised at the last meeting, two growers' representatives voted as instructed by the Farmers' Union, and one did not. I understand that member has since been told where he stands and will vote the same way as the other two members at the next meeting.

The Minister for Agriculture: I do not know where you get your information from.

Hon. H. L. Roche: He is a bit off the beam.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The hon. member would be surprised to know that I am right on the beam.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think you had better get on to a point that you know something about.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I will for a few more days defer saying precisely what I do know. When the Bill was introduced in 1946, one of the arguments presented to the House in support of it was that it was not opposed by the brewers and maltsters. Similarly in 1949 when a Bill to renew the period was brought down, the House was again informed that it was not opposed by the brewers and maltsters, but today we find, on account of the reasons I have mentioned, that the brewers and maltsters, and also the exporters, are not enamoured of a continuance of the position which has developed during the last year or two. I feel the board has outlived its usefulness, and I suggest it is not necessary as far as two-row barley is concerned and is equally unnecessary for six-row barley. For these reasons, I am not inclined to agree to the continuance of the board any further.

On motion by Hon. A. R. Jones, debate adjourned.

BILL—EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

HON. R. J. BOYLEN (South-East) [9.56]: I commend the Bill. I think it is a necessary measure. It safeguards the interests of pupils at both Government and private schools. The Minister in another House, when introducing the Bill, said he was satisfied with the present standards of the schools, but that the

measure would ensure there would be no likelihood of any inferior schools coming into being. He drew attention to an amount of something like £30,000 granted for travelling and similar allowances to children attending private schools.

That, I think, is necessary, not only so far as children attending private schools are concerned, but those attending Government schools also, and I hope it will be continued. It gives an opportunity to children who are not within an area where it is compulsory to go to school to receive the same education which is available to the great majority of youngsters in the State. An important provision in the Bill is that which places the responsibility on a pupil, who is going in for the teaching profession and to whom assistance is given, to carry on with his profession. Previously the responsibility was on a guarantor or the parents, and they were responsible if the pupil decided to withdraw.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Section 20 amended:

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The clause is not very clear. It goes on in a stream of words, more or less like a babbling brook, which could be confusing to the ordinary person who has to understand them. I move an amendment—

> That paragraph (a) of proposed new Subsection (1) be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—
>
> (a) In the case of a deaf or mute child to notify the Minister in writing of the name and whereabouts of the child within one month after he attains the age of three years.
>
> (b) In the case of a blind cerebrally palsied or mentally deficient child to notify the Minister in writing of the name and whereabouts of the child within one month after he attains the age of four years.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I ask the Minister whether the words "or guardian" should not be inserted after the word "parent" at the end of the first line of proposed new Subsection (1).

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Under the interpretations, "parent" includes the guardian and every person who is liable to maintain or has the actual custody of any child. That answers the query by Mr. Jones. I do not intend to oppose the amendment, but I do not think that there is any need for it. As far as I can understand, any notice sent out to these people will clearly state whether the child is a deaf or mute child or whether it is blind or mentally defective. Few people will read the Act. The intention of the department is that immediately it is acquainted of the fact that there are any of these children in the vicinity, and the parents are not able to provide the necessary education, the department will take the matter in hand. The Bill is perfectly clear, but if it gives the hon. member any satisfaction, I have no objection to his amendment.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I want the position made perfectly clear. The Minister for Education informed me that it was his intention to advise parents through the schools so that many parents will receive a notice to this effect. I said to him, "How are you going to let the parents know that this is in force? It is a new feature and there is a penalty provided if the parent does not notify the Minister." I wanted to make sure that this did not cause any further hardship to these people and the position should be made quite clear.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think it is quite clear.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: These people have enough troubles now and this will clear up the position for them. The Minister for Education agrees with the amendment I have submitted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to it, but the Minister for Education must have been aware that the wording was clear enough before the amendment was discussed. I do not know how children going to school can be notified. It may be an only child that is affected.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I explained that during my second reading speech.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The main consideration is to see that these children get the best possible education, and I do not think the amendment makes much difference, except that it will delay the passage of the Bill.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I want the Minister to explain the meaning of the words,—

> To provide efficient and suitable education for the child from an age to be determined in each case by the Minister until he attains the age of 16 years.

I understood that the State provided education for all children and that any parent was entitled to send his child to a State-controlled or subsidised school. Why now put the onus on the parent of the afflicted child?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think the hon. member must know the reason. These children need to be carefully taught and it takes some time to decide which are the most suitable lines upon which they should be educated. I do not care if they are kept at school until they are 18.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: That is not my point.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Apparently I have misunderstood the hon. member.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Surely every parent in this State is entitled to send his child to be educated at the expense of the State.

Hon. A. R. Jones: This Bill will not allow him to do that.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Under the Bill the parent of a defective child has to provide efficient and suitable education for the child until he attains the age of 16 years. These people are already burdened with having a defective child, and this will force them to provide efficient and suitable education, whereas that should be the duty of the State.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member reads further down to the proposed new Subsection (14) he will see that the Minister or any person authorised by him may grant exemption from all or any of the provisions of the section. At present the parent is compelled to send a child to school until he reaches the age of 14 years and the Bill will relieve him of that compulsion.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: But they do not have to provide the education.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: By this means the State will provide it.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: But this is making a distinction.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the parent cannot provide the necessary finance, the State will do it as far as possible.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I support the remarks of Dr. Hislop. I have had close association with a family which has a child of this type. At a time when that family could ill afford to do so, they had to send the child to be educated. But neither the Act nor the Bill provides any sort of compensation for expenses and these types of children are prevented, under the new health scheme, from joining and receiving the benefits of a lodge. Under this measure the parents will be forced to provide efficient and suitable education for these children until they attain the age of 16 years. Not until a child reaches 21 years of age does the State or Commonwealth provide anything at all. At 21 years, the child becomes a major and becomes entitled to an invalid pension. The Minister should have another look at this and see if there has been a mistake.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is no mistake, but it does need revision by the Minister. Section 20 of the Education Act reads—

> (1) It shall be the duty of every parent of a blind, deaf, or mute child, from the time such child attains the age of six years until he attains the age of sixteen years, to provide efficient and suitable education for such child.

As far as I know, whether a man has money or not, there are very few private institutions to which an individual can send a child if it is blind or mute. It is extremely difficult to find anyone who will take care of a child so afflicted. Subsection (2) reads—

> If the parent having the actual custody of any such child is unable to provide such education, he shall give notice in writing to the Minister of such inability, and shall, from such date as is specified by the Minister, send the child to such (if any) institution as the Minister directs, and shall pay such periodical sum or sums towards the cost of the education or maintenance and education thereat of the child as is or are agreed between such parent and the Minister.

Here again, the same distinction continues. A child is compelled, through its parents, to pay for its education, and is the only child in the State asked to do so, and the only type of parent that is asked to pay for education. If a normal child receives education at the expense of the State, surely it is the State's responsibility to educate every child!

It is wrong to ask a family to pay because it happens to be afflicted in this manner. If the Act is not wrong, we should take steps to alter it. It is introducing a distinction between groups of people. If the Minister appreciated the difficulties families with afflicted children have, he would realise how distressing it is, what a large amount of attention the mother has to give the child, and also how expensive it is. The Minister said he has heard this sort of talk from me many times, but if nothing is done about it, he will hear from me again and again, because I do not think it is right to impose a means test on children that are afflicted. Subsection (3) of Section 20 reads—

> If no such agreement is made, then, upon the complaint of the Minister, or of any person authorised in that behalf by the Minister, a court may, if satisfied that such parent is able to contribute towards the education or maintenance and education of such child, make an order that the parent shall pay such periodical sums, not

exceeding twelve shillings a week towards the cost of the education or maintenance and education of the child as the court deems proper and are specified in the order.

I cannot move an amendment because it would increase the cost of the Crown, and if the Minister does not do anything about it, my respect for him will certainly be lessened.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: For the same reasons as Dr. Hislop has advanced, I, too, am powerless to amend this provision because it will increase the cost to the Crown. I do not think there has been any trouble in the past, but if it suits members I will ask that progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that we deal with the Bill completely and the Minister could then recommit it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Cannot I ask that progress be reported?

The CHAIRMAN: I must put the clause as amended.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 18, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

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

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 11th November.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 4th November, 1952.

CONTENTS.

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

QUESTIONS.

HARBOURS.

As to Bunbury Cut and Report on Pollution.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Works:

As the engineer who was in charge of the Bunbury harbour is now in the metropolitan area, will he give the following particulars to the House:—

(1) The present state of the cut from the estuary to the sea?

(2) Details of the report of pollution which is occurring in the estuary caused by the plugging of the estuary?

The MINISTER replied:

The reports relating to these two questions will shortly be laid on the Table of the House.

COLLIE COAL.

As to Companies' Prices.

Mr. MAY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

What was the price paid for coal from the following coal companies prior to, and subsequent to, the metal trades strike:—

(a) Amalgamated Collieries of W.A. Ltd.;

(b) Griffin Coal Mining Company;

(c) Western Coal Mining Company?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

(a) Price as at 21/2/52, £2 2s. 5d.; at 18/8/52, £2 13s. 6d.

(b) Price as at 21/2/52, £2 2s. 5d.; at 18/8/52, £2 12s. 8d.

Above prices are tentative and subject to adjustment.

(c) Price as at 21/2/52, £2 10s. 11½d.; at 18/8/52, £5 0s. 8½d.

HOUSING.

As to Stockpile Suspense Account.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

What were the balances of the imported houses stockpile suspense account as at the 31st July, the 31st August and the 30th September, this year?

The MINISTER replied:

As at 31/7/52, £79,637 2s. 2d.; 31/8/52, £77,742 7s. 2d.; 30/9/52, £77,313 7s. 2d.

FORESTS.

As to Danger from Pests in Imported Timber.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Forests:

In view of the fact that it is on record that sirex wasp has been introduced to New Zealand forests through the importa-